

Flight 93 Advisory Commission Meeting

Meeting Number 8

Saturday, April 16, 2005

Somerset County Courthouse

Somerset, Pennsylvania

Minutes prepared by:

JAMISON PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Forest Park, Georgia

Chairman John Reynolds called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present:

Mr. John Reynolds, Chair

Ms. Donna Glessner, Vice Chair

Mr. Larry Catuzzi

Mr. John Felt

Dr. Brent Glass

Mr. Jerry Guadagno

Dr. Ed Linenthal

Mr. Ken Nacke

Mr. Gary Singel

Mr. Jerry Spangler

Mr. Dan Sullivan

Ms. Pamela Tokar-Ickes

Mr. Greg Walker

Mr. Michael Watson

Mr. Calvin Wilson

I. Opening of Meeting and Pledge Of Allegiance

Chairman John Reynolds welcomed the Commissioners and the members of the public, and formally opened the eighth meeting of the Flight 93 Advisory Commission.

“Welcome. I’d like to take just a second to go over a few things. First, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to offer our sincere honor, particular delight, and thanks to all of the Ambassadors out at the site. Joanne, Ed and I recently visited the site. It was great to see the Ambassadors effectively and efficiently assisting the visitors as necessary. The Ambassadors were cheerful and immediately responsive to every visitor, and it was a wonderful display of American volunteerism and caring.”

Superintendent Joanne Hanley led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Welcome, Introductions, Opening Remarks and Housekeeping

Chairman Reynolds – “Although there are not many motions on the agenda for this meeting, the business before us is in establishing a national memorial for the families of the crew and passengers of Flight 93, and for all the citizens of the United States of America, and for the future. It is never common business. We take this very seriously, and the level of emotion, concern and caring that is exhibited by each of you on this Commission demonstrates how important this work is to all of us. I would just like to reaffirm to you, the public, that this Commission is incredibly and deeply engaged in this important endeavor, both emotionally and intellectually.

Superintendent Hanley went over handouts and travel voucher instructions.

III. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 16, 2005

Motion 05-11 Regarding the Approval of Minutes from April 16, 2005

Motion: The Commission approves the minutes of January 2005

Moved: By Commissioner Felt.

Second: By Commissioner Wilson

Discussion from the Commissioners: None

Discussion from Public: None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed

Motion passes.

A summary of all motions passed at every Commission meeting since the first one in November 2003 was passed out.

V. Reports

A. Lands Update

Superintendent Joanne Hanley

“The announcement of the establishment of the Flight 93 National Memorial boundary was published in the Federal Register on March 21, 2005. If you recall, the Secretary of the Interior approved the boundary at our last meeting via memo, and the map as well as the boundary was published in the Federal Register. These are now on file and available for public inspection at our office in Somerset, the Lands Office in Washington, and the Lands Office in Philadelphia as well.

I would also like to announce that an offer was made to a property owner inside the fence, and the National Park Service is in negotiations with that property owner right now in terms of whether they will accept that offer.

There were three other appraisal inspections done this past month for three additional properties inside the fence, and we anticipate that those appraisals will come to us before the next Commission meeting.

An additional thirteen parcels have had their preliminary title evidence ordered. Preliminary title evidence reveals whether there are any encumbrances on the title, or exceptions to the title, and it is required for all of the land interests that we acquire.

The relocation bids have been completed for one of the major property owners. A rental housing study is being currently done for one of the other landowners (who has a tenant) to potentially relocate this tenant.

If you will recall, we have been using this chart for the Conservation Fund properties, as well as the National Park Services properties. You will also recall that while we report by parcel, the parcels don't necessarily reflect the number of landowners. There are 58 parcels with which we deal inside the 2200 acres; however, that only represents 36 landowners. Some of the landowners may own one parcel; some of the landowners may own ten parcels. "

Superintendent Hanley reviewed the Conservation Fund chart (**see Attachment 1**).

"If you will recall, we mentioned several meetings ago that the closings that have been done are on underground mineral rights bought from PBS. Most of the other parcels that the Conservation Fund is working with have to deal with PBS Coal Company land, which stretches from Route 30, all the way down to the drag lines and a little bit beyond.

The reason the Conservation Fund has not closed on the PBS Coal land is because PBS still has some remediation and some environmental work to do on their properties. As soon as the remediation is complete and the Department of Environmental Protection has signed off on all of the remediation, there is a 60-day window within which Conservation Fund will close on the PBS Coal properties.

