AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

WHAT VISITORS CAN EXPECT AT THE CAPITOL VISITORS CENTER: TRANSPORTATION, ACCESS, SECURITY AND VISUALS

(110–49)

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 8, 2007

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

35–931 PDF WASHINGTON : 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota, *Chairman*

NICK J. RAHALL, II, West Virginia
PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
JERRY F. COSTELLO, Illinois
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JERROLD NADLER, New York
CORRINE BROWN, Florida
BOB FILNER, California
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa
TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania
BRIAN BAIRD, Washington
RICK LARSEN, Washington
MICHAEL E. CAPUANO, Massachusetts
JULIA CARSON, Indiana
TIMOTHY H. BISHOP, New York
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, Maine
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
JOHN T. SALAZAR, Colorado
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, California
DANIEL LIPINSKI, Illinois
DORIS O. MATSUI, California
NICK LAMPSON, Texas
ZACHARY T. SPACE, Ohio
MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
BRUCE L. BRALEY, Iowa
JASON ALTMIRE, Pennsylvania
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
HEATH SHULER, North Carolina
MICHAEL A. ACURI, New York
HARRY E. MITCHELL, Arizona
CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY, Pennsylvania
JOHN J. HALL, New York
STEVE KAGEN, Wisconsin
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
JERRY MCNERNEY, California
VACANCY

JOHN L. MICA, Florida
DON YOUNG, Alaska
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
HOWARD COBLE, North Carolina
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
WAYNE T. GILCHREST, Maryland
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
RICHARD H. BAKER, Louisiana
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
GARY G. MILLER, California
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
HENRY E. BROWN, JR., South Carolina
TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON, Illinois
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia
JIM GERLACH, Pennsylvania
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
TED POE, Texas
DAVID G. REICHERT, Washington
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JOHN R. 'RANDY' KUHL, JR., New York
LYNN A WESTMORELAND, Georgia
CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR., Louisiana
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
THELMA D. DRAKE, Virginia
MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
VERN BUCHANAN, Florida

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia, *Chairwoman*

MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, Maine
JASON ALTMIRE, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL A. ARCURI, New York
CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY, Pennsylvania
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
(Ex Officio)

SAM GRAVES, Missouri
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
JOHN R. 'RANDY' KUHL, JR., New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

Page

Summary of Subject Matter vi

TESTIMONY

Ayers, Stephen T., AIA, Acting Architect of the Capitol and Deputy Architect/Chief Operating Officer, United States Congress 5
Moneme, Emeka C., Director, District of Columbia Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20
Morse, Chief Phillip D., Chief of Police, United States Capitol Police, Washington, D.C., accompanied by Daniel Nichols 20
Purnell, Marshall E., FAIA, President, The American Institute of Architects, Washington, D.C. 32
Shepherd, Leslie L., Chief Architect, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 32
Ungar, Bernard L., Director of Physical Infrastructure, Government Accountability Office, Washington, D.C. 5

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Altmire, Hon. Jason, of Pennsylvania 41
Mitchell, Hon. Harry E., of Arizona 42
Norton, Hon. Eleanor Holmes, of the District of Columbia 46

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY WITNESSES

Ayers, Stephen T. 49
Moneme, Emeka 56
Morse, Phillip D. 61
Purnell, Marshall E. 64
Shepherd, Leslie L. 70

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

James L. Oberstar
Chairman

Washington, DC 20515

John L. Mica
Ranking Republican Member

David Heymsfeld, Chief of Staff
Ward W. McCarragher, Chief Counsel

James W. Coon II, Republican Chief of Staff

June 7, 2007

SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER

TO: Members of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management

FROM: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Staff

SUBJECT: Oversight Hearing on "What Visitors Can Expect at the Capitol Visitors Center: Transportation, Access, Security and Visuals"

PURPOSE

The Subcommittee will meet on Friday, June 8th, 2007, at 10 a.m. in room 2167 Rayburn House Office Building to receive testimony from a panel of government officials, including the Acting Architect of the Capitol ("AOC"), the Chief of the Capitol Police, D.C. Government officials, and trade associations on "What Visitors Can Expect at the Capitol Visitors Center: Transportation, Access, Security and Visuals." The panels will provide testimony on the operational and management plans for the new Capitol Visitors Center ("CVC").

BACKGROUND

The Architect of the Capitol is responsible to the United States Congress for the maintenance, operation, development, and preservation of the United States Capitol Complex, which includes the Capitol, congressional office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, the Supreme Court building, the U.S. Botanic Garden, the Capitol Power Plant, and other facilities. The Subcommittee has jurisdiction over the Capitol building and the Senate and House office buildings.

Capitol Visitors Center

As originally conceived, the United States Capitol was never intended to be able to accommodate the throngs of visitors that visit the U.S. Capitol annually. Today, over three million

people visit the Capitol on an annual basis. In addition, since the birth of our Nation, the number of Representatives in Congress has increased as the nation has grown. This increase, along with the resulting increase in staff, has created a need for additional space in the Capitol. In 1991, Congress provided funds for the conceptual design and planning of a Capitol Visitors Center. In 1993, the Capitol Preservation Commission allocated funds to carry the conceptual study into an actual design document.

The Capitol Visitors Center project gained momentum with the tragic shooting of Capitol Police Officers John Gibson and Jacob Chestnut in 1998.[1] On July 24, 1998, Russell Weston, Jr. burst through a security checkpoint entrance on the eastern front of the Capitol and opened fire, killing the two Capitol Police officers and wounding several others. Soon after the shooting, Congress appropriated $100 million for a visitor's center to increase security within the Capitol, and to provide a safer environment for visitors awaiting tours of the Capitol. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the subsequent discovery of anthrax in congressional office buildings in October 2001 highlighted concerns regarding the potential vulnerabilities of the Capitol and the need for improved security on Capitol Hill. These developments influenced congressional discussions concerning the necessity of spending money on the center.[2]

The new CVC is expected to be completed in the fall of 2008. There will be 170,000 square feet of office space for the House and Senate, a main Exhibition Hall, a Visitor Center Auditorium, a gift shop, and other amenities. In total the CVC will have 580,000 square feet of space. The CVC is expected to provide space for visiting constituents of Members of Congress, as well as provide office space for several Congressional Committees. The CVC is the largest project in the Capitol's 212-year history and the planned space is approximately three quarters the size of the Capitol itself. The CVC is expected to significantly improve the screening of delivery vehicles that move tons of equipment, food, and other material into and out of the Capitol every day.[3] The entire facility is located underground on the east side of the Capitol so as not to detract from the appearance of the Capitol and of the grounds designed by Frederick Law Olmsted in 1874.[4]

Construction History

The CVC project has been beset with cost overruns. Although design plans for the Capitol Visitors Center began before the deaths of two Capitol Police officers, radical changes were made to the original design once the shooting took place and still more after the terrorist acts of September 11th. Congress initially appropriated a $100 million for the project but the CVC is expected to cost well over $500 million.

According to Government Accountability Office ("GAO"), since construction started, there have been 180 design changes and 80 contract modifications.[5] Most of the added costs were outside or largely outside the AOC's control. Approximately $147 million of the cost increase has been due

---

[1] "Gunman Shoots His Way Into Capitol; Two Officers Killed, Suspect Captured." Washington Post, July 25, 1998, Martin Weil, A1.
[2] Congressional Research Service RL31121 -- The Capitol Visitor Center: An Overview, Updated April 25, 2007, Stephen W. Stathis.
[3] Congressional Research Service RL31121 -- The Capitol Visitor Center: An Overview, Updated April 25, 2007, Stephen W. Stathis.
[4] Architect of the Capitol, *Capitol Visitor Center Overview*, Spring 2007, http://www.aoc.gov/cvc/index.cfm
[5] Capitol Visitor Center: Update on Status of Project's Schedule and Cost. GAO-06-665T. April 27, 2006.

to changes in the project's scope, many of which were made for security enhancements following September 11th attacks and the anthrax incident. Congress added the House and Senate expansion spaces and the Library of Congress tunnel to the project's scope after the original project cost estimate had been developed. In addition, the Department of Defense recommended and funded an air filtration system for the facility.[6] The delays in construction and subsequent change orders have caused the opening date of the CVC to be pushed back several times.

Operational Plans

Until this point, operational and transportation plans for the new Capitol Visitors Center have been uncertain. Recent news reports indicate that Capitol Police officials plan to prevent tour buses from having access to the eastern part of First Street, which runs in front of the Library Congress and Supreme Court.[7] Preventing tour bus access to First Street, which was originally envisioned as the drop off point for visitors, could prove to be problematic in allowing public access to the CVC. If tour buses are not allowed to drop off visitors in front of the CVC, there is also the possibility of congestion in residential neighborhoods surrounding the Capitol complex. As early as 2003, the GAO highlighted problems with the AOC being able to identify and address operational concerns and requirements of the public areas of the CVC, such as the gift shop, cafeteria, exhibitions and theater.[8]

In addition to those concerns, the Subcommittee will examine transportation plans, building security, and general access. The Subcommittee is interested in how the AOC plans to staff the new visitors center, how it will provide security to both the Capitol and its visitors, and the details of the operational plan for the CVC when it opens in 2008.

---

[6] Capitol Visitor Center: Priority Attention Needed to Manage Schedules and Contracts. GAO-05-714T. May 17, 2005.
[7] *Roll Call*, Bus Ban Coming to Hill: Plan May Affect Access to CVC, June 5th, 2007. John McArdle.
[8] Capitol Visitor Center: Current Status of Schedule and Estimated Cost. GAO-03-1014T. July 15, 2003.

WITNESS LIST

PANEL I

Mr. Stephen T. Ayers, AIA
Acting Architect of the Capitol and
Deputy Architect/Chief Operating Officer
United States Congress

Mr. Bernard L. Ungar
Director of Physical Infrastructure
Government Accountability Office
Washington, D.C.

PANEL II

Chief Phillip D. Morse
Chief of Police
United States Capitol Police
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Emeka C. Moneme
Director
District of Columbia Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.

PANEL III

Mr. Marshall E. Purnell, FAIA
President
The American Institute of Architects
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Leslie L. Shepherd
Chief Architect
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

HEARING ON WHAT VISITORS CAN EXPECT AT THE CAPITOL VISITORS CENTER: TRANSPORTATION, ACCESS, SECURITY AND VISUALS

Friday, June 8, 2007

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:10 a.m., in Room 2167, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Ms. NORTON. Good morning and welcome to all our witnesses and visitors at today's hearing on What Visitors Can Expect at the Capitol Visitors Center: Transportation, Access, Security and Visuals.

This morning, the Subcommittee will hear testimony concerning what exactly it is that visitors can expect when they arrive at the new section of the Capitol Building that will be known as the Capitol Visitors Center and we have already started calling the CVC. I visited the CVC this week and found an addition of considerable beauty and majesty in keeping with the main Capitol Building. Estimates are that the CVC is 90 to 95 percent complete, and opening is expected in 2008.

In addition, today we will hear about transportation security and general access plans that are still being developed and refined. It is good to hear about them now because we know there is still time, given the schedule date, a date we hope is met when the visitors center is to open.

There has been no oversight of the CVC by an authorizing committee and none on the issues of transportation, security and access that are of special interest to this Subcommittee today. Because our Subcommittee deals with Federal construction, we shared jurisdiction with other subcommittee in the past.

Moreover, the new visitors center is a matter of considerable interest and concern to the member who represents the Nation's Capital. The Congress and the Nation depend on this city to be welcoming to constituents and to visitors from around the world. The District of Columbia is one of America's preeminent tourist destinations, and consequently there is a perfect synergy between what the Congress and the District of Columbia want when tourists come to the city to visit historic sites. As a result, I spend far more

time than most members on Federal monuments and structures here.

Our Subcommittee will have a hearing on the Smithsonian which is passing through a particularly troubled period and on the John F. Kennedy Center on June 15th, 2007, and I will shortly introduce a bill for revision and expansion of the National Mall.

The visitors center idea began to take shape long before I came to Congress, in 1966, when the former Public Works Committee, now the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee passed P.L. 89-790. For years, many had remarked about the spectacle of members hosting school and other groups on the steps of the Capitol or constituents waiting in the heat of the summer or the cold of the winter to enter the Capitol as well as the lack of meeting space of even space to stand comfortably and speak to a group of constituents.

P.L. 89-790 was a simple page and a half bill that directed a "full and complete investigation and study of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capitol."

The hearing record quotes then Vice President Hubert Humphrey who said, "No city in the world treats its visitors with such shabby indifference." I assure he was referring to the Capital and not the District of Columbia then.

The record from May, 1966 reflects many ideas about where to put the center including the Botanic Gardens, the west front of the Capitol or in the vicinity of the Capitol grounds. The record is filled with testimony brimming with enthusiasm for the concept and the uses of a national visitors center.

The law was amended several times to accommodate the acquisition of land, authorize certain leases and even become the vehicle for the rehabilitation of Union Station, and that was completed and is beautiful. That was P.L. 97-125.

The need for the current center continued to grow, but nothing moved forward. In 1998, following the first shooting death of Capitol police officers in the Nation's history, I believed that finally security, not merely convenience, would make Congress want to focus on a visitors center.

Less than a week later, I introduced H.R. 4347, the Jacob Joseph Chestnut-John Michael Gibson United States Capitol Visitors Center Act of 1998. The bill provided for enhanced security within the Capitol grounds and for an appropriate place to welcome our constituents, taking into account their health and comfort. Included in the bill was a provision, that I note with some irony today, requiring the Architect to "identify alternatives for construction of the Capitol Visitors Center that will reduce the costs of construction."

Now, 40 years after the original proposal, we finally are on the verge of realizing what was called in 1966 a "building of magnificent opportunity for education in its broadest and most attractive sense."

This Subcommittee is not much interested in fighting the last war over what went wrong with the CVC construction program. Speaking for the host city, not to mention most members of Congress, we simply want to make sure the new structure works. The

CVC cannot live on beauty alone. Entirely fresh thinking about transportation, access and security are necessary.

How will the transportation plan enable visitors to arrive at the center with minimum hassle, fresh and ready to reap the benefits of a visit or a tour?

How will security plans balance the important goals of maintaining an open and accessible Capitol while moving visitors quickly into the center and ensuring the highest security for one of the world's most strategic open facilities?

Considering the funds, design and craft that have gone into the CVC, we are also interested in the management of the facility by the Architect of the Capitol, charged with the maintenance of the CVC and the main Capitol Building.

Washington is not only one of the world's most beautiful cities; the District of Columbia is the central locus of our democracy and those principles and ideas we cherish and others to which we aspire.

Every year visitors come from every State in the Union and virtually every country in the world. Individuals and groups walk through and around the Capitol to learn firsthand how democracy is achieved. The new CVC will itself be a learning experience in democracy if it is run with the same grace its beauty conveys.

I want to now ask the Ranking Member if he has an opening statement he would like to make.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Madam Chairman. As a part of my opening remarks, let me express my gratitude and admiration to and for you for your tireless, passionate and, when necessary, relentless pursuit on behalf of the citizens of Washington, DC.

Unfortunately, I don't know all the members of the audience, but as an example, I would like to thank Chief Morse. With the exception of Chairman, others of us who serve here are guests in the city. Please let me extend my thanks and gratitude to the Chief, our firefighters and all the other wonderful servants that make up the infrastructure of Washington, D.C. and make it such a hospital place.

Your comments are very well made. People come from all over this Country and others with excitement and anticipation about seeing the Capitol, and I think for the most part they leave with enthusiasm and optimism and awe as to what the Founding Fathers have done on their behalf.

So, on behalf of Chairman Mica who unfortunately could not be here today and Ranking Member Graves, thank you for letting me sit in on your Committee.

I know Ranking Member Mica has a longstanding interest in the Capitol Visitors Center. He followed this project closely since he first introduced legislation authorizing construction of the visitors center in the early 1990s. In fact, this Subcommittee held the first and only legislative hearings in 1995 and 1998 on the visitors center project prior to its authorization.

Ranking Member has asked me to read his opening statement for the record on the Capitol Visitors Center, and I am happy to fill in for him today and express his views.

As the visitors center nears completion, we believe it is important for the Committee to reassert its jurisdiction over the project.

The Capitol Visitors Center is one of the most significant projects undertaken by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol since the extension to the Capitol and the dome were built more than 140 years ago. CVC is the largest addition in the history of the Capitol Building and presents a 75 percent increase in the total size of the Capitol.

While some have been critical of the expanded costs and timeline over the original estimates, there are clear reasons for both increases. First, the project scope increased dramatically after Capitol Police Officers Chestnut and Gibson were killed in the line of duty and then again after the 9/11 and anthrax attacks. Each incident led to increases in the project size and security measures. In fact, there have been over 2,000 change orders since the project began.

Fortunately, the project was revised to incorporate a number of important security and life-safety upgrades that will protect the public against explosives, chemical and biological attack, fire and other hazards. For example, redesigning the project to contain rather than spread a chemical or biological agent through the Capitol was a complicated and expensive undertaking. These modifications to the original design account for almost $200 million of additional costs to the 1998 authorized level.

