

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said it was the granite walls that concerned her most. Mr. Halprin said they would be only 10 feet high (the drawing^s of record indicate one actual height of 14 feet) and would frequently have sculpture or inscriptions on them, as well as being interspersed with waterfalls and plant material. She asked him if he would have designed the memorial in the same way if he had started just a year ago; he said that was a hard question to answer, that he still believed in the basic principles although he might have come up with different forms. He was also asked how he would reduce the size of the memorial if the budget demanded it; he said he did not have an answer to that question at the time, but hoped it would not be necessary because he felt it was just right the way it was.

Ms. Frances Campbell, from the FDR Memorial Foundation, asked to comment. She said the late congressman, Claude Pepper, who had been a close friend of the late President's, thought the memorial was most appropriate, especially because of its historical aspects. She said the Roosevelt family also considered it appropriate. Mr. Halprin commented that the form of a memorial was not up to the person memorialized, but to those who wanted to remember him.

The Chairman said the Commission did not want to hold things up, but had been asked by the Congress to comment again on the design, and it was evident that there was a unanimous concern about the size and grandiosity of the scheme. He said there were many positive things about the design that he would not want to see destroyed, but thought it should be looked at again in the terms of the 1990s. Mr. Halprin said he had no problem with that, and would restudy the design with the members' comments in mind, especially with a view to giving it a softer, more gardenesque quality. The Chairman thanked him for his presentation, and Mr. Halprin said he would return in two or three months with new studies. Exhibit B

2. CFA 19/APR/90-2, Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Memorial to honor women of the U. S. Armed Forces who served in Vietnam. Site selection. (Previous: CFA 22/OCT/87-1.) Staff member Sue Kohler noted the members' visit to the site just before the meeting, and then gave a brief summary of the previous submission for the benefit of those who had not been members at the time. She said that in October 1987 the Commission had reviewed a proposal to place a statue of an army nurse at the Vietnam Memorial, in a grove of trees near the path at the south east end of the memorial site. At the time, the members were reluctant to approve any additions to the memorial, which they considered complete. It was observed that a delicate balance had been achieved, not without great difficulty, when the statues of the three foot-soldiers had been added.

A second concern was that the site selected, although not detrimental to the existing elements, was somewhat remote and gave the statue the appearance of an after-thought, a secondary element, that would not accomplish the goal its sponsors had in mind.

A third question concerned the authority to add the statue: Could it be added under the legislation that had authorized the original memorial, or did it require new legislation, which would follow the procedures required by the Commemorative Works Act? It was thought that the sponsors should get their own legislation, and they were encouraged in this direction by Rep. Mary Rose Oakar, then chairman of the House Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials. Mrs. Kohler said legislation authorizing the memorial was signed into law in November 1988; a year later, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, a joint resolution of the Congress authorized the location of the memorial in Area I. In neither case was the legislation site-specific, but each bill noted that: "It is the sense of the Congress that it would be most fitting and appropriate to place the memorial within the 2.2 acre site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial."

Mrs. Kohler then introduced David Sherman from the Park Service to begin the presentation. Mr. Sherman said the Memorial Advisory Committee had reviewed a number of sites for the memorial and had preferred what was called Site 2, near the location chosen in 1987, although the door was left open to other possibilities, should the winner of the design competition prefer an alternate. He then introduced Diane Evans, head of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project, to continue the discussion. Ms. Evans said she had served in Vietnam as an Army nurse and had been working to make this project a reality since 1984. She thanked the Commission for giving her the opportunity to present it, and said she would make further remarks after the various site possibilities had been presented by Suzette Voline, from the architectural firm of Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum.

Ms. Voline said her firm's study had two goals in mind: to find a site relevant to its historic context, and one that would not impact any existing memorials. She showed site diagrams, pointing out five areas that had been considered, and the sites looked at within each area. Area A was located to the north of the Wall, between Henry Bacon Drive and Constitution Avenue. She said it had been eliminated because anything placed there would be intrusive on the visitor's experience of the Wall; another concern was the traffic noise from Constitution Avenue. Area B was the central area of the memorial, including the upper terrace of lawn north of the Wall and the larger lawn area in front of it; anything placed in this area would be considered intrusive. Area C consisted of the cone-shaped view sheds from the apex of the Walls towards the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument; again, these were considered areas that should not be built upon. Area D was the area adjacent to the entry plaza; as such, it was

considered to be in the "shadow" of the Hart statue and unsuitable for any development. Area E, on both sides of the southern perimeter path and on the west side of the path coming from the Lincoln Memorial, offered the best opportunity for sites that would relate to, but would not be intrusive on, the existing memorial elements.

Ms. Voline then discussed six sites within Areas A and E. She said the two sites in Area A (sites 5 & 6) were not recommended because of the noise and intrusion aspects previously mentioned. Site 3, in Area E, was considered too close to the Hart statue and presented pedestrian circulation problems. Site 4, along the path coming from the Lincoln Memorial, had the disadvantage of setting up a linear sequence of events in this area, which was already congested with people stopping at the flagpole, the Hart statue, then back to the directories and the beginning of the Wall. She said the two most promising sites were 1 & 2, both located near the path that led to the Hart statue and entry plaza or to Constitution Gardens. Site 1 was located on the north side of the path, in a grove of trees; site 2 was south of the path. Both would offer views of the Wall through the trees, a new way to experience it, but at the same time, the trees would screen the women's memorial so that it would not intrude on either the Wall or the Hart statue. Ms. Voline said it was expected that the memorial would be set in a round plaza and would be about the same size as the Hart statue and its setting. She said the Park Service had informed them that the path could be moved slightly if necessary to accommodate a memorial on either Site 1 or Site 2.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor asked if the memorial would line up with the apex of the Wall. Ms. Voline said it would be approximately in that position but not rigidly aligned. The Chairman thought it very important that it not be aligned; he recounted the difficulty experienced previously in persuading the proponents of the flag and statue additions that placing these elements on direct axis with the apex, in full view of the Wall, would be severely damaging to both the Wall and the additions. Ms. Abrahamson said that after having seen the site, she was more comfortable with Site 2 than she had been before. Ms. Voline said that although the Memorial Advisory Commission had expressed a preference for Site 2, her firm would like to keep the option of going with either Site 1 or Site 2, because they would not know what the design would be until after the competition. Mr. Sherman said the Advisory Commission had taken the same position and left the door open to allow for more creativity. Ms. Abrahamson said she was pleased to hear that, because she would not like to throw out a wonderful design because it had been conceived for one of the other sites.