Since the last meeting, the National Park Service has made a lot of progress, particularly in relation to the appraisals taking place inside the fence. Superintendent Hanley reviewed the National Park Service chart (**see Attachment 2**).

Superintendent Hanley also advised the Commissioners that the National Park Services would continue to proceed on ordering title evidence. She advised the Commissioners that this data is available on hardcopy charts for their perusal.

B. Design Solicitation Committee Update

Jeff Reinbold

"Mr. Chairman, I'd like to do the Design Competition first.

"For those of you that were here this morning, you know that we were very fortunate in that we had the opportunity to introduce the finalists. We had five teams here, and they all spoke very briefly about what inspired them to participate in this project and inspired their designs.

What I would like to do, though, is turn it over to Don Stastny and Helene Fried, and ask Don to update us on the process and the schedule for the design competition, especially for anyone that was not here this morning. Then the other important task is to forward the recommendation to the Commission from the Design Oversight Committee for the Stage 2 jurors.”

Don Stastny: “Thank you. I just got back from the site for the fourth time. It is a phenomenal piece of ground.”

The last time that we spoke before the Commission was when we received the submittals from the competitors. We convened the Stage 1 jury, and the jury went through a very rigorous four days of work evaluating many, many different submittals and coming up with five that we invited into Stage 2 of the design competition.

The five finalists, which, if you were here this morning you had the chance meet, are a very diverse group. They range from students to quite accomplished practitioners. But they share a common bond, and I think the bond that they agree upon is to be a part of the overall project; understanding and trying to define what the Memorial is. They have a tremendous dedication in trying to find the right answers that honor the fallen heroes, that respond to the wishes of the families, and that interprets the mission statement that everyone worked so hard to get to. I have the pleasure of working with them very closely now, working with them on very specific questions, and assisting them in getting towards their final solution.

The first thing we did was to bring them to Somerset for two days of meetings. The first day was a briefing, in which we again laid out the program and the mission statement. We had our entire Design Oversight Committee with us during these two days. We spent time at the site in the middle of the winter. It was very, very cold, and yet their dedication and love showed through. The next day we spent the full day meeting with specific master plan workshops. The purpose of this was to engage those five teams at a level of defining the overall master plan for the Memorial in such a way that we could use their designs as alternatives for the general management plan. We've asked each of them to give us a zoning diagram for the site.

We invited them to come back to the site this weekend. Through Jeff's work, and through the courtesy of PBS and other landowners, we have been able to open up the entire site for the teams to explore. They were able to check their designs and details against the land, get a renewed sense of what this particular land is about, and what this very special piece of ground means in both a literal and figurative ways.

Two months from now we will be receiving materials from the Stage 2 design teams. This will include drawings, models, cost information, some additional specifications, and the best consultant they would ask to assist them to take on the next stage of design development, should they be selected. Those submittals, or at least a graphic model of the drawings, will be on display. They will be on display for at least six weeks at the Georgian Place Outlet Mall. The purpose of the six-week exhibition date is to allow a public evaluation period that is required by the General Management Plan.

When we receive the submittals in June, we will again engage the Stage 1 jury. Remember, their job is to come back and look at the five teams and ensure that they didn't change their design so much that it is different than their original submittal. They will not make an evaluation among the different concepts, but the Stage 1 jury will specifically look at each final design, and make a list of what they see as positive or negative attributes concerning each one. We will pass this on to the Stage 2 jury as part of the overall information.

We will convene the Stage 2 jury, pending the Commission's approval of their appointment, August 1st through 3rd. We will put the jurors through the same type of rigor that we used for the Stage 1 jury. Between now and then, we will be spending time with each of the Stage 2 jurors, i.e. sending them materials, explaining what their role is, and what the program information is. When they come the first of August, they will be prepared to go to work and they will understand what the purpose of their role is.

Following their recommendation, we will be writing up their report, and submitting that to the Design Oversight Committee through the proper channels.

Everything is on schedule. Everything has been completed to the best of our abilities as far as protecting the integrity of the process, and the rigor that we are executing. As I stated this morning, having spent the last two days on the site with these design teams, has been an epiphany in a way. Chairman Reynolds and others have spoken about this since the beginning of the competition. After we started out at the sacred ground area this morning, the teams started to dissipate or move out onto the site. Jeff, Tim and myself were watching when we saw an individual starting to go out into the landscape. We realized how big this place is, and the scale illustrated how both insignificant and significant a single person is when standing out in that landscape.