Other changes include numerous utility upgrades and the decision to finish the House and Senate expansion space now instead of finishing them 10 or 15 years later. While this decision added to the total cost, it saved tens of millions of dollars in the long run. The old adage, you get what you pay for, applies to the Capitol Visitors Center, and the American people are getting far more than originally proposed and considered necessary before the September 11th and anthrax attacks.

With the departure of Alan Hantman, the Architect of the Capitol, much of the visitors center senior management team were entering a vulnerable phase of the project. CVC is an extremely large and complicated project. It is important this Committee follow the project closely over the next year.

Once the CVC is completed, the question will be: How do we govern and operate the visitors center? Particularly, this hearing was called to look at access, security and facilities management as they related to the CVC. It is important to determine how the House and Senate will govern the CVC in the future so that it is administered for its original purpose, to improve the public's experience of the Capitol and American democracy.

Madam Chairman, I do have questions to submit for the record and, without further adieu, again thank you Madam Chair for holding this hearing.

Ms. NORTON. I thank you, Mr. Hayes, for being such a worthy and able acting Ranking Member today.

I know our Ranking Member had other business, and he is very interested in this matter. Indeed, at our first hearing, he indicated that the Subcommittee had always had jurisdiction here, that there had not been oversight hearings, and he indicated a special interest in this very area.

I would like to welcome the first panel.

Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Walz. We have another member here, and I would like to ask if he has anything he would like to say at this time.

Mr. Walz of Minnesota, thank you.

I would like then to welcome the first two witnesses on the first panel: Stephen Ayers, the Acting Architect of the Capitol, who had been Deputy Architect and Chief Operating Officer, and Bernard Ungar who is the Director of Physical Infrastructure.

You may proceed, Mr. Ayers.

TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN T. AYERS, AIA, ACTING ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL AND DEPUTY ARCHITECT/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, UNITED STATES CONGRESS; BERNARD L. UNGAR, DIRECTOR OF PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, WASHINGTON, DC.

Mr. AYERS. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, and good morning, Congressman Hayes. Thank you for this opportunity to update you on the progress of the Capitol Visitors Center project. We certainly appreciate the interest you have taken in the project, and we appreciate the fact that the Chairwoman recently toured the CVC.

As you know, the Capitol Visitors Center project is quite complex and has received much attention since construction began in 2002. When you are building a 580,000 square foot facility underground, adjacent to the United States Capitol, it is difficult to ignore. However, when it is completed, the CVC will provide a place for people to learn about our Capitol and our government and the Congress, provide a secure environment to welcome visitors and protect the Capitol Building and the many people that work and visit here every day.

When I assumed the duties of Acting Architect in February, construction was 88 percent complete and numerous critical path milestones were missed monthly. One of my first actions was to direct the project team to reevaluate the project schedule to ensure that it was realistic and to include risk and uncertainty.

By April, the project team had updated the master project schedule to incorporate these risks and uncertainties, particularly with regard to the time needed to integrate the fire alarm, life-safety and security systems into the building systems in general. It is important to note that since the completion of this schedule reassessment, for the third month in a row, all critical path activities have been met as scheduled. This is the first time in the history of this project that that has happened.

With construction now 95 percent compete and $4.5 million of work put in place every month, major construction activities will start winding down this summer. The tasks now left to do largely involve the aesthetics and functionality of the space such as painting and installation of carpet, lighting fixtures and hand railings as well as the tie-in of all the building systems.

The final and most complex challenges ahead are the acceptance testing of the fire, security and life-safety systems and commissioning of the sophisticated building systems. The final testing of the fire and life-safety systems is scheduled to begin this fall. While risks remain, our expectation continues to be that a certificate of occupancy can be issued in June of 2008.

With regard to the commissioning of building systems, air balancing of all of the air handlers must be complete before the fire marshal can commence testing of the smoke control systems. At this time, all but one of the CVC's 23 air handling units are available for operation. Rough balancing has been completed in several of the public areas including the great hall, the food service area, exhibition gallery and orientation theaters, and final balancing will continue after the contractor's smoke testing.

Madam Chairwoman, with regard to the day to day operation of the CVC, when the House and Senate leadership assigned the management of the CVC operations and administration to the Architect of the Capitol in mid-May, we immediately stood up a support team that has begun working to transition the CVC from a construction project to a fully staffed and equipped visitor services operation. With our consulting team from JM Zell Partners, we are working on areas such as administration, food service, gift shops, information technology and exhibits.

One of our top priorities is to recruit a Chief Executive Officer for Visitor Services. Once this person is hired, other staffing of CVC operations can begin. I am pleased to report that the interview process for the CEO of Visitor Services has begun, and we have already begun to hire staff on the facility maintenance side in the Capitol Superintendent's Office. In addition, the CVC food service contract was awarded, effective May 31st of this year.

Other operational issues that we will be working with Congressional leadership on include an advanced reservation system, developing a CVC web site, stocking and staffing gift shops and reaching out to the community, tour industry, business groups with a public information campaign, just to name a few.

As I mentioned earlier, most of the remaining work on the construction site involves installation of finished materials throughout the site. Light fixture installation has begun in the great hall; carpet installation continues in the House and Senate expansion spaces; exhibit case components are being placed inside the exhibition hall; and millwork is nearly complete on both levels of the Congressional auditorium.

In addition, in the House expansion space, the stone work in the hearing room is progressing well and should be done this month. Work in the radio and TV gallery space is expected to be finished in July. The ongoing carpet installation in the House Intelligence Committee space marks the near completion of that area as well.

Outside, the 12-foot tall bronze entrance doors have been installed in the CVC's north and south entrances. The cab components for the exterior elevators are being installed on the east front, and the grounds are being readied for sod and other plantings following the installation of an irrigation system.

Madam Chairwoman, we are committed to getting the CVC project finished as quickly as possible. This is my top priority and the top priority for this organization. At this time, we are on track to meet our scheduled June 2008 date to receive a certificate of occupancy. Nonetheless, we recognize that the project continues to face risks and uncertainties and are instituting additional steps to increase our focus on meeting our scheduled completion dates. We will continue to closely monitor the progress of the building sys-

tems commissioning and the fire and life-safety system testing to mitigate potential delays.

We look forward to working with Congressional leadership as we begin staffing the operations and effectively and seamlessly working to transition the CVC from a construction project to a fully equipped visitor services operation.

That concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much for that testimony, Mr. Ayers.

Mr. Ungar, I know you are here to assist Mr. Ayers. Is there anything you would like to say concerning the project at this time?

Mr. UNGAR. Madam Chair, I would just like to echo Mr. Ayers' statement that we are on track right now to meet our current completion dates. I think it is going to be a challenge for us. It is an uphill battle but so far, so good. We are going to be focusing a lot of attention from this point forward on meeting the schedule dates, and we have a series of actions underway that are aimed toward that.

Ms. NORTON. Both of you have mentioned completion dates. In your testimony, Mr. Ayers, it is interesting you left out the words, I think, June, 2008. You said we are on track to meet our completion date, but the testimony says June, 2008. Is that the date that you are committed to opening the Capitol Visitors Center?

Mr. AYERS. Madam Chairwoman, that is the date we are committed to issuing a certificate of occupancy. After we issue that certificate of occupancy, we expect there will be two to three months of ramp-up period and training period as the operations team shakes out the bugs in the day to day operation of the space which will enable an opening in September, 2008. That opening date is really a Congressional decision, but we think it will be available for opening in September, 2008.

Ms. NORTON. I think you can depend on Congress not to delay the date you would like it open, Mr. Ayers.

So you are saying September, 2008 is when we can expect the center to be prepared to receive the first visitors would Congress agree?

Mr. AYERS. Correct, yes ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Now who issues the certificate of occupancy?

Mr. AYERS. The Architect of the Capitol's fire marshal does that.

Ms. NORTON. The fire marshal for the Architect of the Capitol, is that the fire marshal only for the Architect for the Capitol? He works entirely in the Capitol?

Mr. AYERS. In the Capitol Complex, yes ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Your testimony indicates something of a new day because you talk about meeting critical path schedules. You have already done so for fire, life-safety, security systems.

By the way, Mr. Ayers, I note that you are not only an architect but you have an MBA. I don't know if that has been relevant in all of this. I know well of Mr. Ungar's long work in the Federal Government on management issues and on getting thing done. But I would like to know why the CVC is meeting critical schedule dates now and not in the past.

Mr. AYERS. Well, I think, Madam Chairwoman, that in November of this year, the Architect developed an action plan to refocus efforts of the Architect staff as well as our construction management.

Ms. NORTON. Hadn't there been an action plan all along?

Mr. AYERS. No, ma'am. That action plan was developed in November, and really I think the sustained implementation of that action plan.

Ms. NORTON. How do you build something? Pardon my ignorance, if it is not an action plan, what is it that makes people know they have to meet certain critical dates?

Mr. AYERS. Well, I think this event in November was a refocus and a recommitment to schedule, and we have applied that consistent pressure.

Ms. NORTON. How was this done?

I am just trying to find out the before and after. If there was not an action plan before, but everyone had believed that certain things would take place on certain dates, what is the difference between what is happening now and what happened before?

Mr. AYERS. Bernie?

Mr. UNGAR. Madam Chairwoman, let me explain a little bit, a little history about myself because I have to wear two hats here. Up until two weeks ago, I worked for the GAO, and I had responsibility for helping to monitor and oversee the project. About two weeks, I shifted hats.

Ms. NORTON. Now say that again, so that is clear. You had responsibility for?

Mr. UNGAR. Assisting GAO in helping Congress monitor and oversee.

Ms. NORTON. In short, Congress put the GAO on this project because it was so concerned about the failure to meet critical dates. You were the head man in charge of monitoring, and they decided that they needed the monitor to help them do it?

Mr. UNGAR. Well, unfortunately, AOC ran into a little bit of a problem. The previous project executive, who had been here for about three years, retired. The person who was helping him at AOC took over, and unfortunately he had some health problems. So AOC was in a little bit of a bind.

I had been involved in this project, helping to oversee it for a decade or almost a decade anyway, so I was asked to come and assist Mr. Ayers and the rest of the team just recently.

But what I was going to explain was that in the history of the project, it had been consistently experiencing a number of schedule slippages, schedule extensions since the project construction began for a variety of reasons. One of those reasons Mr. Ayers alluded to was the project consistently had in place what we would call either overly optimistic or unrealistic schedules for a number of reasons and, at least in GAO's view, there hadn't been sufficient emphasis on schedule achievement.

There are a number of other factors that were involved in resulting in some of the delays, many of which were noncontrollable.

Ms. NORTON. Isn't it true that there were stop orders when members of Congress or others in their names asked for additions or

changes in the CVC for which the AOC would not have been responsible?

Mr. UNGAR. Somewhat; not quite exactly as you mention, Madam Chairwoman. What happened was when the project was originally designed, at least in the terms of the 1999 design, efforts were starting to move forward to get the construction documents ready. As that was happening, we had the unfortunate incidents take place in 2001 with the 9/11 and then following that, the anthrax. As a result of those incidents while the construction documents and so forth were being done, Congress did ask for a number of changes to the facility.

Ms. NORTON. So were the dates changed? When Congress asked for these changes which had not been scheduled the dates were set, were new action plans of one kind or another put in place to achieve those changes with a later date?

Mr. UNGAR. Unfortunately, not.

What happened back in that time period, the major changes came up. There was a target date at that point in time of having the facility ready for the inauguration in 2005. I think one of the biggest lessons learned. I think everybody would agree now. It would have been much more helpful if everybody would have stood up at that point in time and said, we are happy to make these changes, but we can't do it in the January, 2000 timeframe.

Unfortunately, that recognition didn't happen for a long period of time. In fact, there were a number of factors that delayed the project, and it wasn't until Mr. Ayers came on board as the Acting Architect that he decided that the schedule would incorporate what we call risks and uncertainties to help account for some of these things that have been.

Ms. NORTON. In construction work today, incentive payments are often used. Perhaps people read that I guess it was the Bay Bridge was just opened in no time flat because of an incentive payment. I believe incentive payments are probably being used for the new Nationals baseball stadium. Anybody in business figures out, particularly if you must get something done on time, that there are ways to get it done.

Was any kind of incentive payment device every used or considered for the CVC?

Mr. AYERS. Yes, madam Chairwoman. There are incentives built into the CVC contract, and that has been a new concept for us.

Ms. NORTON. I take it nobody has been able to take a payment as a result of this incentive to finish on time.

Mr. AYERS. Well, they have. Finishing on time and on schedule is only one part of the incentive. The incentive package is built upon quality, schedule, cost, their adherence to small business concerns as well as their closeout. So there are seven different incentive evaluation periods throughout the contract.

Ms. NORTON. Is that incentive to finish in September—what is that date—2008?

Mr. AYERS. Go ahead, Bernie.

Mr. UNGAR. Madam Chair, no, there is not right now. We have a very difficult situation. The official contract completion date was September of 2006 which is long past unfortunately, and we are in the process now of trying to work with our major contractor for Se-

quence 2 to see if we can come up with a firm contract completion date that reflects the time periods that Mr. Ayers spoke about.

October of 2006, we were trying to shoot for substantial completion and final completion in June of 2008. Also, we are considering whether an incentive would be appropriate at this point in time, but we need to work that out.

Ms. NORTON. Because it may be too late for an incentive?

Mr. UNGAR. Well, it may be. We are trying to work with our procurement team and our legal team to see whether or not at this point in time that would be the most appropriate way to go.

Ms. NORTON. You say that there have been incentive payments, and you say, yes, they have met something and they have been paid.

I mean I have to ask you. Do you think that the kind of incentive that has been used at the Nationals, albeit divided into various parts, taking in consideration unanticipated matters, was that kind of incentive payment used or promised up front and would it have been useful if it was not promised up front?

Mr. AYERS. Certainly, incentives are useful, I think.

Ms. NORTON. I am talking about this Capitol Visitors Center now. I know they are useful. I am saying on this center, was there an overall incentive payment used such as being used in other complicated facilities and, if not, would that have been a useful thing to do?

Mr. AYERS. There were incentive payments used on this particular contract.

Ms. NORTON. I am asking to complete the job. You have got a general contractor.

I am asking when you are doing the Bay Bridge and the city says it has just got to happen or the Nationals have to open on time because tickets are being sold, then there is an incentive payment, and in the beginning you say, hey, fellas, here it is. You compete on the basis of it. You compete for the job on the basis of it. Of course, you get it at the end if you achieve the result promised in the contract.

That is what I am talking about. I am not talking about bits and pieces of incentives, and I appreciate that they have been offered. I am trying to figure out if we have a new center, if we have gone through this, and I don't think we will go through anything quite this large again. I am trying to figure out what would have been the better way to do it. I am trying to apply modern construction devices and incentives to this job, and so I am talking about the incentive I am talking about.

I am not talking about generic incentives.

Mr. Ungar?

Mr. UNGAR. Yes, ma'am. You are right. The problem that we had——

Ms. NORTON. Please put on your GAO hat for a moment.

Mr. UNGAR. I am. Yes, I will put on both hats here. It is a little tough.

Looking back, clearly the incentive that Mr. Ayers talked about was what they call a balanced scorecard. It involves several different factors that we were striving, the AOC was striving to achieve. Unfortunately, the schedule incentive was not given suffi-

cient emphasis in my view and the amount or the percent of the incentive.

Ms. NORTON. What was not? I am sorry.

Mr. UNGAR. The way the incentive was worded, it was tied to certain general factors about having a schedule and following up on the schedule. It really wasn't zeroed in on a specific completion date.

Ms. NORTON. Deadline dates.

Mr. UNGAR. A deadline date. Now, the problem, even if it had been, first of all, I think it would have been better if it had been. But even if it had been, there have been so many changes to the project that weren't the contractor's fault. It would have been very tough to have used that. But I think from this point forward, if something could be worked out, it would be much more effective.

The other aspect was the total amount of money was $1.2 million. In relation to the whole contract amount, it wasn't a huge amount, but the contractor nevertheless tells us that as a symbol of being able to say that yes, the contractor received the award fee, it was an incentive.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate what you are saying. Precisely because you are dealing within an appropriation, the incentive might have been an interesting idea, and I understand precisely what you are saying about the changes that occurred. But it must be said that the Architect has been drawn and quartered, and very little has come out into the public sphere about how this project was structured from the beginning and about the unanticipated changes that had to be made.

An incentive payment up front which said, okay, now. I learned, for example, that there were things under the Capitol nobody expected because nobody has been under there in a zillion years. Now we have gotten this unexpected and that unexpected.

If the Architect's Office is entirely forthcoming, does not wait until appropriation time and if there had been oversight, if I may so, by this Committee as there had been in the past—this is the Committee that processed all of the convention center plans in the past—then I think those things would have been caught. But the poor Architect had to wait until the appropriation time or until the appropriator set a hearing because that was the only oversight, and of course, thank goodness for them.

But then, of course, it was all critical time, and we didn't quite understand whether or not this was simply incompetence or malfeasance, indeed to hear the way it is described on the part of the Architect of the Capitol, or if the structuring of the job in the beginning was faulty. Everybody was going under a capitol that nobody had been under since the thing was built, and I don't think anybody had been under the grounds where the visitors center is coming into.

And so, we see a lot of "gotcha" kind of hearings which are very easy to do on a construction project. I say that as the member who oversees courts and the rest. Some of that is deserved, but I don't think it is entirely fair if one understands what has taken place over time and who indeed asked for the changes.