Ms. Evans continued the presentation, filling the members in on what had happened since the 1987 submission--the passage of the legislation, the creation of a board of directors, investigations into site selection, and preliminary work on the design

competition. She talked about the role of women during the Vietnam War, their healing role, their work behind the scenes and off the record. She said that, like the men, they needed to heal and to receive recognition, something not provided in the existing Vietnam Memorial, therefore leaving it fundamentally incomplete. She reaffirmed that the preferred memorial element remained a figurative statue of a woman, although the competition, judged by a jury of eminent architects, artists, and veterans, would not be closed to other design solutions. She said the figure should relate to the Hart statue in material, style and scale. Ms. Evans recalled the resolve with which Jan Scruggs had pursued his goal to build the original memorial, and said her group had been promised financial support from the major veterans' organizations and had received tens of thousands of private gifts. She closed by quoting from a letter received from a woman in Canada, who said: "While I do not wish to celebrate war, I do wish to see the story of women's involvement with it told with accuracy, dignity, and honor, just as we do that of the men."

The members had several questions. Mr. Peck asked Mr. Sherman if he were aware of any other proposals for memorials to Vietnam veterans in the area or elsewhere. Mr. Sherman said there had been several proposals for other additions to Maya Lin's memorial; one of them, for a flagpole at the apex, had gotten as far as proposed legislation. Ms. Evans commented that the legislation authorizing the women's memorial stated the memorial would be complete with that addition. Mr. Peck said one Congress could undo what another had done, and he thought the site for the women's memorial should be chosen with the thought in mind that sites for other additions might have to be found in the future; he thought the Commission should give a clear indication of its preference in this case. His second comment was that he was disappointed that there was such strong support for the use of figurative sculpture, not because he was against it, but because he thought it would put a constraint on the artists in the competition. Mr. Sherman commented on the question of site selection; he said the only reason the Memorial Advisory Commission had not made a clear-cut decision was that the nature of the design was still unknown, adding that the Advisory Commission would be reviewing the design criteria for the competition.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor asked what kind of competition Ms. Evans had in mind, and who would be paying for the memorial. She was told there would be an open competition, one stage, or possibly two, and that funds would be raised privately, not provided by the government. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she shared Mr. Peck's views on putting any constraint on the artists in regard to the type of design solution that would be acceptable.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield agreed that a strong statement on figurative sculpture would discourage some artists. He also warned about the problems of trying to represent all women who served in

Vietnam with one figure; he said someone would always feel left out. Ms. Evans said she thought that as Frederick Hart's statue represented all men, the women's statue would represent all women, and she thought that challenge could be met.

Ms. Abrahamson said she detected a bit of competitive feeling, on the part of the women's group, with the Hart statue and the Wall; she thought they would achieve better results if they concentrated on how to produce the strongest, most meaningful memorial, one that was integrated with the other elements and did not become a separate precinct for women. In regard to the site, she said she thought not enough had been said about the one near the flagpole, on the path from the Lincoln Memorial. She thought it would have great impact as an entry experience, would be well-related to the other elements, and not seen as peripheral. Ms. Evans said they definitely did not want to be seen as competitive, but Ms. Abrahamson thought that in the desire not to be, there was the danger that a feeling of separateness would creep in.

Ms. Evans said she would like to comment on the image and feeling they wanted to create with this memorial. She observed that veterans and others who visited the Wall for the first time often left in a highly emotional state and needed some place to sit and regain their composure. She hoped that the women's memorial could meet that need, continuing the healing process provided by the women who served during the war. Vice-Chairman Porterfield commented that what she was describing was a place rather than a monument, a place where all these feelings would be brought together in a finale to the experience of war.

The Chairman thought that from the discussion a resolution could be framed in terms of recommending Site 2, but not precluding another site, particularly Site 4, near the entry. Mr. Hartman said he would second that, but would add that Site 2 should be interpreted as encompassing the path, which could be moved or reworked to accommodate the design. There was unanimous agreement that this was the sense of the Commission. Exhibit C

Mr. Peck took the opportunity of the Park Service's presence to ask about the unsightly appearance of the black standards and chains in the area of the Hart statue, erected to channel the crowds. Mr. Sherman said, and the Secretary agreed, that they had been erected with the approval of the Commission. The Chairman said he thought the problem was that they did not seat well, and as the posts leaned, the chains assumed varying catenaries that gave an uneven, messy appearance. Mr. Peck said the posts themselves had not been well-maintained. Mr. Sherman said the problem was that they had been put in as a temporary measure, with the expectation that they would be removed when the extraordinary number of visitors dropped-off, but he would take a look at them and see what could be done. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor suggested that a natural barrier, such as bramble bushes, might be considered.