The designer in me saw an inspiration right there that although we were doing a memorial, the land already is a memorial. The art would be how that land is interpreted into this very special memorial statement.

I was also struck by working with the teams this last two months. I came away convinced that we have exactly the right people with the right kind of commitment, and the right kind of dedication. This will be a memorial not like Viet Nam, and not like Oklahoma City. This will be a memorial none of us have ever seen before; none of us have experienced before. It will not necessarily be a monument; rather, it will be an experience, and I think we are going about it in exactly the right way."

Question from Commissioner Larry Catuzzi: "Don, should there be a finding that for whatever reason one of the teams changes their scope, and we find a need to make a determination that they have done that, do they withdraw? Do we replace them, or do we just go with the four remaining designs? Do any of the remaining entries ever get moved up?"

Answer from Don Stastny: "No...if for some reason something like that should happen, then they will not continue. I don't think it will be a disqualification on our part if something should happen, i.e., if they withdrew. The Design Oversight Committee would make a determination after checking with their constituencies on the appropriate action to take."

Chairman Reynolds: "I'd like us to go into Executive Session before we take the next step. We have some questions that we would like to ask Don and Helene about the makeup of the Stage 2 juries. So with your permission, I'd like to allow us to do that at the end of the rest of the reports, and then we would come back into session."

Motion 05-12: Regarding the Commission Breaking for Executive Session

Motion: The Commission will break for Executive Session at the end of the report to discuss confidential issues relating to the make-up of the Stage 2 jury.

Moved: By Commissioner Spangler
Second: By Commissioner Wilson
Discussion from the Commissioners: None
Discussion from Public: None
Vote: All in favor; none opposed
Motion passes.

C. General Management Plan

Jeff Reinbold

"Mr. Chairman, I will briefly update you on where we are on the schedule in terms of the General Management Plan. As you know, we have three charges for the Commission:

- Recommending the boundary
- Recommending the design, and
- Recommending the management plan

I want to highlight what you have accomplished so far, and what's remaining. We can identify three basic phases through which we are going.

First creating the vision. Everything was grounded in this vision, and through the mission statement, the Memorial Ideas Committee crafted that mission statement which guides both the management plan, and guided the design competition.

The second major task is choosing the design. The design competition, as we all know, has just gone through Stage 1, and we are at the point of refining those final designs and evaluating them, and that will happen in a couple of months.

Thirdly, and what I want to talk about today is the General Management Plan. We've already gathered information. I want to update you on the studies, and to discuss preparing the draft GMP and finalizing the GMP.

Ginger Mesko passed out a compilation of the studies to the Commissioners.

Jeff Reinbold then summarized each of the studies.

"The National Resource Inventory is not included in this package, but it is something that we are going to add. We just received it yesterday. We had a partnership with the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, and they did a fantastic job of inventorying all of the resources, i.e., the vegetation, and the wildlife. They provided some very good snapshots of the site.

We have talked before about the geo-technical overview, and our charge to the consultants was to identify any areas from which we would need to stay away. The geo-technical consultants will stay engaged with the final design throughout the process. Given that that is a disturbed landscape, and one that has undergone surface mining, they are obviously going to play a role in the future.

The cultural landscape inventory, which we talked about before, documented the site as of September 11, and everything that was out there as of that day. We have done environmental investigations to see if in this kind of landscape there are any issues we need to be aware of. We did visitation projection and we also did a visual assessment of the viewsheds. This was used to develop the boundary.

A regional socioeconomic atlas looked at conditions that are occurring in the surrounding counties. Somerset is obviously the one that will be the most impacted by this, the one that I understand will kind of trend what is happening in the surrounding counties. That is actually referenced on the CD in your binders.

We have a complete mapping and GIS system now. We used that to make the information available to the competitors in the design competition.

There have been two phases to the transportation analysis. What you have in the binders is the initial results of the traffic study. We had hoped to have the second part of that for you today, but unfortunately we received 6 to 9 inches of snow during the weekend of our final counts, and snowplows took up all of our counters. We will have that report next week. That will include an analysis of the corridors out to the site. We will also discuss the impacts of terminating any roads within the Memorial area.

The final study that we will have complete next week, is the water and sewage study. One of the issues that were raised as we met with the public was where to get water. We hired a local firm in Somerset to look at the options of drilling a well, and tying into some of the existing systems. They have come back with recommendations for cost estimates, as well as with options for treating sewerage, everything from on-site treatment to perhaps tapping onto what's happening in Shanksville right now. Those recommendations just came in, and we will have them for you probably by next week.