Where I fault the Architect's Office is in transparency. You know if there is not a hearing being called, you don't have to wait for a hearing to be called.

I remember when I was in the chair of an agency of the Federal Government. The first thing I did was to ask for an oversight hearing. I think if agencies of the government are in the habit of coming forward and saying there is some information that staff needs or that the public needs rather than waiting for a hearing to be called, asking for a hearing, I think we would be in better shape.

Now, I have gone down this week and I was very impressed with what I saw. It is very elaborate. Have there been any complaints about how elaborate it is?

Mr. AYERS. No, ma'am. I have not heard any complaints.

Ms. NORTON. Well, the reason I think that there hasn't been is that you have got to have a visitors center in keeping with the majesty of the Capitol itself. You can't just have something down there for people to run through on their way to the Capitol. So I think it has been done with great taste, and I think that a lot of the criticism will go away, albeit if much of it deserved, once it is open.

Now, I note that the center has 580,000 square feet which is considerably larger than my bill contemplated, I must say. What got the center to be so large and do you think that can be justified?

Mr. AYERS. Well, certainly, I think as you pointed out in your opening remarks that there was a design that was already completed in the early to mid-1990s, after the two officers were shot in 1998. Then in 1999, the first appropriation was received, and as part of that appropriation, there was a revalidation study of the previous design work that led up to that. That was the first order of business.

In that revalidation study, the Architect and our designers worked with the Capitol Preservation Commission to update the design, and as part of that process and in consultation with the Capitol Preservation Commission, that is how the facility became 580,000 square feet.

Ms. NORTON. Did you plan all along to have the hearing room, for example, and the meeting rooms, Mr. Ungar?

Mr. UNGAR. Ma'am, I think the basic structure of the facility was planned. The House and Senate expansion spaces, the shells for that, the basic excavation and the shell for the facility were part of the original 1999 design.

Ms. NORTON. What was part? I am sorry.

Mr. UNGAR. The basic 580,000 were part of the 1999 design, and the House and Senate, the shells, the digging, the excavation and the walls and the roof, that was part of the basic 1999 design. That was, I believe, added in 1999.

The hearing room, as I recall, came afterward, the request on the House side.

Ms. NORTON. That was a request from the Congress.

Mr. UNGAR. Yes, the hearing room, correct. I don't believe it was originally slated to be hearing room.

Ms. NORTON. I am not complaining. We don't have enough hearing rooms. But that wasn't included in the original cost or the original space.

Mr. UNGAR. Right.

Ms. NORTON. Now, the auditorium was included.

Mr. UNGAR. Yes, that was in the $265 million, correct.

Ms. NORTON. And the meeting rooms were all included?

Mr. UNGAR. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. What has been added is only the big hearing room?

Mr. UNGAR. Well, there had been some others going back from 1995, the design. The 1999 design added to the size. For example, the exhibit hall was originally about 3,000 square feet, and now it is roughly 16,000 square feet.

So what happened in 1999, there was an assessment or at least a reassessment of the security aspects of the facility and the aspects of the facility that were supposed to provide an enhanced visitor experiences and comfort and education. So, as a result of all of those factors, the design changed in 1999 and some things were added.

Mr. AYERS. I think the tunnel to the Library of Congress was added, the 170,000 square feet.

Ms. NORTON. The tunnel to the Library of Congress in particular?

Mr. UNGAR. Yes.

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. As opposed to is there a tunnel to the Congress itself? Oh, yes, I guess that is a tunnel to the Capitol.

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Tell me about why the tunnel to the Library of congress was added.

Mr. AYERS. That was added at the request of the Congress. Similarly, the 170,000 square feet of expansion space on the House and Senate side was added.

Ms. NORTON. Expansion space, meaning what? I am sorry.

Mr. AYERS. Those are the meeting rooms.

Ms. NORTON. The meeting rooms, all right.

Mr. AYERS. Yes.

Mr. UNGAR. The House and Senate.

Mr. AYERS. The House and Senate meeting rooms.

Ms. NORTON. For both sides.

Mr. AYERS. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. That was added, and Congress asked for that afterwards, and Congress asked for a tunnel to the Library of Congress.

Mr. AYERS. Right.

Ms. NORTON. Of course, tunneling is very expensive.

Mr. AYERS. Correct.

Ms. NORTON. So it would be interesting, and some day somebody is going to total up how much of the expense was due to requests from Congress and how much of the expense was due to the construction itself.

Mr. UNGAR. We can tell you that now, Madam Chair, of the estimated cost of the project, currently. The current estimated cost to complete the project which has not been updated for the last several months, but the current estimated cost by GAO is around $592 million. That was made in November of 2006, so it hasn't been updated. But of that cost, half was due to Congressionally-directed scope changes.

Ms. NORTON. You are saying it doubled because of?

Mr. UNGAR. No, it didn't; half.

Ms. NORTON. Oh, half of the cost.

Mr. UNGAR. Half of the increase.

Ms. NORTON. Half of the increase, okay.

Mr. UNGAR. Right, and there are other factors accounting for the remainder of it.

Ms. NORTON. That deserves analysis as to what it did if only because whatever is the next project, we will have learned from this mammoth one.

Let me move on to two more issues. One is the Chief Executive Officer, and the other is the all important transportation and security issue.

Now, the reason I move to Chief Executive Officer is because it depends now on how it operates. Members of Congress will glorify in the building, but they will be particularly interested in are there sufficient guides to get people through the building, as I don't think there are today. Is there somebody in charge who knows how to run a visitors center in particular?

You say that you have begun interviewing. What kind of skills are you looking for in the Chief?

This is a statutory provision that says that there shall be a Chief Executive Officer responsible for the operation and management of the Capitol Visitors Center. So the Congress foresaw that you need a heavyweight to make sure this thing runs smoothly.

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am, and we are looking for someone that has a great deal of experience in visitor service and museum type business at the high volume level, sort of 10,000 visitors per day, that kind of experience.

Ms. NORTON. Is that what you expect for our visitors center?

Mr. AYERS. It would be more than that.

Ms. NORTON. What do you expect daily on the average for our Capitol Visitors Center?

Mr. AYERS. It could be 15,000 a day.

Ms. NORTON. It will probably attract more than usual because it is new.

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am. We do expect our ongoing attendance to be about three million a year. I think visitors to the Capitol today are about a million and a half a year. We expect that with the visitors center to go to three million a year and first year attendance to possibly be even more than that.

So in terms of the skills we are looking for, certainly someone that has high volume visitor experience, someone that has managed restaurants and catering business and gift shops and retail centers.

Ms. NORTON. You will have a gift shop there.

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am. We will have two gift shops.

Ms. NORTON. Rather than upstairs where we have that cute little thing we have upstairs now.

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Is that going to disappear by the way, the one upstairs, or will there still be something upstairs?

Mr. AYERS. The one upstairs in the crypt is operated by the Capitol Historical Society.

Ms. NORTON. I see.

Mr. AYERS. That will go away.

As well, of course, we are looking for a great communicator.

Ms. NORTON. Will the Capitol Historical Society operate the one in the visitors center?

Mr. AYERS. No, ma'am. That will be operated by the Architect of the Capitol.

Finally, we are looking for a great communicator, someone that can work with members and work with visitors. A visionary leader and a motivator, I think, are some of the basic skills of this person.

Ms. NORTON. Who will make the final selection?

Mr. AYERS. The Architect of the Capitol will make the selection. We certainly won't do that in a vacuum, and we will coordinate with oversight and the Capitol Preservation Commission in that final selection, but ultimately the decision rests with the Architect.

Ms. NORTON. When I visited, I saw where there will be a restaurant and the like, and I was assured that to keep staff from converting it into a McDonald's that there would be no takeout because they would be running down to get takeout, and I appreciate that. As much as we need more food service here, I think that is appropriate.

But I had understood that you are awarding the food service contract to Restaurant Associates. Is that true and was that done through a competitive process?

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am, that is true. We have awarded that contract to that company.

Ms. NORTON. Was it a competitive process?

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am, it was competitive.

Ms. NORTON. They won it based on quality as well as the other?

Mr. AYERS. Quality.

Ms. NORTON. This is a sit-down restaurant, right?

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am, it is. There were extensive proposals by several companies. Restaurant Associates offered the best value to the Government. There was extensive food tasting at all of our vendors, and overall they offered the best value for the Government.

Ms. NORTON. Is there any small or disadvantaged business component in this contract?

Mr. AYERS. No, ma'am, there is not.

Ms. NORTON. What is the minority participation, disadvantaged business participation and participation on the construction project?

Mr. AYERS. I would have to answer that for the record. I don't know the statistics on that.

Ms. NORTON. You don't have any idea how many minority workers have helped to build this project?

Mr. AYERS. No, ma'am, I don't.

Ms. NORTON. Well, I can't believe then that you don't know. That ought to be off the top of your head, Mr. Ayers.

Mr. Ungar?

Mr. UNGAR. Ma'am, I don't know the number of actual workers, but we can get for you the number of subcontractors. That is a requirement of the major general contract for that contractor to affirmatively engage minority contractors and others.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate that. So that would include disadvantage business contractors as well as others. Please, within 30 days, have that information.

Mr. Wynn and I, Mr. Al Wynn and I from Maryland met extensively with the Architect just as his work was beginning because this is a region, a huge region with abundant black and Hispanic construction workers. Mr. Wynn was equally interested in the small business component. I was interested perhaps more in the construction component if I were to put it at a slightly higher level because that is where we were then. We were in construction.

We haven't met since those early meetings, and so it is a matter of some considerable importance. If I may so, it is a matter of sentimental importance to some of us. The Capitol itself was built with slave labor, slaves hired out by their masters who then, of course, received the monetary benefit, by free black labor and, of course, by white immigrants to this city. It was, in a real sense, built with the diversity of America as it was then.

The Subcommittee and the full Committee would be most interested in knowing, and we need to know now what the minority contracting and minority participation in construction was.

I must say that when I went downstairs, I saw a fair number of minority workers, and I was pleased to see that. That is why I am surprised that you can come to a hearing where you knew I was Chair without some information on that. So I would like to have that information within 30 days.

Mr. UNGAR. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Let me move to transportation and security which, of course, are somewhat intertwined. The Sergeant at Arms and the Chief of Police came to see me recently to brief me on how buses are going down near the Botanic Gardens around that circle where visitors come. No visitors would be on First Street.

You will not find me asking for visitors on First Street. That is totally inappropriate. First Street borders one of the District's most graceful residential communities. We would destroy it by making it a thoroughfare as we don't now for these buses, but these buses lurk and they do get in that area. You are trying to deal with a very tough situation.

What analysis has been done to determine how the transportation can be done without seriously inconveniencing visitors who will not be able to get right off of their bus and go into the visitors center which fronts First Street?

Mr. AYERS. You are absolutely right. I echo that it has to be seamless and graceful and quick. Otherwise, it just won't work. We are working with our consultants now, a transportation consultant, working with the Capitol Preservation Commission, the Sergeant at Arms and the police right now, looking at all of those alternatives.

Ms. NORTON. How close are we to getting a plan?

Mr. AYERS. I think we are a month, probably two, away from finalizing the plan.

Ms. NORTON. Will there be a hearing and discussion with the public?

Mr. AYERS. Interesting, I think, many years ago as this project initially started, there were community meetings and meetings

with the ANCs and CHAMPS and Capitol Hill Historical Society. I think for the last three or four years, we haven't had that. I think it is time to do that again as we head towards operations.

Ms. NORTON. I will facilitate that, Mr. Ayers. If you would work with me, I will facilitate that rather than have people scream after the fact.

We find that the people who live here, and by the way there will be people who are very much interested in government. There are people who are in the transportation industry. There will be people who deal with tourists and visitors to the city. What you will find is that, at least for the residents of the District of Columbia, they do understand the difference in jurisdictions, that they can't dictate to the Federal Government or the Congress of the United States.

But open and public hearings where people get an opportunity to testify, and you have to limit them because you will get not testimony but testimonials as they go on for a long time, and you have to say what it is you want to hear. If what we want to hear are suggestions, you will find that people who live in the greater region often have suggestions that none of us would ever have thought about. So if you would work with me, I would arrange such a public hearing.

Mr. AYERS. I am happy to do that.

Ms. NORTON. Are you working with the security officials directly?

Is there a group that decides this matter or is security over here and you over there, Mr. Ayers?

Mr. AYERS. Certainly, they are not disparate. You know we have a great partnership with the Capitol Police. Chief Morse has made that a priority for himself and his entire command staff. I have as well. We are great partners in virtually everything we collectively do.

Of course, I sit on the Police Board with the two Sergeants at Arms which forces that integration of both the Architect and the police work. So we are hand in glove in virtually everything we do.

In terms of the transportation plan specifically, I think ultimately that is approved, with input from the Police Board, by the Capitol Preservation Commission.

Ms. NORTON. Yes, and I do admire the fact that the Police Board has on it the Architect and the Sergeant at Arms and, of course, our police.

I do want to emphasize how important it is, and this Committee will be very, very concerned and interested as to whether or not the security plan is done in a group or off with the security officials.

What is wrong with security in the District of Columbia is the fact that you are all now, security officials, if my good friends on the Capitol Police will forgive me, you were cops before 9/11. The fact is we converted people who were safety officials, who were safety officers into something that is far larger and very different, and nobody has had to do the kind of security we have to do in this Country today. This has been an open society. We have made huge mistakes.

I have had to fight a one-woman battle just to keep the District of Columbia open, and sometimes it gets ugly. I had to threaten to go to the Floor of the House in order to get the Congress open for visitors after the anthrax scare because everybody was so timid

about letting people in. The anthrax scare wasn't even in the Capitol. Letting people in the Capitol and finally we got it open.

But it says that the first instinct, understandably, of a security official is to think about his mission. This Capitol has to be open and secure. No one must feel when they go in, the way they feel now. Only now, only recently have we been able to get the planters in place, and it still feels like an armed fortress frankly. You have got to feel that you are still in the United States of America where you have an open society.

I have a bill that I have continuously introduced. I introduced it after Pennsylvania Avenue was closed for a commission to be appointed by the President to have, sitting around the same table, security officials, military officials, architects, lawyers, engineers, artists, people who live in the great society itself and together outline a broad sense of how security would work in an open society. I think it is most unfair to say to police, hey, here is the security part of this; deal with it.

The frivolous closings of Independence Avenue that I screamed and yelled about, now I am pleased to see we no longer stop people going to the Capitol, creating huge backlogs of people to make sure that we are looking at something as if this were the old German pre-Soviet breakup where you had to pass through some check as if somehow if you saw the check was there and you wanted to do something, you wouldn't find your way around the checkpoint.

That was police officials trying to learn how to be security officials, and part of it was that they were left by themselves. The people on our side, including the Congress, mostly elected officials who are in charge of the open society were not at the same table with the security officials. We made some terrible blunders, got people real mad about security.

We are maturing now about security, and I ask particularly that any security plan be the work of the entire group, not only the officers whose job it is to have tunnel vision. The only way to get out of that and to have a balance with security and openness is to have everybody at the table. Nobody is going to compromise security for this building. What does get compromised easily is openness to this building, and that would be an outrage for the new visitors center.

I would like to ask about the donations. Mr. Ayers, you mentioned $65 million in private donations for the center. Is this program still in effect? Are they being received now? Who administers it? What is the use of these funds, if so?

Mr. AYERS. The Capitol Preservation Fund is still in existence. They are not actively seeking donations, but donations can be made to the Capitol Preservation Fund, should the Capitol Preservation Commission want to accept them. So the fund is still operating.

Ms. NORTON. Have the funds been used at all to offset the cost the taxpayers have incurred?

Mr. AYERS. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Ungar wants to answer that question.

Mr. AYERS. Sure.

Mr. UNGAR. Yes, ma'am. The first $65 million has been transferred from the fund to the AOC and has been used in the construction of the facility as intended.

Ms. NORTON. That is our good news.

Along with the full Chairman of the Committee, I have worked on intermodal transportation ideas for Union Station so the buses would have some place to go. After we are finished with you, we are going to have to find out where the buses that can't come on First Street are supposed to then go disappear. Then they come back. There are no special effects here.

One of the things we worked on was the air rights over Union Station and transportation or intermodal facility that would be there. Do you have any knowledge about the intermodal system? Have you worked with anybody on that issue?

Mr. AYERS. We have certainly talked with the folks at Union Station, and they do have recently finished construction in that area for bus parking for up to 85 buses, so that is one of the alternatives we are currently exploring in our transportation and bus management plan. We work with them. We know the Circulator bus routes and are working with all of those entities to come up with the best plan.

Ms. NORTON. That facility will probably require some public funding. And so we are going to have to move, now that we have the air rights issue settled, to how indeed we get the facility, how it is constructed, what mix, if that is what it is to be, of private and public funds because one of my major concerns here is that with the increase that you testified to, Mr. Ayers, of people coming just to see the visitors center if nothing else, the bus traffic is going to increase. With all your hard work to make sure that they have some place to go, there will still be a problem.

One final question on that, you are going to leave people off. As it now stands, you are going to leave people off down the hill. Now if you are a race walker like me, you just regard this as another opportunity for exercise, but besides the elderly, there will be people with children and the rest. Are you really prepared to handle the increase in traffic you are about to have at that facility down on the hill where you wait in line?

