

It was agreed by all that the entire project needed more study. The addition, in particular, was disapproved, with the recommendation that if it had to be done, all of it should be as transparent as possible. The concept of the OTS was considered an interesting one, but there was concern about its size, and a request for further study of ways to keep it as unobtrusive and respectful of the landscape as possible.

(The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 12:50 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.) ^{Exhibit F}

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 16/APR/92-5, Vietnam Women's Memorial. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 19/SEP/91-1.) Mrs. Kohler showed a photograph of the previously approved design for the sculpture for this memorial, designed by Glenna Goodacre. Then she showed a sketch by the Planning Commission staff, suggesting a major change in the posture of the kneeling figure; this was followed by a revised version by Ms. Goodacre, incorporating several of the minor changes requested. The change in posture had not been incorporated; the board of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project had considered it unacceptable because it removed the feeling of isolation and despair so important to the figure. Mrs. Kohler pointed out that the helmet had been moved from the right to the left hand, as requested by NCPC, the head had been turned slightly towards the helmet, and the free hand, instead of resting on the thigh, was held in an extended, open position. Mrs. Kohler noted also that the left hand of the standing figure had been lowered and placed closer to the body, eliminating what the Park Service had thought was a potential hazard to children, who might run into it.

Mrs. Kohler introduced Diane Carlson Evans, chairman of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project, to discuss the changes. She said she had worked with the sculptor to respond to the suggestions made, and while they were not willing to alter the kneeling figure to the extent requested, they could accept the changes now being presented to the Commission. It was thought that the changed position of the helmet would help hide some of the sandbags, and the slight change in the turn of the head would show more of the face; the position of the hand was something the artist did not feel strongly about. Ms. Evans read a letter from the artist commenting on the revisions.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she was not sure the sculpture had been improved; in fact, she found it weakened. The Chairman was concerned that the helmet had lost its symbolism and become part of the mass of the sandbags, and he thought the change in the position of the head had diminished the poignancy and feeling of emptiness the figure had as she

kneeled with her back to the other nurse, alone with her thoughts. Mr. Peck said he preferred the hand as it was originally, that it had more strength. Vice-Chairman Porterfield and Ms. Abrahamson felt that by focusing the gaze on the helmet, the figure had lost the feeling of despair it had originally.

Mr. Peck asked to comment on the review process. He said he thought the Planning Commission was exceeding its bounds when it started making specific comments on a piece of sculpture. He thought it was particularly inappropriate for the staff to make a sketch, explaining to the artist just how the design should be altered. The Chairman agreed and said he would like write a letter to NCPC on this matter. He said the Commission of Fine Arts did not comment on planning, and he did not think the Planning Commission should comment on a work of art--especially to the point of telling the artist how to redesign it.

John Parsons from the Park Service (and also a member of NCPC) asked to comment. He said the Planning Commission had taken exception to the fact that they had never been asked to review the original sculpture; their rationale for wanting to review it was the Commemorative Works Act, which said that both the site and design for memorials had to be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, the Planning Commission, and the Secretary of the Interior (or the Administrator of General Services, as appropriate). He said that although the Commission might not be aware of it, it was common practice for NCPC to make design comments and offer sketches. The Chairman said he interpreted the Commemorative Works Act to mean site and architectural design, not the design of works of art associated with the memorial. He said this kind of duplicate review could send applicants back and forth to the two commissions forever. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor added that this was a common problem with review agencies all over the country.

The consensus was that the Commission did not think the design had been improved by the changes; it was suggested, however, that the comments made be given to the artist, and that she be allowed to make the final decision. Exhibit G

2. CFA 16/APR/92-6, East Potomac Park Golf Course, Ohio Drive, S.W. Preliminary design. Staff member Jeffrey Carson said the project consisted of renovations and additions to a golf course that had been on the site since the 1920s. He showed photographs and site plans, noting the original clubhouse, and the driving range, putting greens, miniature golf course, and swimming pool. He said there would be an increase in the parking, a new pro shop, snack bar, rain shelters, maintenance facility, and driving range structure.