Don Stastny mentioned that the Design Competition and the Management Plan were going hand in glove. I want to show you, very briefly, what this management plan would look like. In the management plan we need to have two things for each of the designs:

1. *Management Zoning Map* - In the Management Plan, we will have the entire site designated into different zones: the gateway, the approach, bowl, the sacred ground, and the memorial view. One of the things the designers will do is to take their design and look at the entire site and zone it so that we will understand what their definition of "gateway" is, for example.
2. Each designer will do a matrix that will identify three things:
 - the desired resource conditions
 - the desired visitor conditions, and
 - the kind of development and use that will occur in each zone.

Next Steps - The next couple of months are going to be very busy. As I mentioned this morning, we're holding a public meeting on May 12th at Camp Allegheny. I would like to thank them for graciously donating that space to us. They have done it before for the landowner meetings. This will be an opportunity for the public to come out and hear a brief presentation and an overview of where we are to learn more about the design competition, data gathering studies, etc.

We are also going to have representatives from the Pennsylvania Environmental Council and some of our partners at the Camp Allegheny meeting to talk about other activities that are happening in the region as well.

The crunch time for us is April and May. We have to write the GMP and the Environmental Impact Statement essentially by the end of May. It is a very, very ambitious schedule and it will be done. But that will require the help of the GMP Committee, not for writing, but for reviewing. I'm working with the consultants to write the draft chapters. Those are going to be circulated to the Committee, so when you as a Commission review it, you will know that family, Commission members and Task Force members have looked at it. The Commissioners on that committee include Greg Walker, Gary Singel, Kenny Nacke, Jerry Spangler, Larry Catuzzi, and Donna Glessner.

The document has to go through a 45-day public review period.

We talked a lot about internal communications, and this is one for the Task Force members as well. Ginger Mesko has spent an enormous amount of time lately updating our communications website, buildmgr.com. As you may remember, we have a password-protected site for your use, and I will be re-sending instructions on how to access this web site, which includes all the meeting minutes. This site is for the partners, and is different from the general public site.

Finally, I wanted to update you on the corridor study of which we are a part. At this point, Somerset County has moved forward and submitted applications for funding from two state agencies to be able to fund this corridor study. The study will look at routes to be improved from Somerset out to the crash site, and will analyze what kinds of development are likely to happen along those corridors. That will probably begin this summer if the funding comes through. It will be an opportunity to engage the public, local business interests, and everyone who has a stake in that corridor to come together and talk about what might happen, and then explore the kinds of steps they may want to take.

I would also like to say that Commissioner Greg Walker has done a fantastic job keeping this thing going, and this summer promises much activity.

We have also been active in other projects around the area. There are about 25-30 conservation and tourism related initiatives in Somerset County, and so we are talking with them about these issues as well."

The Commission went into Executive Session for 45 minutes.

D. Design Solicitation Committee Revisited

Findings of the Stage Two Jury - Helene Fried

“Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I am pleased, on behalf of the Design Oversight Committee, to present to you the recommended members for the State Two Jury.”

The Stage Two Jury is comprised of 15 voting members and one non-voting recorder as follows:

- 8 members from families of Flight 93 and partners
- 7 additional members, including design professionals and civic leaders drawn from the local and national community; and
- one non-voting recorder who is a family member.

The Design Oversight Committee members were:

Calvin Wilson, representing the Advisory Commission

Gina Farfour, representing the Families of Flight 93

Tim Beard, representing the Flight 93 National Memorial Task Force

Jeff Reinbold, representing the National Park Service and

Don Stastny and Helene Fried

Helene was very appreciative of the tremendous support, concern and attention given by the Design Oversight Committee.

Helene then read the following list of proposed members of the Stage 2 jury (***see Attachment 3***).

Motion 05-13 Regarding the Approval of the Stage 2 Jury

Motion: The Commission approves the recommendation of the Stage 2 Jury.

Moved: By Commissioner Spangler

Second: By Commissioner Wilson

Discussion from the Commissioners: None

Discussion from Public: None

Vote: All in favor; none opposed

Abstained:

Calvin Wilson

Larry Catuzzi

Ken Nacke

John Felt

Motion passes.

E. Fundraising Committee Update

Jason Zajac from Ketchum

“Mr. Chairman, first, please allow me to convey Rick Stafford’s apologies for his absence today. We spoke a couple of times about the issues that would significantly affect the success of the fundraising efforts. We need to attract the leadership to support the case, in addition to continued support. The Ketchum team instinctively has never felt that there was a question about the case being compelling. Certainly during our research, we learned that the case for support and the purpose, for which we are all working, is universally understood and appreciated. Leadership is going to be a unique challenge for this campaign.