Now you are still having to wait in line to get into the visitors center? Is that how it is going to be?

Mr. AYERS. Well, I don't think. First, I don't think the decision to drop off people at that location has been made. On this plan, there are a variety of alternatives. You could drop them off at Union Station or other places and have a Circulator bus or a shuttle bus shuttle people back and forth to the visitors center. But that basic decision of dropping them off on First Street West has really not been made.

Ms. NORTON. The Circulator will be able to come down First Street?

Mr. AYERS. I don't think that decision has been made yet.

Ms. NORTON. Limited traffic on First Street that was not tour buses is something that might conceivably be the best public transportation of the kind so that you don't have more traffic, much more traffic than you have now could be conceivable, but one would have to see if that would in fact also be a lot more bus traffic. But I see what you are saying. There are a number of ways to do this.

What I have in mind, though, Mr. Ayers is that you have many people who will not want to walk great distances, and that is some-

thing that has to be considered not only for the elderly or the disabled but for others as well.

Mr. AYERS. We do understand that. As I think I mentioned earlier, as well as you, that this transportation and getting visitors to the front door has to be seamless and graceful and quick. We can't just drop people off six blocks away and say you are on your own. We do understand that and are actively working to include that.

Ms. NORTON. Well, fortunately, we have a panel following you that I think has some information to allay our concerns on that issue.

I thank you both for the very informative testimony. I look forward to working with you, Mr. Ayers, on the public hearing on the transportation plan and continuing to work with you, Mr. Ungar. Thank you for being here.

Mr. AYERS. Thank you.

Ms. NORTON. May I call the next panel?

Chief Phillip Morse who is the Chief of Police for the United States Capitol Police and Emeka Moneme who is the Director of our own District of Columbia Department of Transportation. Mr. Nichols is here accompanying Chief Morse.

Chief Morse, would you begin?

TESTIMONY OF CHIEF PHILLIP D. MORSE, CHIEF OF POLICE, UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, WASHINGTON, D.C. ACCOMPANIED BY DANIEL NICHOLS; EMEKA C. MONEME, DIRECTOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, WASHINGTON, DC.

Chief MORSE. Madam Chairwoman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Committee today to discuss the planning and preparations United States Capitol Police has conducted in anticipation of the opening of the Capitol Visitors Center next year.

In 1998, after Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were fatally shot in the United States Capitol by an armed intruder, planning of the Capitol Visitors Center began in earnest. In fact, Madam Chairwoman, you were one of the first proponents to reinvigorate the concept of the visitors center when you introduced H.R. 962 in 1999.

Since that time, the United States Capitol Police has worked in partnership with the Architect of the Capitol to help design the CVC in such a manner as to not only enhance and enrich the visitors' experience but also enhance the security of the United States Capitol. As the construction of the facility progresses, it is clear that both goals will be achieved.

The main advantage that the CVC presents from a security perspective is the ability for the United States Capitol Police to conduct security screening of visitors in a state of the art facility that was designed for that purpose. As we saw in 1998, the historic and ceremonial entrances of the Capitol were never intended to support the security screening that is necessary in today's threat environment. The opening of the CVC with its entryways, custom design to support security equipment, police officer positioning and technology to detect and contain threats, all in a seamless, welcoming

environment, will serve to enhance the visitor experience while mitigating current and emerging threats.

It should be noted that the U.S. Capitol Police is, in effect, staffing what equates to a new Federal building that has a high level security requirement to protect both the structure and the building occupants. This requirement was magnified in the aftermath of the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks. We have conducted numerous studies to determine the requisite policing staffing that will provide optimum law enforcement and security services.

We have also been working closely with the committees of jurisdiction on this issue. At present, based on the current hours of operation of the CVC and other operating assumptions of the facility, we submitted a detailed staffing and budget plan for consideration and approval. We are currently moving forward to fill those police positions.

In addition, we are developing a training module for all U.S. Capitol Police personnel that will familiarize them with the facility, the life-safety systems and the emergency response plans. We are also in the process of integrating the emergency plans of the CVC with those already in place for the Capitol since the buildings are interconnected.

While the CVC is designed to welcome visitors to the Capitol, its opening presents a significant logistical challenge of getting visitors to the main entrance. Prior to CVC construction and prior to 9/11, commercial tour buses used to offload and load visitors on the east side of the Capitol. In peak tourist season, scores of buses would crowd the streets throughout the Capitol Complex, causing congestion and impeding traffic flow.

Following the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. Capitol Police took measures to prevent large trucks from coming into close proximity to the Capitol and the House and Senate office buildings. This was done to prevent the introduction of a large vehicle-borne improvised explosive device into that area and, if detonated, would result in significant loss of life, structural damage and disruption of the national legislative process.

This week, in a measure aimed at enhancing security, plans were announced to also exclude commercial buses from select streets within the Capitol Complex. While we have a concern with large motorcoach type buses due to their load capacity, this policy will not affect public transit buses or sightseeing trolleys from continuing to traverse the major thoroughfares within the Capitol Complex.

It should be noted that this decision was not made in isolation. As we were developing our security plans, we conferred with the Capitol Preservation Commission and other stakeholders so as they could begin exploring alternate methods of moving visitors from satellite locations to the CVC.

The CPC is actively considering a number of options that will leverage infrastructure already available near the Capitol as well as public transportation or public transit vehicles. One such facility is Union Station which is an intermodal transportation hub that can support motorcoach parking. Talks are underway with city officials to explore integrating the Circulator bus system into the movement of people to and from the CVC.

Once the CPC decides upon a workable plan that meets the security criteria and visitor transport needs, recommendations will be made to the committees of jurisdiction. We look forward to continuing to work with the CPC, various House and Senate committees and city officials as these plans are discussed and implemented. In the interim and even after the CVC opens, tour buses will be allowed to offload and load passengers on First Street located on the west side of the Capitol just as they have done for the past six years while the CVC has been under construction.

Madam Chairwoman, we understand that bus traffic in the city does not just affect the Capitol Complex. United States Capitol Police has always been good neighbors to the surrounding community, and it is our desire not to displace problems into the local neighborhoods. Therefore, in order to offer a security and law enforcement point of view on this matter, we stand ready to work with the city officials and other concerned entities to develop a comprehensive bus management plan for the city that supports tourism and visitor experience while respecting the quality of life and environmental concerns of city residents.

We have made great strides in improving security within the Capitol Complex while balancing the needs of the city, visitors and the Congress. The opening of the Capitol Visitors Center will mark the achievement of a long desired goal of creating a facility that welcomes visitors from across the Nation and around the world in a modern, safe and secure environment that complements the grandeur of the United States Capitol.

That concludes my opening statement, and I would be happy to answer any questions you have, Madam Chairwoman.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you.

Mr. Nichols, is there any statement that you wanted to make?

Mr. NICHOLS. No, ma'am. Should you have any questions, I will be able to answer whatever you may be interested in. As always, it is a pleasure to be in front of you today.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you.

Mr. Moneme?

Mr. MONEME. Good morning, Chairwoman Norton and members of the Subcommittee.

I am Emeka Moneme. I am the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Transportation or better known as DDOT. I thank you for the opportunity to share a number of the transportation options DDOT has been developing with others to serve the residents, workers and visitors of the District of Columbia.

In particular, my brief remarks will focus on the Circulator bus service for visitors of the new Capitol Visitors Center or CVC and the District's vision for the Union Station intermodal transportation center which is currently being planned. I would like to run through a few of the short term action items that we have and some of our long term visions for the city.

Certainly, millions of families, students, children, foreign and domestic tourists will flock to the CVC for many years to come. As the District of Columbia's primary agency for facilitating a safe and efficient movement of information, goods and people throughout the District, DDOT was compelled to begin conceptualizing transpor-

tation options for CVC visitors as the Fall of 2008 opening date comes near.

After analyzing various possibilities, we concluded that the most feasible transit solution was the Circulator bus. As you are aware, the Circulator bus service was launched in 2005 and is jointly managed and operated by DDOT and WMATA Metro. Partially funded by the District of Columbia, the Federal Government, contributions from local business associations and fare box revenue, it is really a model public-private partnership.

Currently, the Circulator offers three routes: the Georgetown to Union Station route, the Convention Center to the Southwest Waterfront route and the Smithsonian National Gallery of Art loop which we also call the Mall loop. Circulator ridership has steadily increased since 2005. To date, the Circulator has served 3.5 million riders. Last month, our fleet served over 200,000 riders, a more than 10 percent increase over the May, 2006 ridership totals.

Encouraged by this stellar record of service, DDOT has developed two new Circulator route options to serve the CVC. The first proposed route is really an extension of an existing Circulator route. Specifically, DDOT and its partners are planning an extension of the current Smithsonian National Gallery of Art loop. The existing route circles the National Mall on Constitution and Independence between Fourth Street Northwest and 17th Street Northwest.

The extension will expand the present route eastward to encompass the U.S. Capitol along with a proposed stop at the main entrance of the CVC on First Street Northeast. This expansion would offer a convenient, seamless transit option for visitors to enjoy the CVC and the numerous sites and activities along the National Mall.

The second proposed route, and I will direct you to the exhibit on the easel. The second proposed route DDOT is developing is a new Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard route that would also service the new CVC. This new route would substitute or augment the existing WMATA Metro Bus N22 route. The initial stop on this line from Union Station would be the CVC. As planned, this route would offer a direct, frequent, easily accessible transit link between Union Station and the CVC.

We strongly believe that the success and effectiveness of this proposed route is contingent upon the reopening of First Street between Constitution Avenue and C Street, the portion of First Street that runs between the Russell and Dirksen Senate Office Buildings. As such, we look forward to continued dialogue with the U.S. Capitol Police and the Architect of the Capitol on this matter.

As we anticipate an immediate, steady and extremely large number of visitors to the CVC upon its opening, I must stress the importance of implementing these proposed transportation solutions for the CVC visitors, particularly the transit services connecting the CVC and Union Station which serves as the District's primary intermodal transportation center.

A recent Roll Call editorial highlights the need to further strategize about how we will handle tour bus traffic around the Capitol and facilitate the movement of visitors in and out of the CVC. By developing a number of transportation options, DDOT can

reduce the need for tour bus traffic to travel in the vicinity of the U.S. Capitol Complex.

Now, I would like to speak to some of the broader transportation solutions we would like for the consideration of the Committee. Although Union Station is a functioning transportation hub, it can become a more effective ITC or intermodal transportation center with upgrades to the existing facility as well as a potential expansion into the adjacent air rights. DDOT has been discussing and planning these upgrades for a number years.

The ITC at Union Station will include improvements such as a new rail passenger concourse for commuter rail operations, upgrades to the Amtrak passenger concourse, new pedestrian connections between Union Station and H Street Northeast, integration of commercial bus lines such as Greyhound into the new ITC, expanded tour bus parking opportunities and an integrated streetcar connectivity into and through the Union Station site.

Another potential transportation option for CVC visitors is a Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard corridor streetcar line. This streetcar line would complement Circulator service and could offer a direct transit link to the CVC for those traveling on the WMATA Metrorail. This service is only in the conceptual phase at this time, but DDOT plans to begins streetcar service in other parts of the District in 2008, in the Fall of 2008, and we would like to introduce this potential concept in this corridor.

So let me end my remarks by highlighting a few critical points. The development of the Union Station ITC will have a significant impact on future Circulator service to the CVC. Tour bus parking accommodations, streetcar integration and convenient on and off boarding at Union Station will encourage utilization of the Circulator as a preferred transit option to the CVC.

Again, I must mention the reopening of First Street between Constitution and C Street is crucial to the success of the planned Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard Circulator route and, for that matter, any direct connection to the CVC from Union Station.

Third, continuous communication and coordination with the Architect of the Capitol and the U.S. Capitol Police is a must to ensure the smooth operation of transit services around the Capitol.

Finally, securing operational and capital funding is always challenging, and additional funding is needed to implement these planned transit service to accommodate CVC visitors.

In conclusion, I thank you for the opportunity to share DDOT's plans with you. We look forward to working with this Subcommittee, the Architect of the Capitol, the U.S. Capitol Police and others that are obviously interested in this matter. I welcome any questions you may have.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Moneme.

Chief Morse, you have just heard Mr. Moneme, and he says on page three of his testimony that the success and effectiveness of the proposed route is contingent upon the reopening of First Street between Constitution Avenue and C Street that runs from Russell and Dirksen.

Has maturation on how to secure buildings come to the point that we can at least have public buses run along that route just

as public buses run along, behind and beside virtually every other public building in this city?

Chief MORSE. Yes. We believe that we can work with both the city and the jurisdictions of authority to make that recommendation and have that consideration for movement of people to the CVC. We would certainly work the group, the Capitol Preservation Commission, the city, the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, to make that recommendation and find a resolution to that.

Ms. NORTON. That is very, very good news. I do think that with the technology we now have and we are talking about a public bus, that that would be a giant step forward. It is a source of great concern about the impression that we can't protect the Capitol, that we close a major, one of the widest streets in the District of Columbia that was not closed for years afterward, and then when we got this red and yellow thing going, it was closed.

I recognize. Even though I make fun of where we were and where we are, I recognize that everybody was learning then, and I very much appreciate the efforts being made now to revert to as much openness as is consistent with keeping this place absolutely secure.

May I ask you, Chief Morse, I note improvements like the stationing of cars and actual policemen standing on Independence Avenue—you probably have them on Constitution as well—as opposed to checkpoints. Am I to take that to mean that you are to the point where you think that is sufficient rather than these checkpoints that held up traffic in the past? In the early days, I will call them.

Chief MORSE. We have been able to recently enhance our security operations regarding truck interdiction, and certainly we going to improve upon that with other larger vehicles like commercial bus traffic.

We have been able, with technology and improvements with physical security, to be able to effect security without impeding upon the normal traffic flow. We are clearly able to identify threats in advance and take the appropriate action without impeding upon normal traffic flow.

Ms. NORTON. Do you think a facility at Union Station, Chief Morse, is critical to the security of the Capitol itself?

Let me back up on that question. I indicated before that all along Congress had in mind that there would be an intermodal facility. You have heard Mr. Moneme describe both short term and long term plans.

Let me just ask you both this question. Now, we know about Circulator, and I will have a question on the buses later. Whatever we do with the buses, where will they go now?

Let us say the visitors center were to open on time. You leave the people off. I know the plans are being devised, but these buses do not then disappear into the air. You heard the testimony of the Architect that there may be a doubling of people coming. Some of them, if we are at all fortunate, will understand public transportation is the way to get here. But the buses are likely to come in far greater number.

What will we do with the buses once you devise these wonderful plans for leaving people off when there is no facility now?

I understand there is not any now. What will we do with no intermodal transportation facility for them to go now? What will we do with them now?

Chief MORSE. I think one of the things that was mentioned is the overall impact of buses throughout the city and how we can use the current transportation systems that are in place to alleviate that and make the connectivity. Union Station is a great intermodal hub. It has parking. It has shelter. It has amenities that other locations in the city also provide. So it is important as a part of this plan that we use the public transportation systems that are currently in place to alleviate some of the current heavy bus traffic.

Ms. NORTON. Chief, I am going to insist that you answer the question I put. The question I put is the practical question we all face.

Yes, there will be use of public transportation. Mr. Moneme has talked about what the city is moving ahead to do. We know that there is a wonderful subway system. We also know, by the way, half of the people who come here, the 20 million visitors, are school children. Many are people brought on buses. I know that we have plans that the buses can come to First Street. I know that they can't come beyond the Botanical Garden area.

I want to know what happens to them after that now and what will happen after that when there will be many more of them, not about public transportation. I understand that is the sane way to travel, but you can't do that if you are a kid, a school kid coming from Pennsylvania.

So I want to know what happens to the buses. Maybe Mr. Nichols, Chief Nichols can tell us what happens to the buses now—that will give me some kind of clue—or maybe Mr. Moneme can tell me what happens to the buses now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, your question actually drives to the heart of the problem. The problem is that there is no comprehensive plan and there hasn't been for years. What we have seen, and you are a resident of Capitol Hill. What we have seen is that the bus drivers and the bus companies are left to their own devices because there isn't a comprehensive facility that has been designated by the city.

Ms. NORTON. What that means—I thank you Mr. Nichols—is we just have to lay this out. Then it will make Congress want to find a solution.

Mr. NICHOLS. Exactly, correct.

Ms. NORTON. If you go down by the wonderful Mall, nobody has the nerve to say to the buses, get out of here, because we don't have any place for them to get. So the Mall is lined with buses. Now, we are coming to a place where you have to say, get out of here, and a bus driver who has never been to D.C. has to figure out, well, where do I go?

Mr. NICHOLS. Correct.

Ms. NORTON. If he dares come into the Capitol Hill neighborhood, he will get chased out physically.

So now what are we going to do, I guess? What are we going to do?

Mr. MONEME. Madam Chair, if I could, I think I could sum it up as the good, the bad and the ugly. I think the good situation is we

have no more than six locations in the city where we have capacity for buses. A short, quick example is RFK. The buses can go to RFK.

Ms. NORTON. Are we using RFK, Mr. Moneme?

Mr. MONEME. People are using it on occasion, not a lot of them, not enough of them.

Ms. NORTON. So there is no direction to go RFK.

Mr. MONEME. Right.

Ms. NORTON. Why doesn't somebody tell somebody to go at least to those places rather than leaving people to get a tourist map and find where they are least likely to be chased?

Mr. MONEME. Right. Well, I think the Chief was correct in terms of there is no structured plan or structured program as it relates to tour buses. We have locations where we encourage them to go, but there is nowhere that they are told to go there.

As I was going through the list, the bad is that they do go on the Mall where they go places we don't want them. The ugly is they go into neighborhoods and they park on people's streets when people leave, and that is when I began to hear about it. So I think the points are well taken here.

We have sites we can use in the interim, and we should get them there, but I think that the solution we do want to go to is one place that can comprehensively hold a majority of the buses.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think the other advantage is that, as the Chief testified earlier, we want to be part of the solution here. I think everyone has stovepiped this issue in the past, Madam Chair, and now it is time to get beyond that.

We have reached to DDOT, and we want to work with the other agencies that are affected by this. National Park Service certainly has an interest in this and so do the citizens associations. So it is a new day, and there is an answer out there. We need to find it. Likely, Union Station will be the answer.

Ms. NORTON. I spoke earlier about the need to have everybody in on security so people don't yell and scream to the police when the security plan is done and so that it is, in fact, balanced. You have at the table here, a very good and competent District official who is working on the same thing because this is another of those instances where you have synergy between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia.

I have not discerned any group or anybody who is in charge of this matter. Because it involves both Federal matters and D.C. matters, I wonder if we could have discussions, perhaps after this hearing, about getting a similar group or committee of District officials and security officials here to meet regularly on these matters. The first thing I would ask you to do is right now, having nothing to do with the visitors center at the moment, to develop a plan.

Mr. Moneme says that there are at least six locations where people go, but of course nobody knows that so they figure it out for themselves. That happens. That is not Mr. Moneme's fault. That happens because this is a joint Federal and D.C. matter, and of course there hasn't been oversight. So these things don't get out, and citizens complain, and then they are left with nobody in charge.

If you, Mr. Morse, would meet with Mr. Moneme and within 30 days if you would submit to me the names of a group that will take

responsibility, joint responsibility for the transportation and bus issues that exist now, that will help us build into what we need when there is a visitors center and you have a much more challenging task. If you would get us that within 30 days, we are open to whatever you decide is the best way to do it.

All we know is that certainly the actors have to be District of Columbia officials and Capitol Police. You may say there must also be other actors. So I am leaving that entirely to you. I am just asking that you get those names to us and that you meet and that the first thing you do is develop a plan for where the buses should go, recognizing that you may not have enough places now, but Mr. Moneme says there are at least six places to go, ways to inform bus companies.

We know who the bus companies are who come here, and after a while the word gets around anyway. Ways to inform them by written materials, faxes, emails—there is a bus association that this member works with closely, for example, because of the District—so that we can say to people there are places to go and so that we can talk about places that are off limits, so it is not left to citizens. If you would do that, I think we would advance not only visitors center transportation but the existing transportation and security systems, problems we have now.

Chief MORSE. We will do that.

Ms. NORTON. Could I ask? The Capitol Police for good and sufficient reasons, was expanded very substantially after 9/11. Are there enough police on board to handle the new security requirements at the CVC?

Chief MORSE. Currently, we are filling those positions to handle that requirement. Currently, we do not have the numbers to do that, but the Congress has gracious given us the FTE to fill those positions, and we are currently and actively doing that.

Ms. NORTON. I looked for a huge increase. In fact, you were increased in ways that the poor Park Police, which a huge area to cover, didn't get. I am not here saying that should or not should not be. That is not anything I have any information on or business in.

But you have not yet looked at whether or not there are sufficient police on staff now to cover the CVC or whether there will need to be added Capitol Police?

Mr. NICHOLS. We did a staffing analysis based upon what we knew the requirements of the CVC were going to be, how many visitors were going to be coming in, how many entry and exit points we were going to have staff, and then just general security requirements. When we did that, we submitted that plan to our oversight and authorizing committees.

We got the authorization to hire those officers. Obviously, that came with a funding requirement. We are just in the last string right now of bringing those officers on board so that we could be able to secure that facility.

The interesting thing about the facility is it is going to welcome the visitors, but they are going to have the ability to linger there and enjoy the facility. So we have to have enough officers on board if we should have an emergency evacuation of the facility. We can safely either collectively protect everyone there or make sure they

are safely evacuated out of that facility, and all of that was taken into our consideration for our hiring and staffing.

Ms. NORTON. That is good to hear.

Mr. Moneme, how is the Circulator paid for now upon which you are going to be relying on rather heavily bringing people from Union Station and elsewhere to the new CVC?

Mr. MONEME. The Circulator was structured initially to have a Federal contribution, a District contribution, fare box revenues, and then an association of business improvement districts in the city would contribute.

Over the last couple of years, what we have seen is fare box revenue hasn't been as high as we anticipated, the Federal contributions have been pretty consistent over the last couple years, and we have not been able to see as much contribution from the business improvement districts. So the District has been paying the lion's share of the operations of the Circulator. Out of $6 million budget, we are coming up with a balance between $4 to $3 million, more than half of it.

Ms. NORTON. I was able to get an appropriation and have worked to get one every year. But I believe that you will need more buses, will you not?

Mr. MONEME. That is correct.

Ms. NORTON. Could I ask you, Mr. Moneme, for the record, some of the issues I have raised with you in private. Can you guarantee me that we will have smaller buses rather than the great big Circulators?

Mr. MONEME. I can, in fact. Actually, I believe we have an image of one of those smaller 30-foot buses with us. In fact, if you are on K Street later on this evening, one will be on display for your viewing pleasure.

Ms. NORTON. Well, thank you. My goodness, do you have a picture of such a bus here?

Mr. MONEME. We do.

Ms. NORTON. I can't tell from looking at it about the size, but I will be on K Street to find out.

The Circulator was a wonderful idea, but the District, again for good and sufficient reason, was looking to spend as little money as possible and the best word to say for it is I think they got these on sale. They are very large, and there are times when there are just very few people in them. It makes you wish for something I guess like that or for vans or something, not vans but the smaller buses.

Are those about the size of the WMATA buses, the smaller WMATA buses?

Mr. MONEME. Exactly, exactly. What we are going to find is that especially for events that will be happening at the ballpark area or really when you are looking for crush loads of ridership from Union Station to the CVC, we will need the bigger buses because they will be filled. But on off-peak hours or when we don't expect high ridership, I think the smaller bus will do just fine.

Ms. NORTON. Particularly considering that the Congress is extremely conscious these days about the destruction of the planet at our hands, anything you can do to save the emissions of C02 would be much appreciated.

Let me ask you, are these buses even ordered?

Mr. MONEME. They have not been. We are in the final stages of negotiation on those.

Ms. NORTON. Is anybody making hybrid buses?

These are not buses that are going to go very fast. Some cities are in the forefront of doing what cities and the Congress, the Federal Government should be doing. We should be the ones coming forward with hybrid vehicles or ethanol vehicles. I don't like that so much because the cost of corn is going up but with alternative vehicles.

Are you investigating the possibility the way New York is going to use hybrid cabs now that you are going to have to invest in a whole new set of vehicles, of using environmentally appropriate vehicles?

Mr. MONEME. We are. As part of the District's contribution to WMATA Metro, every new bus that we are buying is essentially a clean fuel bus.

Ms. NORTON. What are you talking about in clean fuel?

Mr. MONEME. Either CNG, compressed natural gas, or the hybrid electric buses.

Ms. NORTON. I think I could more easily and I would feel more comfortable asking for a contribution from the Federal Government if, in fact, we were invested in state of the art new hybrid or other alternative vehicles. I say hybrid because I don't know why we should be using gas at all.

Mr. MONEME. Understood.

Ms. NORTON. If we are using it because you have got to get it. Even if it is clean, you have got to get it. We don't produce enough here. While the technology is not nearly as advanced as it would be if we would have started doing this when we should have. The technology is there, and New York is using it.

So before you order anything, I would like to have a conversation with you.

Mr. MONEME. Definitely, I would love to have that conversation.

Ms. NORTON. The price does not look to be a great deal more and when you consider the saving on gas, it seems to me that is the calculation that has to be made. What is the life of the vehicle? What would be the savings in gas from an alternative vehicle?

Among the things that I would recommend that you do is to talk to New York because they look like they are moving ahead. There are some areas that are doing so. When we are buying anything new, it seems to me that that is something that the Congress ought to be looking at in any case.

I also believe that this cost now has to be shared more than it is now shares. The Congress did its step-up, I think, in a very good way. I had a hard time getting the first appropriation. They didn't mind paying something for the buses. They did mind paying for the operations. Now, there is nothing to be said about the operations except when it comes to the Capitol Visitors Center. It does seem to be the case has been made there.

I want to thank you very much. You have answered my questions. I have given you some homework, so I think I ought to let you go. Thank you very much for very helpful testimony.

Mr. NICHOLS. Thanks. It was a pleasure.

Mr. MONEME. Thank you.

Chief MORSE. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank our two Capitol Police leaders especially for your extraordinary service. I do want to thank you for the men and women who serve our Capitol. They are always polite. They serve as long as you say they have to serve. I have nothing but the greatest respect for the risk they take and the service they give.

I wish that the next time you have your—what do you call it when you call them together? Tell them that the Congresswoman put in the record not at a time when there is an emergency, not at time when somebody has been injured, but just in the ordinary way in which they operate, that they are the best of the best.

Let me also say, Chief Morse, I noted that almost from the beginning, not from the very beginning, the Capitol Police made a decision that was different from the decisions that were made when they closed the streets or put the checkpoints. Since I am in the city seven days a week, when I come to the Capitol on Saturday or Sunday, I must come along Independence through the New Jersey Avenue entrance. There is no one at the other entrance. There, of course, is somebody always at the Capitol. There is no one at the D Street entrance. I compliment you.

The reason that that occurs is because somebody, and this was before your service, Chief Morse—Mr. Nichols may have been here—did the kind of analysis that, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I can tell you we are now requiring the Homeland Security Administration to do, and that is what is the risk and what would be consequences. Somebody has figured out that al Qaeda does not like empty buildings, that there is not a single instance of the destruction of property where there were not always a lot of people to be destroyed in the process.

And so, if you go to South Capitol Street, the traffic there, if you go to D Street, if you go to any entrance except the entrances to the Capitol and except the one entrance that you go to get to the Senate, there is nothing there. There are the blockades there, and of course you have police on duty who could get there and a lot of things would happen. But that is because we clearly have made the kind of calculations you have to make in an open society. You don't just want to have people sitting there to be sitting there without any sense of what the risk would be, what the consequences would be as if you couldn't do the kind of analysis.

I would ask that that kind of analysis be used, the kind of analysis I see you using already on Independence Avenue, whenever the suggestion is made that maybe you ought to close down some part of the city.

Again, thank you for service which is the most extraordinary service members of Congress could ask for. Thank you, gentlemen.

Could I ask for the last panel?

Chief MORSE. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. I am pleased to welcome Marshall Purnell, who is President of the American Institute of Architects and he is himself an architect and Leslie Shepherd who is the Chief Architect of the General Services Administration.

What we are trying to do here is, as Congress usually does, try to get something to compare with instead of living within the bubble of ourselves. So we are very pleased to have you both here.

Could I ask Mr. Shepherd to testify first?

TESTIMONY OF MARSHALL E. PURNELL, FAIA, PRESIDENT, THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, WASHINGTON, D.C.; LESLIE L. SHEPHERD, CHIEF ARCHITECT, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, DC.

Mr. SHEPHERD. Sure. Good morning, Chair Norton. I want to thank you for inviting me here today.

I had sort of written my comments assuming I was following Mr. Purnell.

Ms. NORTON. If you prefer that. I just do that because you are public official, but I would be glad to have Mr. Purnell if you prefer that. It doesn't matter to us. Do you prefer that?

Mr. SHEPHERD. I would prefer that. Thank you.

Ms. NORTON. All right. Mr. Purnell, you are up.

Mr. PURNELL. We are coordinated here.

Madam Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, good morning. I am Marshall Purnell, President-elect of the American Institute of Architects and a resident of the District of Columbia. Parenthetically, I am architect for the new convention center, the Nationals baseball stadium and first phase of the intermodal parking facility at Union Station.

I am honored to testify before you, Madam Chairman, and deeply appreciative of your steadfast commitment to improving the quality of life in the District of Columbia, a mission we have shared for many years.

On behalf of AIA's 81,000 members and 281,000 Americans who work for architecture firms nationwide, I would like to thank you for inviting me to testify about what the AIA envisions as the future role and responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol as they relate to both the Capitol Visitors Center and the rest of the Capitol Complex.

As the Subcommittee knows, a congressional selection commission is interviewing candidates, one of whom the President will select to become the next Architect of the Capitol. This is a major decision as the next Architect will be in charge of the design and maintenance of the Capitol Complex for the next decade.

When you consider the historic significance of this complex, its role as a physical symbol of our democracy and the important work that goes on here every day, it is clear that the next Architect of the Capitol must possess the skills to protect this great landmark and ensure the safety, security and health of thousands of people who work and visit here.

Throughout its 200 year history, the U.S. Capitol has undergone major transformations to ensure that it meets the growing needs of Congress. At nearly every major stage of the Capitol's physical growth, a professional architect serving as the Architect of the Capitol led this effort, making sure our fledgling democracy had a suitable home.

Today, the Capitol Complex must once again be transformed. Over the next 10 years, the Architect of the Capitol will be called

upon to manage a nearly 15 million square foot campus, to oversee major renovations to the existing historic structures and to improve the working conditions for legislators and their staff. The next Architect will need to address post-9/11 security concerns, find ways to conserve energy and mitigate the effects of global warming, and install 21st Century technology in 20th and 19th Century buildings. All this must take place while assuring that the business of America's legislature is not disrupted.

These are challenges that demand complex and creative solutions, the kinds of challenges that professional architects overcome every day. As history has shown us, Congress finds those solutions when a professional architect is Architect of the Capitol.

The Architect of the Capitol manages the entire Capitol Complex including the seven congressional office buildings, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress and the National Botanic Gardens. The Architect is responsible for the safety, security, health and productivity of all occupants and the thousands of daily visitors to these national treasures. It would not be in the interest of the public or the taxpayers to entrust this responsibility to someone without the formal education, on the job training and practical experience of a licensed professional architect.

Former Architect of the Capitol George White, a licensed architect himself, said it best in his letter to the commission members. Referring to the many duties of the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. White says, "The various necessary characteristics and talents must be based on a foundation of architecture."

Mr. White led the design, construction and renovation of many of the Capitol Complex buildings in his nearly 25 years as Architect of the Capitol, so he knows what the job requires better than most anyone. I respectfully request permission to have Mr. White's letter entered into the record.

The Architect of the Capitol must understand what it takes to maintain the integrity of these great buildings, their priceless artifacts and their place in the District's landscape. This often understated role of the Architect of the Capitol is clearly stated by the inclusion of the Architect of the Capitol as a member of a number of local planning bodies including the D.C. Zoning Commission and the National Capital Memorial Commission. He or she must be able to find solutions to the Capitol's challenges that work in tandem with the city's design and planning processes.

Only a licensed architect has the specific certified knowledge base as well as the full experience and training to handle such an enormous responsibility, commanding respect as the most qualified person to decide how the Capitol Complex will evolve.

Now, I am aware that the Federal law does not require the Architect of the Capitol to be an architect, but neither does our Supreme Court require its justices to be members of the bar. To appoint an Architect of the Capitol who is not a licensed architect is as troublesome as appointing a Supreme Court justice who has not passed the bar. It verges on insult to my 81,000 colleagues and negligence on the millions of Americans who trust and depend on the Architect of the Capitol to sustain and enhance the beauty, sanctity and security of our Nation's Capitol Complex.

Licensing laws in all 54 United States jurisdictions disallow anyone to even call oneself an architect without completing licensure. This regulation ensures public safety across our Nation and in all its territories. To this same end, the Architect of the Capitol should be exactly that, an architect licensed, by definition.

Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to appear before you today. I will be happy to address any questions from the Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Purnell.

Mr. Shepherd?

Mr. SHEPHERD. Now good afternoon, Chair Norton. My name is Leslie Shepherd. I am the Chief Architect of the General Services Administration, and I thank you for inviting me here today.

I would like to comment on the statement by my esteemed AIA colleague, Marshall Purnell. I concur; the individual responsible for managing the Capitol Complex, the icon of democracy, must possess outstanding skills and leadership, managerial excellence and design excellence. Mr. Purnell has eloquently spoken on these three points.

My desire is to amplify his testimony on areas of work from GSA. In particular, I would like to expand on two key areas within the broader context of design.

As a preface to these remarks, I note that GSA has a different structure and focus than the Architect of the Capitol. We manage and oversee programs, policies and processes executed through our 11 regional offices. GSA's Chief Architect does not directly design, construct or manage specific facilities. That said, I am convinced that we have the experience that can further illuminate the talents needed to fulfill the responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol.