Identification of leadership is paramount to the success of this campaign. We have spent a great deal of energy over the last two months identifying candidates and profiling Fortune 500 leaders, etc. We have also been conducting meetings with early candidates to gauge their level of interest and involvement. So the leadership issue is critical to us.

The second area of activity is the launch phase. If you will recall from our recommendations in the study process, we identified the channels that we felt that we could identify and solve in our launch committee. One was “*what is the role of Pennsylvania in funding this project?*” There has been a bit of a disconnect between the leaders in western Pennsylvania in particular, who felt it was approximate and therefore of interest, and something that they should support. Others say that “this is a nationally important project, so what are the people of Pennsylvania going to do?” We need to bring those two perspectives together.

We also need to create a critical starting point of seed money to carry the whole process forward. So we developed this model of a launch phase campaign focused principally in western Pennsylvania.

Since the last Commission meeting I am pleased to announce that we have enlisted leadership for the launch phase committee, and I’d like to thank John Reynolds for assisting us in that process. I would also like to thank Commissioner Dan Sullivan for agreeing to lead the launch phase fundraising initiative.

I would also like to recognize two other members of the Commission, Commissioner Larry Catuzzi, and Commissioner Mike Watson will also be working with us. Thank you for getting involved.

The third area we have been concerned about, we refer to as “awareness and cultivation.” We discovered that there is a broad awareness of the general events of September 11, but that is a relatively shallow awareness. There is not an understanding of the site really at all. People have not seen all of the hard work that has been done by all of the private organizations and volunteers over the past few years. So we need to get out and really start to build awareness and educate our prospects.

Our cultivation and awareness building activities are focused in two geographic centers; western Pennsylvania, and California. We investigated the possibility of involving a leader from the National Park Foundation Board, Ms. Nancy Bechtel, who is a Vice-

Chairman of the National Park Foundation. I want to take a moment to thank the National Park Foundation and their leadership for allowing us to engage Nancy in that level of dialogue. She was very forthcoming in agreeing to assist us, and we appreciate her interest and her continued support. She is a very well respected leader in that area. So we are very excited about Nancy's involvement.

The fourth and last area that we have been working on is really the nuts and bolts of this operation, and it is "campaign operations." Unlike regular campaigns, we don't have the infrastructure to just go out and do this, so we have been working with Hamilton Peterson, Gordie Felt from the Families, the families' board, working with Joanne and the National Park Service, and others.

F. Miscellaneous NPS Report

None

V. Old Business

Joanne Hanley

"I want to report very briefly that on April 2nd, we had a nice dinner for the volunteers who worked on our design exhibit.

One of the jury members from the Stage One Jury could not accept his honorarium because he was a federal employee, and so he designated the use of that honorarium to host a dinner for the volunteers who gave tirelessly to the Stage One Jury and exhibit. We held the dinner at the Green Gables restaurant. It was a very nice dinner, and very well represented by the partners and volunteers as well.

We had great representation from the Commission as well; i.e., Mike Watson, Donna Glessner, Kenny Nacke, and Gary Singel were there. Judge Gibson was there from the Task Force, and Esther Heymann was there from the Families. I wanted to thank Debbie Branton and Gail Kemerer for all of their hard work in putting that together."

Ms. Hanley was very appreciative of everyone coming out in joining and supporting the volunteers.

VI. New Business

Chairman Reynolds

"Teen Vogue Magazine called the Student Conservation Association, which is a group that goes and finds volunteers to work in the national parks, national forests, city parks, etc., for conservation internships. Ginger Mesko is working here at the NPS office as a Student Conservation Association intern.

The Student Conservation Association office referred Teen Vogue to Ginger, as an example of a young woman who was making a career and was a wonderful example of the kinds of things young people can do today. So Teen Vogue will have an article on Ginger in a future issue. We are all very proud of her (applause).

Second, this phase of activity is the most critical stage of activity. Communication across all channels is just as important as the complex technical considerations with which we have to deal. We really need to continue to talk with each other and share with each other. I hope that all of us start to use the communication website better. Sharing of information remains critical.”

VIII. Additional Public Comments

None

Next meeting is set for June 25th

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

Minutes prepared by:

JAMISON PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

531 Forest Parkway, Suite 200

Forest Park, Georgia 30297

(404) 363-6894

(404) 363-0130 (fax)