My first point under the broader category of design expertise would emphasize the importance of historic preservation. The Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court and other facilities under the purview of the Architect of the Capitol are among our Nation's most precious landmarks designed over the past 200 plus years and shaped by history in a venue established by our Founding Fathers. Given this momentous context, as you know well, the Architect of the Capitol must be especially wise and sensitive in the areas of historic preservation.

At GSA, we are steward of more than 400 historic buildings nationwide, including over 200 monumental public buildings, several of which are national historic landmarks. Our historic preservation architects make sure that we maintain the design integrity of these structures and, at the same time, we implement innovative modernization techniques that incorporate the latest technology and building systems.

I have no doubt that the Architect of the Capitol must have a background with similar strengths. The individual should be a respected leader in the field with the expertise to speak authoritatively on challenging preservation issues, and in this regard I highlight that the Architect of the Capitol is a permanent member of the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation. The Architect of the Capitol must be able to make sound and insightful judgments to successfully balance contemporary needs and stewardship responsibilities.

Then the second point is to address the subject of security. This is always a concern with public buildings. We want to protect and assure the safety of users and visitors. We want to protect the buildings themselves. We also want our public buildings to be open and welcoming, compelling symbols of our democratic system.

At GSA, we invest significant energy and resources to delivering this balance. In addition, we are well aware that successfully addressing security in historic buildings is an even larger challenge. We have devised strategies for installing security without compromising the design or openness of our landmarks, including such measure as blast protection and mitigating the risk of progressive collapse while maintaining the original fabric of the structures under our stewardship.

This too is a talent and expertise required by the Architect of the Capitol.

In the Office of the Chief Architect, we have recently been reorganized into two components, the Office of the Chief Architect and the Office of Capital Construction Programs. The Chief Architect and Assistant Commissioner for Capital Construction work in partnership to ensure successful implementation of the Capitol design and construction program and related activities.

The Chief Architect and Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction Programs both report directly to the Commissioner of PBS, who has overall responsibility for the public building service.

It is my personal opinion that any person occupying this position with the title, Architect of the Capitol, should also be a registered architect. The United States Capitol, being the foremost architectural icon of democracy and as such is best preserved and safeguarded by a highly qualified architect.

Madam Chair, this concludes my statement. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Ms. NORTON. Well, as you are aware from the prior testimony, our major interest is not in the qualifications for the Architect of the Capitol. As such, we didn't think you could have a hearing of this kind without touching on this issue, and we recognize there has been some back and forth between the profession and others, and that has a lot to do with the changing nature and function, frankly, of the Capitol.

When you add a space that is almost as much as we have here now, you have controversy about the structure people begin to ask, well, what kind of person. It is interesting, you both have testified that if you are going to be called the Architect of the Capitol, you should be an architect. That, of course, does not say that the person who is in charge of the building should be an architect. I don't know if you both are testifying to that effect as well.

You can have an Architect of the Capitol who was in charge of what architects do, and that wouldn't necessarily be the person in charge of the Capitol structure.

Mr. PURNELL. You could have someone who was in management operations in terms of operating the facility, a facilities manager, but he should be working under the auspices of the Architect of the Capitol because the issues that come up are likely to be something that the Architect could address. That is a subset of what the architectural profession does.

Ms. NORTON. Yes, rather than the other way around, you say.

Mr. PURNELL. No, it doesn't work the other way around because facilities management is not necessarily he is not trained to handle the other issues that would come up.

Ms. NORTON. I am pulling your leg a little bit because most of the time in projects the project is not run by the architect and the architect is not the CEO of the project. You seem to be saying that the architect should be the CEO here if that is not the usual role he plays in construction.

Mr. PURNELL. You are right. In many instances, the architect is not running the project in terms of at the very top of the food chain, and every project doesn't necessarily run smoothly with or without that structure.

But I am saying if the architect has been trained to understand what the roles of everybody involved are and should be and how everybody should play together, if you will. Engineers, facilities managers are not so trained. They are basically dealing with their particular discipline and what they understand to be the issues.

Mr. SHEPHERD. I would also add if I could.

Ms. NORTON. Yes, Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. SHEPHERD. In previous testimony, they spoke that the fire marshal for the Architect of the Capitol would be doing the occupancy acceptance. That is a little different than a normal city. The Federal buildings, we do the same thing at GSA. We have a fire marshal within GSA who does those inspections for fire/life-safety.

The Architect is ultimately responsible for the fire/life-safety and overall well-being. We don't generally have, in the District of Columbia, fire marshals wouldn't come in and do inspections. It would be the Architect of the Capitol.

Ms. NORTON. That has everything to do with jurisdiction. The Capitol is a jurisdiction of itself. You don't even have jurisdiction. The Federal Government doesn't even have jurisdiction over the Capitol the way it does over Federal agencies, and that is why the District of Columbia and everybody else can come in here because this is one of the branches of government.

But I take your point nor am I suggesting. I think this takes a great deal of study, study that this Committee does not intend to give to this particular aspect of this subject but one that raises itself when you are considering the new facility.

I note, Mr. Shepherd, that you are an architect.

Mr. SHEPHERD. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. But your work would seem to have little to do with architecture or your training as an architect as such. Does your work have more, as much to do with management of this empire of real estate that you relate to?

Mr. SHEPHERD. That kind of goes to the way we have been reorganized in our Office of the Chief Architect. I am more involved in design review and architectural review. The Assistant Commissioner for Capital Construction Programs is more involved in the review of construction documents, the bidding process, et cetera, but I am involved in the front end review of the budget up front and review of all design work and recommend each project for approval by the commission.

Ms. NORTON. So you are doing mostly work within the ambit of what we think of when we think of what architects do.

Mr. SHEPHERD. Absolutely.

Ms. NORTON. Was Capital Construction under the GSA Architect before?

Mr. SHEPHERD. Correct.

Ms. NORTON. Why was that moved? Why was that separated?

Mr. SHEPHERD. Maybe it was a response. I was in this position for two years. In the job we have at GSA, we have 195 active projects. Probably, I think about 60 of those are in design and the balance in construction. It is just the enormity of the workload.

I think it has worked much better since we have reorganized a little, about six months. The Assistant Commissioner and I meet every single morning. We talk about every project together, but it is a collaboration and it takes the two of us to effectively deliver the program.

Ms. NORTON. What skills do each of you think the new appointee should have to operate the new visitors center, assuming we are talking now about the Architect of the Capitol? What skills do you think that either the Architect of the Capitol, whoever is appointed, should have to run this facility and this building?

Mr. PURNELL. I may speak first.

I think the person should have some experience with really large gathering places or places of assembly, be it convention centers or places where there are sports venues, where there are always a number of people in attendance at any one time. To deal with potential issues of evacuation has been stated here, potential issues of security threats and then just the daily operations of a mixed use facility as this will be. You are having restaurants, shops for purchasing, in addition, meeting rooms and spaces. It is a space that is not too unlike a modern day convention center in terms of the complexity of the different venues that will be happening there at any given time.

But I wanted to just add when you say what you typically think of an architect as doing. There are a number of architectural firms in this Country that have hundreds and even thousands of people with offices, multiple offices, as many as 25, 26 offices in this Country and around the world and managing thousands of people.

Ms. NORTON. Yes, but that is like saying lawyers who run a law firm, but what you have described is not that. You described an architect in charge of a different kind of facility altogether.

Mr. PURNELL. Well, I think when you mention the CVC is one facility and it is a part of one complex. The Architect of the Capitol, which is what I am focusing on and not necessarily the person who is hired to run the CVC, admittedly, is a person that you need to have this convention experience, people gathering experience. That is not necessarily the Architect of the Capitol. That person should report to the Architect of the Capitol as I see it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Shepherd?

Mr. SHEPHERD. I would concur. It is that word, operate. I think generally an Architect is going to have very little experience in the operation of a building. The majority aren't. But that function of reporting to the Architect, I think that Architect is then capable of making those broad decisions about appropriateness.

Really, your goal is to protect this icon of the American Capitol, and I think the Architect is in the best position to help broker those kind of decisions that may need to be made as things change in the operation of the building.

Ms. NORTON. You both seem to believe an architect is important to be the Architect of the Capitol. I am taking Mr. Purnell's reference to lawyers.

Mr. SHEPHERD. I would also add the Surgeon General. You would expect the Surgeon General to be a physician.

Ms. NORTON. You would. Yes, you would.

Mr. Purnell rightly says that you don't have to pass the bar to be a lawyer. I wonder if anyone would say it would be nice to be lawyer, though, to be on the Supreme Court. You are saying that the person should be licensed architect, and you are saying that this lawyer should be a member of the bar.

I wonder if we could get at least some understanding because again the notion of who reports to whom is not something that this Subcommittee is interested in or how the Architect of the Capitol notion should be done. The President gets to appoint that, and the House and the Senate do have some input into that.

But the closest analogy I can think of, frankly, does come from my own profession of lawyers. The way we are trained is about the worst way to run something, and some of us never lose that, the way we are trained in due process, for example, Due process is about stopping things from happening, slowing things down. It is about process. The very word, process, tells you what the problem is.

And so, lawyers can really bollux things up. It is very important to have a general counsel, but that is what he is. He advises you on the law.

On the other hand, you would be surprised how many lawyers transform themselves into something else, managers. There are lawyers who run the world. Well, Secretary Rubin was in law school with me. He is not in a law firm. I am sure he may have spent this much time in a law firm, but he became the Treasurer of the United States and he was an investment banker.

There are professions where people study this. They don't take to heart some of the worst aspects, if you want to move on, of the profession. In our case, it is get real stuck on process, in the case of lawyers. Often you will be reading somebody's vitae, who is running something, and you say I will be blessed if the person didn't go to law school.

But what is important is that the person has I say transformed themselves. Lawyers can be big or they can be little. Transformed themselves so that these lawyers fit another mold and a mold that is not particularly related to the process that is involved in being a lawyer which is very plodding, not very much interested in moving quickly, not management-oriented.

Can we agree? Let us assume—I am offering a hypothetical—that the Architect of the Capitol is an architect. Can we assume that he should be such a transformative figure who, in fact, somehow has proven himself as a manager as well as a captain of his profession, Mr. Purnell?

Mr. PURNELL. I would consider that to be a given for this particular position.

Architects, by the way, are trained to solve problems. We are not trained to just design buildings. We are trained to take ideas and thoughts and basically people's wishes and their problems and resolve them in such a way that we hand them something that says this is what your thoughts, your program, all the problems that we saw along the way. This is how it manifests itself into what you decided you wanted in terms of building a visitors center.

We are taught that we are problem-solvers in our architectural education. Thomas Jefferson was an architect. He became President of the United States.

Ms. NORTON. The ultimate renaissance man, though, Mr. Purnell.

Mr. PURNELL. He was more than one thing, but he was also an architect.

Ms. NORTON. You could name about a dozen other things he was and the best of them, okay, but if you want to start there, that is fine.

Mr. PURNELL. He talked about transforming.

Ms. NORTON. Harness that kind of Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. PURNELL. But I consider myself a pretty good manager when asked to manage. I have managed a firm, and I have managed projects, the Convention Center project as one of the lead architects on that, working with a developer. The person who was charged with developing that project, his formal education was that of a Master's degree in architecture from Columbia University and myself. So I think that when asked to manage, I can manage. I don't see my architectural background limiting in any way, shape or form in that capacity.

Managing the construction of a project is one of the most difficult things anyone will ever do. There are millions of decisions to be made on any building that have been done, whether it is the type of hinges used on the doors to where the security checkpoints are going to be. Every decision that is made is made by someone who is both designing and managing how people will use that building.

Like I say, to accuse our whole profession and put our whole profession in one box is just unfortunate because just like the legal profession, I too know lawyers who have never set foot in a courtroom, that are managing many different businesses and practices be it in corporate America, private industry or just serving as public servants. So I don't think that architect in itself is something that should be looked at in a very narrow perspective.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Shepherd?

Mr. SHEPHERD. I agree with that.

Ms. NORTON. Remember my question was about whether or not you think that the Architect of the Capitol for this position today should have gone through the transformation such that he can manage a large enterprise like this.

Mr. SHEPHERD. I absolutely believe that the person referred to and has the title, Architect of the Capitol, should be an architect. I think that almost goes without saying. That would be the public's expectation is that that person has formal training. They have that skill set. They know what to do.

I was going to also add, I report to and the Assistant Commissioner for Capital Construction Programs reports to the Commissioner. The last three Commissioners of GSA, Bob Peck, Joe Moravec, David Winstead, also they are trained in design and construction. They have design and construction backgrounds. They know almost as much about design and construction and a lot of architects, not with formal background, but they are Commissioner of Public Building Service. They are not the Chief Architect of GSA.

Ms. NORTON. Well, I just think the fact that we have discussed hypotheticals here has been useful.

Again, this Committee does not have any view on the question except that the Architect of the Capitol ought to be somebody who knows how to deal with this new facility and all of its component parts, but we certainly have no view on whether the person has to be an architect or not. I know that that is controversial, whether the job should be bifurcated, who should support, who should report to whom.

We know for the record that there is a commission or committee who has been assigned the job to look at the skills that are necessary and to report to the deciding officials in the House and the Senate the kinds of names they think meet that skill set. We have every confidence that they will do that job with great confidence.

But it is useful, it seems to me, for those of us concerned about the building itself, particularly those of us who live in the District of Columbia and I certainly appreciate the work that both of you have done in your respective capacities, and those of us on this Subcommittee who are interested even more so in transportation, security and access. Those are issues that inevitably intrude on the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, whoever is appointed.

Thus, we have a interest in making sure, as I am sure will occur, that whoever gets to head this operation and whomever the President chooses upon the recommendation of the leaders of the Congress will be what we need for a 21st Century Architect of the Capitol, remembering that even Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Purnell, would probably have had to transform himself to be the Architect of the Capitol here today.

I want to thank you both for the kind of perspectives you brought to the hearing. To hear from you, Mr. Purnell, who has done work managing large projects, who speaks also for the profession and to hear from you, Mr. Shepherd, also an architect who has worked in that capacity leading a huge real estate enterprise through the GSA, gives us the kind of perspective to understand what will be required and expected.

Thank you very much and the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management

Hearing on "What Visitors Can Expect at the Capitol Visitors Center: Transportation, Access, Security, and Visuals"
Friday, June 8, 2007

Statement – Congressman Jason Altmire (PA-04)

Thank you, Chairwoman Norton, for holding this hearing today to receive testimony from the Acting Architect of the Capitol, the Chief of the Capitol Police, D.C. government officials, and trade associations on "What Visitors Can Expect at the Capitol Visitors Center: Transportation, Access, Security and Visuals."

The Capitol Visitors Center (CVC) project has been beset by numerous delays and cost overruns. Congress initially appropriated $100 million for the project in 1998. But the CVC is now expected to cost over $500 million and not be completed until the fall of 2008. The Government Accountability Office reports that there have been 180 design changes and 80 contract modifications since construction started.

As a new Member of Congress, I am concerned about the mismanagement of the project to date and the inefficient use of the American taxpayers' dollar. While the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch has primary jurisdiction over the CVC project, this committee does have an oversight role and I look forward to working with the Chairwoman to see the project through to completion.

Thank you again, Chairwoman Norton. I yield back the balance of my time.

# # #

Statement of Rep. Harry Mitchell
House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee
Subcommittee on Highways and Transit
6/7/07

--Thank you Mr. Chairman.

--As you know, Arizona is now the fastest growing state in the nation. Since 1970, our population has more than tripled.

--The Phoenix metropolitan area, long the largest in our state, is now one of the largest in the nation. According to the U.S. census, our metropolitan area is now the 13th largest in the nation, just behind San Francisco and Boston.

--Not surprisingly, all this growth has created an urgent need for new transportation infrastructure….not just highways, but public transportation as well.

--According to the most recent Federal Highway Administration traffic congestion report, the portion of I-10 that runs through the Phoenix metropolitan area has some of the worst bottlenecks in the country.

--Congestion caused by construction is further hampering our ability to get around efficiently.

--Light rail will do a lot to alleviate this congestion…but we must find other alternatives to ensure our roads can meet the needs of our rapidly growing community.

--When completed in 2008, this project is expected carry 26,000 people daily and 47,000 by 2020.

--I look forward to hearing from our witnesses on how we can solve current and future congestion issues.

--I yield back the balance of my time.

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

SUBCOMMITTEES:
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

INTELLIGENCE AND COUNTERTERRORISM

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
AVIATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM*

SUBCOMMITTEES:
CIVIL SERVICE AND AGENCY REORGANIZATION

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES

*COVERS D.C ISSUES

STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

"WHAT VISITORS CAN EXPECT AT THE CAPITOL VISITORS CENTER: TRANSPORTATION, ACCESS, SECURITY, AND VISUALS."

JUNE 8, 2007

I welcome our witnesses and visitors to today's hearing on "What Visitors Can Expect at the Capitol Visitors Center: Transportation, Access, Security, and Visuals." This morning the subcommittee will hear testimony concerning what exactly it is that visitors can expect when they arrive at the new section of the Capitol building that will be known as the Capitol Visitor Center or CVC. I visited the CVC this week and found an addition of considerable beauty and majesty, in keeping with the main Capitol building. Estimates are that the CVC is 90% to 95% complete and opening is expected in 2008. In addition, today we will hear about transportation, security, and general access plans that still are being developed and refined.

There has been no oversight of the CVC by an authorizing committee and none on the issue of transportation, security, and access that are of special interest to this subcommittee today. Because this subcommittee deals with federal construction we shared jurisdiction with other subcommittees in the past. Moreover, the new visitors center is a matter of considerable interest and concern to the Member who represents the nation's capital. The Congress and the nation depend on this city to be welcoming to constituents and to visitors from around the world. The District of Columbia is one of America's preeminent tourist destinations and consequently, there is a perfect synergy between what the Congress and the District of Columbia want when tourists come to the city to visit historic sites. As a result, I spend far more time than

529 14TH STREET, N.W., SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, D.C 20045-1928
(202) 783-5065
(202) 783-5211 (FAX)

2136 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C 20515-5101
(202) 225-8050
(202) 225-3002 (FAX)
(202) 225-7829 (TDD)
www.house.gov/norton

2041 MARTIN L KING AVENUE, S.E
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, D.C 20020-5734
(202) 678-8900
(202) 678-8844 (FAX)

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

most Members on federal monuments and structures here. Our subcommittee will have a hearing on the Smithsonian, which is passing through a particularly troubled period and on the John F. Kennedy Center on June 15, 2007, and I will shortly introduce a bill for revision and expansion of the National Mall.

The visitors center idea began to take shape long before I came to Congress in 1966, when the former Public Works Committee, now the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, passed P.L. 89-790. For years, many had remarked about the spectacle of Members' hosting school and other groups on the steps of the Capitol or constituents waiting in the heat of summer or the cold of winter to enter the Capitol, as well as the lack of meeting space or even space to stand comfortably and speak to a group of constituents. P.L. 89-790 was a simple page and a half bill that directed a "full and complete investigation and study of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capitol." The hearing record quotes then Vice President Hubert Humphrey who said, "No city in the world treats its visitors with such shabby indifference." The record from May 1966 reflects many ideas about where to put the center, including the Botanic Gardens, or the West Front of the Capitol, or in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds. The record is filled with testimony brimming with enthusiasm for the concept and the uses of a national visitors center. The law was amended several times to accommodate the acquisition of land, authorize certain leases and contracts, and even became the vehicle for the rehabilitation of Union Station. (P.L. 97-125).

The need for the current center continued to grow but nothing moved forward. In 1998, following the first shooting deaths of Capitol Police officers in the nation's history, I believed that finally security, not merely convenience, would make Congress want to focus on a visitors center. Less than a week later I introduced H.R. 4347 the Jacob Joseph Chestnut-John Michael Gibson United States Capitol Visitor Center Act of 1998. The bill provided for enhanced security within the Capitol Grounds and for an appropriate place to welcome our constituents, taking into account their health and comfort. Included in the bill was a provision that I note with some irony today, requiring the Architect to "identify alternatives for construction of the Capitol Visitors Center that will reduce the costs of construction."

Now 40 years after the original proposal, we finally are on the verge of realizing what was called in 1966 a "building of magnificent opportunity for education in its broadest and most attractive sense." This subcommittee is not much interested in fighting the last war over what went wrong with CVC

construction program. Speaking for the host city, not to mention most Members of Congress, we simply want to make sure that the new structure works. The CVC can not live on beauty alone. Entirely fresh thinking about transportation, access and security are necessary. How will the transportation plan enable visitors to arrive at the center with minimum hassle, fresh and ready to reap the benefits of a visit or a tour? How will security plans balance the important goals of maintaining an open and accessible Capitol while moving visitors quickly into the center and ensuring the highest security for one of the world's most strategic open facilities? Considering the funds, design and craft that have gone into the CVC, we are also interested in the management of the facility by the Architect of the Capitol, charged with the maintenance of the CVC and the main Capitol Building.

Washington is not only one of the world's most beautiful cities; the District of Columbia is the central locus of our democracy and those principles and ideals we cherish and others to which we aspire. Every year visitors come from every state in the Union and virtually every country in the world. Individuals and groups, walk through and around the Capitol to learn first hand how democracy is achieved. The new CVC will itself be a learning experience if it is run with the same grace it beauty conveys.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN T. AYERS, AIA
ACTING ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Regarding the Capitol Visitor Center Project

Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure U.S. House of Representatives

June 8, 2007

Madam Chairwoman, Congressman Graves, and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to update you on the progress of the Capitol Visitor Center (CVC) project. We certainly appreciate the interest you all have taken in the project, and we appreciate that the Chairwoman recently toured the CVC. I would like to take a moment to provide a brief history of the project before discussing the latest construction progress.

Madam Chairwoman, the idea for a visitor center is not new. It dates back to the mid-1970s and several feasibility studies were conducted in the 1990s. The fatal shootings of two U.S. Capitol Police officers in July 1998 underscored the degree to which the building and its occupants are at risk. Therefore, in October 1998, Congress provided $100 million in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for the planning, engineering, design, and construction of a visitor center.

The events of September 11, 2001, the anthrax attacks, and the war on terrorism further punctuated the need to enhance security in the Capitol. Understanding the need to screen visitors beyond the building, and wanting to provide basic amenities for visitors, Congress appropriated $100 million to supplement the previous appropriation and the $65 million in private donations that had been raised to begin construction of the Capitol Visitor Center in September 2001.

The first phase of construction began in summer 2002. However, before we could put a shovel in the ground, we had a number of pre-construction tasks to complete. We moved or made arrangements to protect historic trees. We removed and stored the Frederick Law Olmsted-designed lanterns and water fountains so we could reinstall them when the project is completed.

We constructed new visitor screening facilities, and installed ramps along the West Front to provide an ADA accessible path into the building. Offices located in the East Front Extension that were temporarily closed or relocated due to the construction were moved into alternate space.

Once the pre-construction work was completed, we began excavation of the site. The CVC is an underground, three-story structure encompassing 580,000 square feet of space. It is unique among underground structures in that it is an underground assembly, meeting, and museum facility. Over the course of the Sequence 1 work, we removed 60,000 truckloads or 4.2 million pounds of dirt from the East Front of the Capitol. Once full excavation was completed, we began pouring concrete for the outer perimeter walls, erecting steel columns, and installing the concrete roof slab and utilities.

The original intent for building the CVC was that one construction contract would be awarded that included excavation, structure, fit-out and finishes to be awarded in 2002. After September 11, significant scope changes, including fit-out of the expansion spaces, the installation of state-of-the-art security elements, and the addition of a new, pedestrian tunnel to the Jefferson Building, would have delayed the start of excavation by several months. Before this work could begin, it needed to be designed and funded, which would take several months to do.

This delay would have jeopardized meeting the Congressional requirement that the East Front be ready to support Inaugural activities in January 2005. Therefore, the construction package was divided into two contracts: A structure/foundation contract or Sequence 1, and a second contract, which would be awarded more than a year later, for installation of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, fit-out and finishes, or Sequence 2.

The Sequence 2 contract was awarded in April 2003. This second phase of construction — which we are finishing up now — involves installation of electrical, mechanical, and plumbing services, and build-out of the facility including installation of all stone and finishing materials, and preparing the CVC for public use.

Madam Chairwoman, there is a third phase of construction. It is the $85 million design and build-out of the House and Senate expansion space adjacent to the CVC. In November 2001, additional

funding was provided in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill to finish the 170,000 square feet of space.

That brings us to the progress made to date. As you know, I assumed the duties of Acting Architect of the Capitol in February 2007. At that time, construction was 88 percent complete and numerous critical path milestones were being missed monthly.

One of my first actions as Acting Architect was to direct the project team to re-evaluate the project schedule to ensure it was realistic and to include the two major risks that were not built into the schedule or into the fire and life-safety acceptance testing plan. Those risks are (1) the commissioning of building systems, and (2) acceptance testing of fire, security, and life-safety systems to include testing to ensure the building systems and fire and life-safety systems are integrated and work together properly.

By April, the Project Team, under the direction of Mr. Doug Jacobs, had updated the master project schedule to incorporate these specific risks and contingencies, particularly with regard to the time needed to integrate the fire alarm, life-safety, and security systems with the building systems. It is important to note that since the completion of the schedule re-assessment in April, for the third month is a row, all critical path activities have been met as scheduled. This is the first time in the history of the project that this has occurred.

With construction now 95 percent complete, major construction activities will start winding down this summer. The tasks now left to do largely involve the aesthetics and functionality of the space such as painting and installation of carpet, lighting fixtures, and hand railings, as well as the tie-in of building systems. The final and most complex challenges ahead are the acceptance testing of the fire, security, and life-safety systems and the commissioning of the sophisticated building systems.

The final testing of the fire and life-safety systems is scheduled to begin this fall. Our expectation continues to be that a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued in June 2008. Last month, representatives from our Fire Marshal's office tested a mock-up of the CVC fire alarm system. Programming codes and device operation and sequencing was reviewed and tested. The initial results were considered very positive. This process and the increased coordination between the Fire

Marshal and the fire alarm subcontractor during the pre-testing process will help minimize delays and reprogramming requirements during the final testing process.

With regard to commissioning the building systems, air balancing of all of the air handlers must be completed before the Fire Marshal can commence testing of the smoke control system. At this time, all but one of the CVC's 23 air handling units are operational or available for operation. "Rough" balancing has been completed in several of the public areas of the Visitor Center — Great Hall, Food Service Area, Exhibition Gallery, and Orientation Theaters. "Final" balancing activities can continue after the contractor's smoke testing.

I continue to work closely with the CVC project team to ensure that the project continues to move forward based on a realistic schedule. Completing this project is a top priority for me and this Agency and I have directed the team to come to me immediately when any issues arise. They have been working hard over the past several months to stem delays and cost increases.

A new member of the team is Mr. Bernie Ungar, who joins me at the table today. Mr. Ungar became CVC Project Executive on May 23. He is very familiar with the history of the CVC and has a working knowledge of the project having been a part of it since the groundbreaking as part of the Government Accountability Office's team conducting management reviews and audits of the project. His leadership will help bridge the gap between the AOC and GAO as we work to complete construction.

Madam Chairwoman, the Project Team and I are very serious in our commitment to complete this project as expeditiously and as safely as possible while maintaining the exceptional quality of the work in the facility. Each month approximately $4.5 million of work is being executed and hundreds of construction contractors are working on the site daily. I will continue to communicate with the Subcommittee and Congressional leadership in an open dialogue to keep them apprised of our progress and any issues that arise. The AOC, the CVC Project Team and I are dedicated to providing Congress and the American people with a Visitor Center of which we can all be proud.

PROJECT UPDATE

Operations Planning

With regard to the operation of the CVC, on April 12, I received a letter from House and Senate Leadership assigning the management of CVC operations and administration to the AOC. I immediately stood-up a support team that has begun working to transition the CVC from a construction project to a fully staffed and equipped visitor services operation.

David Ferguson, our Chief Administrative Officer, is leading this transition team full-time. In this role, he is overseeing CVC operational planning for the AOC and coordinating with our consulting team from JM Zell Partners, and House and Senate leadership on areas such as administration, food service, gift shops, information technology, and exhibits.

One of our top priorities is to recruit a Chief Executive Officer for Visitor Services (CEOVS). Once this person is hired, other staffing of CVC operations can begin. The CEOVS will be responsible for the overall operation of the CVC and the implementation of the policies and programs that fulfill the CVC's mission of security, visitor comfort, and education. I am pleased to report that the interview process for the Chief Executive Officer for Visitor Services has begun. The plan is to have someone on board by this fall. We have already begun to hire staff to attend to the facility's maintenance which report to the Capitol Superintendent's Office.

In addition, the CVC food service contract was awarded effective May 31, 2007, to Restaurant Associates. Restaurant Associates provides food services to a number of well- known museums, performing art centers, and institutions, including The National Gallery of Art; The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; and the Smithsonian Institution; National Museum of American History; National Museum of Natural History; National Museum of the American Indian; and the Reynold's Center/Portrait Gallery.

Other operational issues that we will be working with Congressional leadership on include an advanced reservation system, developing a CVC Web site, stocking and staffing gift shops, developing position descriptions for staff, and reaching out to community, tour industry, and business groups with a public information campaign, to name a few.

Construction Update

As I mentioned earlier, most of the work remaining to be done involves installation of finish materials throughout the site. Light fixture installation has begun in the Great Hall; carpet installation continues in House and Senate Expansion Spaces; exhibit case components are being placed inside the Exhibition Hall; and millwork is nearly complete on both levels of the Congressional Auditorium.

In addition, in the House Expansion Space, the stone work in the Hearing Room is progressing and should be done this month. Work in the Radio and TV Gallery space is expected to be finished in July, and the ongoing carpet installation in the House Intelligence Committee space marks the near completion of that area.

Outside, the 12-foot-high bronze entrance doors have been installed in the CVC's north and south entrances. The cab components for the exterior elevators are being installed on the East Front Plaza, and the grounds are being readied for sod and other plantings following the installation of an irrigation system.

Madam Chair, we are committed to getting the CVC project finished as quickly as possible. As I noted previously, it is my top priority and the top priority of this Agency. This one-of-a-kind facility was conceived as an extension of the Capitol, offering open access to all people in a safe and secure environment so that they may witness the workings of democracy and the legislative process. The CVC also will enhance the visitor experience by eliminating the long lines where tourists had to stand in the heat, the rain, or the cold; providing greater comfort and accessibility, including plenty of restrooms and a cafeteria and other necessary amenities; as well as new educational opportunities for our children and our children's children through interactive exhibits and an orientation film.

At this time, we are on track to meet our scheduled June 2008 date to receive the Certificate of Occupancy. Nonetheless, we recognize that the project continues to face risks and uncertainties and are instituting additional steps to increase our focus on meeting our scheduled completion dates.

We will continue to closely monitor the progress of the building systems commissioning and the fire and life-safety system testing to mitigate potential delays, and we look forward to continuing to work with Congressional leadership as we begin staffing the operations and effectively and seamlessly work to transition the CVC from a construction project to a fully staffed and equipped visitor services operation.

This concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Testimony of Emeka Moneme, Director
District of Columbia Department of Transportation

Before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings
and Emergency Management

June 8, 2007

Good morning Chairwoman Norton and members of the Subcommittee. I am Emeka Moneme, Director of the District of Columbia Department of Transportation or DDOT. I thank you for the opportunity to discuss transportation options for individuals that will visit the new Capitol Visitors Center or CVC.

It is my understanding that the CVC will open in the fall of 2008. Excitement abounds about this new facility that will reflect our country's birth, growth and march into the future. Certainly, millions of families, children, students, foreign and domestic tourists, and others will flock to the CVC for many years to come. As the District of Columbia's primary agency for facilitating the safe and efficient movement of information, goods and people throughout the District, I am excited to elaborate on the transportation options DDOT is currently planning and conceptualizing for CVC visitors.

Circulator Service

The most promising transportation option we are planning for CVC visitors is the Circulator bus. As you are aware, Circulator bus service was launched in 2005 as an innovative, attractive, environmentally-friendly, inexpensive, hop-on/hop-off transit service throughout the downtown area and between downtown and other critical District neighborhoods and destination

points. DDOT and the Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) jointly manage and operate the service. Currently, the Circulator offers (3) routes:

- The Georgetown – Union Station Route;
- The Convention Center – SW Waterfront Route; and
- The Smithsonian – National Gallery of Art Loop.

Since establishing the service, we have witnessed ridership steadily increase. To date, the Circulator has served 3,530,228 riders, and last month our fleet served 203,143 riders, which is an 11% increase over the May 2006 ridership totals.

DDOT and its Circulator partners are planning an extension of the current Smithsonian – National Gallery of Art Loop to serve the CVC in time for its projected opening. The existing route circles the National Mall. The proposed extension would expand the present route eastward to encompass the U.S. Capitol Complex and include a stop at the main entrance of the CVC. This expansion would offer a convenient, seamless transit option for visitors to enjoy the CVC and the numerous sites and activities along the National Mall.

Second, DDOT plans to operate a new Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard Route that would also service the new CVC. This new line could replace the existing WMATA Metrobus N22 route to avoid duplicative Circulator and WMATA Metrobus service. The initial stop on this line from Union Station would be the CVC. As planned, this route would offer a DIRECT, frequent, easily-accessible transit link between Union Station and the CVC. We strongly believe that the success and effectiveness of this proposed route is contingent upon the re-opening of 1st Street, between Constitution Avenue and C Street – the portion of 1st Street that runs between the

Russell and Dirksen Senate Office Buildings. And as such, we look forward to continued dialogue with the U.S. Capitol Police and the Architect of the Capitol on this matter.

Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard Corridor Streetcar

Yet another potential transportation option for CVC visitors is a Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard Corridor Streetcar line. This streetcar line would complement Circulator service and could offer a direct transit link to the CVC for those traveling on the WMATA Metrorail Green Line. This service is only in the concept phase but is certainly a reality in the foreseeable future as DDOT will begin Streetcar service in other areas of the District as soon as the fall of 2008.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

Lastly, we recognize that many visitors may want to enjoy the CVC after or in the midst of a pleasant stroll or bike outing. As so, DDOT is prepared to work with the Architect of the Capitol and other CVC planners to assist in designing and constructing needed pedestrian and bicycle path improvements adjacent to the CVC. Without question, DDOT encourages and promotes walking and bicycling as a viable transportation option for residents and visitors and works continuously to foster a safe pedestrian and bicycling environment. I would also note that DDOT and other partners are currently planning a Bicycle Center at Union Station which would complement any bicycle path improvements throughout the U.S. Capitol Complex.

As we anticipate an immediate, steady and extremely large number of visitors to the CVC upon its opening, I stress the importance of implementing these proposed transportation solutions for CVC visitors, particularly, the transit services connecting the CVC and Union Station, which

serves as the District's primary intermodal transportation center. A recent Roll Call editorial highlights the need to further strategize about how we will handle tour bus traffic around the Capitol and facilitate the movement of visitors in and out of the CVC. The planned Circulator service and potential streetcar line would offer safe and efficient transportation options and reduce the need for tour bus traffic to travel in the vicinity of the U.S. Capitol Complex.

Circulator Costs

The annual costs of operating the extended Smithsonian – National Gallery of Art Loop are estimated at approximately $1.4 million. Service for this route would be seasonally adjusted with more frequent service offered during the high tourist season from March to October and reduced service from October to March. The annual costs of operating the new Union Station-CVC-Navy Yard Route are estimated at approximately $2.0 million. We are presently working to design an exact route alignment and schedule for this new service. Please note that the aforementioned costs are solely projected operational costs, and do not include the additional funding needed to purchase and equip additional vehicles for the proposed service. DDOT has pursued federal funding to support Circulator service and we are also contemplating revenue generating partnerships with corporate entities. We welcome the assistance of the Subcommittee in securing funding.

Crucial Considerations

Let me end my remarks by highlighting a few obvious but crucial points:

(1) The development of the Union Station Intermodal Transportation Center will have a significant impact on future Circulator service to the CVC. Tour bus parking accommodations, streetcar integration and convenient on and off boarding at Union

Station will encourage utilization of the Circulator as a preferred transit option to the CVC;

(2) Again, the re-opening of 1st Street between Constitution Avenue and C Street is crucial to the success of the planned Union Station – CVC – Navy Yard Circulator route;

(3) Continuous communication and coordination with the Architect of the Capitol and U.S. Capitol Police is must to ensure the smooth operation of transit services around the Capitol;

(4) Securing operational and capital funding is challenging and additional funding is needed to implement the planned transit services to accommodate CVC visitors

I thank you for the opportunity share DDOT's plans with you. We look forward to working with the Subcommittee, the Architect of the Capitol, the U.S. Capitol Police, and others to ensure that the countless visitors that come to Washington, DC to enjoy the new Capitol Visitors Center will have adequate and convenient transportation options. I welcome any questions you may have.

PHONE: 224-9806

UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
119 D STREET, NE
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7218

Testimony of

Chief Phillip D. Morse, Sr.
United States Capitol Police

before the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and
Emergency Management

June 8, 2007

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee today to discuss the planning and preparations the United States Capitol Police has conducted in anticipation of the opening of the Capitol Visitors Center next year.

In 1998, after Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were fatally shot in the United States Capitol by an armed intruder, planning of the Capitol Visitors Center began in earnest. In fact Madam Chair, you were one of the first proponents to reinvigorate the concept of a visitors center when you introduced H.R. 962 in 1999.

Since that time, the U.S. Capitol Police has worked in partnership with the Architect of the Capitol to help design the CVC in such as manner as to not only enhance and enrich the visitor's experience, but also enhance the security of the United States Capitol. As the construction of the facility progresses, it is clear that both goals will be achieved.

The main advantage that the CVC presents from a security perspective is the ability for the U.S. Capitol Police to conduct security screening of visitors in a state-of-the-art facility that was designed for that purpose. As we saw in 1998, the historic and ceremonial entrances of the Capitol were never intended to support the security screening that is necessary in today's threat environment. The opening of the CVC, with its entryways custom-designed to support security equipment, police officer positioning, and technology to detect and contain threats, all in a seamless welcoming environment, will serve to enhance the visitor experience while mitigating current and emerging threats.

It should be noted that the U.S. Capitol Police is, in effect, staffing what equates to a new federal building that has a high-level security requirement to protect both the structure and the building occupants. This requirement was magnified in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. We have conducted numerous studies to determine the requisite police staffing that will provide optimum law enforcement and security services. We have also been working closely with the committees of jurisdiction on this issue. Based on the planned hours of operation of the CVC and other operating assumptions of the facility, we submitted a detailed staffing and budget plan for consideration and approval. We are currently moving forward to fill those police positions. In addition, we are developing a training module for all USCP personnel that will familiarize them with the facility, the life-safety systems, and emergency response plans. We are also in the process of integrating the emergency plans of the CVC with those already in place for the Capitol since the buildings are inter-connected.

While the CVC is designed to welcome visitors to the Capitol, its opening presents a significant logistical challenge of getting visitors to the main entrance. Prior to CVC construction, and prior to 9/11, commercial tour buses used to off-load and load visitors on the East side of the Capitol. In peak tourist season, scores of buses would crowd the streets throughout the Capitol Complex causing congestion and impeding traffic flow.

Following the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. Capitol Police took measures to prevent large trucks from coming into close proximity to the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings. This was done to prevent the introduction of a large vehicle borne improvised explosive device into an area that, if detonated, would result in significant loss of life, structural damage and disruption of the national legislative process. This week, in a measure aimed at enhancing security, plans were announced to also exclude commercial buses from select streets within the Capitol Complex. While we have a concern with large motor coach type buses due to their load capacity, this policy will not affect public transit buses or sightseeing trolleys from continuing to traverse the major thoroughfares within the Capitol Complex.

It should be noted that this decision was not made in isolation. As we were developing our security plans, we conferred with the Capitol Preservation Commission (CPC) and other stakeholders so that they could begin exploring alternate methods of moving visitors from satellite locations to the CVC. The CPC is actively considering a number of options that will leverage infrastructure already available near the Capitol as well as public transit vehicles. One such facility is Union Station which is an intermodal transportation hub that can support motor coach parking. Talks are also underway with city officials to explore integrating the Circulator Bus system into the movement of people to and from the CVC. Once the CPC decides upon a workable plan that meets the security criteria and visitor transport needs, recommendations will be made to the committees of jurisdiction. We look forward to continuing to work with the CPC, various House and Senate committees, and city officials as these plans are discussed and implemented.

In the interim, and even after the CVC opens, tour buses will be allowed to offload and load passengers on First Street located on the west side of the Capitol just as they have done for the past five years while the CVC has been under construction.

Madam Chair, we understand that bus traffic in the city does not just affect the Capitol Complex. The United States Capitol Police has always been a good neighbor to the surrounding community and it is our desire not to displace problems into local neighborhoods. Therefore, in order to offer a security and law enforcement point of view on the matter, we stand ready to work with the city officials and other concerned entities to develop a comprehensive bus management plan for the city that supports tourism and visitor experience while respecting the quality of life and environmental concerns of city residents.

We have made great strides in improving security within the Capitol Complex while balancing the needs of the city, visitors, and the Congress. The opening of the Capitol Visitors Center will mark the achievement of a long desired goal of creating a facility that welcomes visitors from across the nation and around the world in a modern, safe, and secure environment that compliments the grandeur of the United States Capitol.

I look forward to adding this new element to the mission of the United States Capitol Police. I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF
MARSHALL E. PURNELL, FAIA
PRESIDENT-ELECT

"The Role and Responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol"

United States House of Representatives
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

-

June 8, 2007
Rayburn House Office Building

The American Institute of Architects
1735 New York, Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-7507
govaffs@aia.org
www.aia.org

Madam Chairman, members of the subcommittee –good morning, I am Marshall E. Purnell, the President-Elect of the American Institute of Architects. I am honored to testify before you Madam Chairman, and praise you for the steadfast commitment you have to improving the District of Columbia, the city I too, as an architect, am working everyday to improve. On behalf of our 81,000 members and the 281,000 Americans who work for architecture firms nationwide, I would like to thank you for inviting me to testify about what the AIA envisions as the future role and responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol, as they relate to both the Capitol Visitors' Center and the rest of the Capitol Complex.

As the Subcommittee knows, a Congressional selection commission is interviewing candidates, one of whom the President will select to become the next Architect of the Capitol. This is a major decision, as the next Architect will be in charge of the design and maintenance of the Capitol Complex for the next decade. When you consider the historic significance of this complex, its role as a physical symbol of our democracy, and the important work that goes on here every day, it is clear that the next Architect of the Capitol **must possess the skills to protect this great landmark and ensure the safety, security and health of the thousands of people who work and visit here.**

This is something that the members of AIA feel very strongly about. And it is *not* because the position happens to have the word "architect" in the title, or merely out of professional pride. It is because we uniquely understand the demands of the position. It is because we know, from our own professional lives, the importance of an architect's skills. And it is because, like all Americans, we revere the Capitol complex.

Throughout its 200 year history, the U.S. Capitol has undergone major transformations to ensure that it meets the growing needs of Congress. At nearly every major stage of the Capitol's physical growth, a professional architect serving as the Architect of the Capitol led the efforts, making sure that our fledgling democracy had a suitable home.

When a changing government required modernizing, enlarging and renovating the Capitol, professional architects who served as Architect of the Capitol answered the call and gave us the great campus that we know and admire today.

Today the Capitol Complex must once again be transformed. Over the next ten years, the Architect of the Capitol will be called upon to manage a nearly 15 million square foot campus, to oversee major renovations to the existing historic structures and to improve the working conditions (in terms of productivity and comfort) for legislators and their staffs to the level of those of the private sector. The next Architect will need to address post-9/11 security concerns; find ways to conserve energy and mitigate the effects of global warming; install 21st Century technology in 20th and 19th Century buildings; and renovate aging facilities. All this must take place while assuring that the business of America's Legislature is not disrupted.

These are challenges that demand complex and creative solutions. And as history has shown us, Congress finds those solutions when a professional architect is Architect of the Capitol.

Responsibilities/Qualifications

The Architect of the Capitol manages the entire Capitol Complex, including the seven congressional office buildings, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress and the National Botanical Garden. The Architect is responsible for the safety, security, health, and productivity of all occupants and the thousands of daily visitors to these national treasures. It would not be in the interest of the public, or of the taxpayers, to entrust this responsibility to someone without the formal education, on-the-job training, and professional experience of a licensed professional architect.

Former Architect of the Capitol George White, a licensed architect himself, said it best in a letter to the commission members. Referring to the many duties of the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. White says, "the various necessary characteristics and talents must be based

on a foundation of architecture." Mr. White led the design, construction and renovation of many of the Capitol Complex buildings in his nearly 25 years as Architect of the Capitol, so he knows what the job requires better than most anyone. I would ask permission to have Mr. White's letter entered into the record.

The job of Architect of the Capitol requires three key sets of skills: leadership, managerial excellence, and design expertise. Architects have all three; in fact, they use them every day to lead the design and construction of buildings in each of your districts.

First, leadership. Licensed professional architects are trained, both in school and on-the-job, in leading multi-disciplinary teams to design, construct and renovate buildings that are safe, secure, productive and energy efficient. A significant number of licensed architects have demonstrated the leadership qualities this job demands. Someone without professional licensure would not command the respect and confidence necessary to lead the office in making the critical decisions affecting the physical conditions of the Capitol complex.

Second, architects have extensive experience in managing large scale construction and renovation projects, often with complex schedules and tight budgets. They coordinate the entire building process from initial sketches to the ribbon-cutting. They serve as the advocate of the building owner to ensure that the structures are designed, constructed and operated in an aesthetically pleasing manner, while balancing all necessary safety, security, and budgetary requirements.

Lastly, architects have the insight and design tools necessary to anticipate the current and future needs of the people who use the buildings they design. They understand the building codes that protect the public health and safety. They understand how to design workplaces that maximize worker productivity. They know how to incorporate the latest technologies and materials into historic structures. Architects do not merely build buildings. They must be knowledgeable about how building features affect the health and productivity of their occupants. At the same time, they must take care to manage the

impact of the building within the larger community, especially their impact on the natural environment.

The Architect of the Capitol must understand what it takes to maintain the integrity of these great buildings and their priceless artifacts. Only an architect has the specific knowledge base as well as the full experience and training to handle such an enormous responsibility.

The Architect of the Capitol must also be keenly aware that the Capitol Complex is much more than just a fortress on the Hill; it is a vital part of a large, thriving city, situated in a neighborhood of homes and businesses, with major thoroughfares running right through its heart. This often understated role of the Architect of the Capitol is clearly stated by the inclusion of the Architect of the Capitol as a member of a number of local planning bodies, including the D.C. Zoning Commission, and the National Capital Memorial Commission. He or she must be able to find solutions to the Capitol's challenges that work in tandem with the city's design and planning processes.

Finally, the Architect of the Capitol must be particularly attuned to the intangible beauty and meaning of our Capitol Complex in order to adapt current facilities to future needs while protecting their priceless heritage. The U.S. Capitol Complex should never be treated like a collection of routine office buildings. Our founding fathers envisioned a building that would symbolize our Republic while providing a safe place to conduct our nation's legislative business. That should never change.

The Architect of the Capitol must preserve the sanctity and functionality of the Capitol while balancing the intrinsic security and technological requirements of any building housing a branch of our federal government. Only licensed professional architects possess the skills, education, and training to meet these challenges, and thus be a successful Architect of the Capitol.

Finally, some might argue times have changed. The Capitol complex is already built. What we need now is not an architect, but a manager, who can make the Capitol complex operate efficiently.

With all due respect, this argument misapprehends the skills of a first-class architect, and misapprehends the challenges that must be addressed regarding the Capitol complex over the next generation.

In fact, Glenn Brown, the noted historian of the Capitol building once wrote "repairs to and alterations of the Capitol have been continuously made, and will be so long as the nation lives and grows. When such alterations cease, the nation will be on the decline."

Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to appear before you today. I will be happy to answer any questions from the Subcommittee.

House Committee Statement
Les Shepherd
June 8, 2007

Good morning, Chairman Norton, Ranking Member Graves, and Members of the Subcommittee. My name is Leslie Shepherd and I am the Chief Architect of the Public Buildings Service (PBS) at the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). Thank you for inviting me here today.

I would like to comment on the statement of my esteemed AIA colleague Marshall Purnell. I concur, the individual responsible for managing the Capitol complex—THE icon of democracy –must possess outstanding skills in leadership, managerial excellence, and design expertise. Mr. Purnell has eloquently spoken to these 3 points.

My desire is to amplify his testimony in areas based on our work at the U.S. General Services Administration. In particular, I would like to expand on 2 key areas within the broader category of design expertise. As a preface to these remarks, I note that GSA's Central Office, where I am the Chief Architect, has a different structure and focus than the organization under the auspices of the Architect of the Capitol. We manage and oversee programs, policies, and processes that are

executed through our 11 regional offices. GSA's Chief Architect does not directly design, construct, or manage specific facilities. That said, I am convinced we have experience that can further illuminate the talents needed to fulfill the responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol.

My first point, under the broader category of design expertise, would emphasize the importance of historic preservation. The Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, and other facilities under the purview of the Architect of the Capitol are among our nation's most precious landmarks, designed over the past 200+ years and shaped by history in a venue established by the Founding Fathers. Given this momentous context—one you know well—the Architect of the Capitol must be especially wise and sensitive in the arena of historic preservation. At GSA, we are the steward of more than 400 historic buildings nationwide, including over 200 monumental public buildings—several of which are National Historic Landmarks. Our historic preservation architects make sure that we maintain the design integrity of these structures at the same time that we implement innovative modernization strategies that incorporate the latest technology and building systems. We are recognized internationally for our

achievements in this area. I have no doubt that the Architect of the Capitol must have a background with similar strengths. The individual should be a respected leader in the field with the expertise to speak authoritatively on challenging preservation issues. In this regard, I highlight that the Architect of the Capitol is a permanent member of the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation. The Architect of the Capitol must be able to make sound and insightful judgments to successfully balance contemporary needs and stewardship.

A second point is to address the subject of security. This is always a concern in public buildings. We want to protect and assure the safety of users and visitors. We want to protect the buildings themselves. We also want our public buildings to be open and welcoming, compelling symbols of our democratic system. At GSA, we invest significant energy and resources into delivering this balance. In addition, we are well aware that successfully addressing security in historic buildings is an even larger challenge. We have devised strategies for installing security without compromising the design and openness of our landmarks, including introducing such measures as blast protection and mitigating the risk of progressive collapse while maintaining the original fabric of the structures under our stewardship. This, too, is a talent and

expertise required of the Architect of the Capitol, and I urge you to include this as one of the requirements as you review candidates.

The Office of the Chief Architect, has recently been reorganized into two components, the Office of the Chief Architect the Office of Capital Construction Programs. The Chief Architect and the Assistant Commissioner for Capital Construction work in partnership to ensure successful implementation of the capital design and construction program and related activities. The Chief Architect and Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction Programs both report directly to the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service.

It is my personal opinion, that any person occupying any position with the title "Architect of the Capitol" – should be a registered Architect. The United States Capitol building is the foremost Architectural Icon of Democracy and as such is best preserved and safeguarded by a highly qualified Architect.

Ms. Chairman, Ranking Member Graves, this concludes my statement. I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or the other members of the Subcommittee may wish to ask.

○