AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

H.R. 1126, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMPLETION ACT

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Serial No. 113–6

Printed for the use of the Committee on Natural Resources

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.fdsys.gov
or
Committee address: http://naturalresources.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

80–076 PDF WASHINGTON : 2013

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 NATURAL RESOURCES

DOC HASTINGS, WA, *Chairman*
EDWARD J. MARKEY, MA, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK
Louie Gohmert, TX
Rob Bishop, UT
Doug Lamborn, CO
Robert J. Wittman, VA
Paul C. Broun, GA
John Fleming, LA
Tom McClintock, CA
Glenn Thompson, PA
Cynthia M. Lummis, WY
Dan Benishek, MI
Jeff Duncan, SC
Scott R. Tipton, CO
Paul A. Gosar, AZ
Raúl R. Labrador, ID
Steve Southerland, II, FL
Bill Flores, TX
Jon Runyan, NJ
Mark E. Amodei, NV
Markwayne Mullin, OK
Chris Stewart, UT
Steve Daines, MT
Kevin Cramer, ND
Doug LaMalfa, CA
Vacancy

Peter A. DeFazio, OR
Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, AS
Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ
Grace F. Napolitano, CA
Rush Holt, NJ
Raúl M. Grijalva, AZ
Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Jim Costa, CA
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Niki Tsongas, MA
Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Tony Cárdenas, CA
Steven A. Horsford, NV
Jared Huffman, CA
Raul Ruiz, CA
Carol Shea-Porter, NH
Alan S. Lowenthal, CA
Joe Garcia, FL
Matt Cartwright, PA

Todd Young, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Legislative Counsel*
Jeffrey Duncan, *Democratic Staff Director*
David Watkins, *Democratic Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

ROB BISHOP, UT, *Chairman*
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, AZ, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK
Louie Gohmert, TX
Doug Lamborn, CO
Paul C. Broun, GA
Tom McClintock, CA
Cynthia M. Lummis, WY
Scott R. Tipton, CO
Raúl R. Labrador, ID
Mark E. Amodei, NV
Chris Stewart, UT
Steve Daines, MT
Kevin Cramer, ND
Doug LaMalfa, CA
Doc Hastings, WA, *ex officio*

Peter A. DeFazio, OR
Niki Tsongas, MA
Rush Holt, NJ
Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Steven A. Horsford, NV
Carol Shea-Porter, NH
Joe Garcia, FL
Matt Cartwright, PA
Edward J. Markey, MA, *ex officio*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on Tuesday, March 19, 2013	1
Statement of Members:	
Bishop, Hon. Rob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah	1
Grijalva, Hon. Raúl M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Arizona	3
Prepared statement of	4
Statement of Witnesses:	
Eisenhower, Susan, Representing the Eisenhower Family	6
Prepared statement of	8
Issa, Hon. Darrell E., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, Oral statement of	5
Moore, Arthur Cotton, Washington, D.C.	27
Prepared statement of	28
Washington Post and New York Times articles submitted for the record	30
Reddel, Brig. Gen. Carl W., USAF (Ret.), Executive Director, Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission	16
Prepared statement of	18
Letter submitted for the record	26
Response to questions submitted for the record	26
Shubow, Justin, President and Chairman, The National Civic Art Society	31
Prepared statement of	33
Index to Selected Articles, Editorials, and Letters Critical of Frank Gehry's Eisenhower Memorial	35
Additional materials supplied:	
The American Institute of Architects, Press release submitted for the record	47
Eisenhower, John S.D., Letter submitted for the record	10
Kelley, General P.X., USMC (Ret.), Former Chairman, American Battle Monument Commission, and Former Commander, U.S. Marine Corps, Letter submitted for the record	48

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 1126, TO FACILITATE THE COMPLETION OF AN APPROPRIATE NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER. "DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMPLETION ACT."

Tuesday, March 19, 2013
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation
Committee on Natural Resources
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in Room 1334, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Rob Bishop [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Bishop, McClintock, Lummis, Tipton, LaMalfa; Grijalva, Holt, Sablan, Horsford, and Shea-Porter.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. The hearing will come to order. The Chair notes the presence of a quorum, kind of. So this Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulations is meeting today to hear testimony on H.R. 1126, which is called the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Completion Act. Under the rules, opening statements are limited to the Chairman and Ranking Member. However, I ask unanimous consent to include any other Member's opening statement in the hearing record, if it is submitted to the Clerk by the close of business today.

[No response.]

Mr. BISHOP. Hearing no objections, that will be so ordered.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. ROB BISHOP, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP. Let me start off with this, if I possibly could. I would like to start off this hearing by thanking the witnesses, the members of the Eisenhower family, as well as others who have a significant appreciation for one of our great American heroes, Dwight Eisenhower. It is on this occasion that there are a lot of people who are interested in this, a lot of attention has been given. Kind of reminds me of a comment made by Red Skelton as he was commenting about a funeral of a Hollywood mogul that was especially well attended. And he simply said, "Give the public what it wants and it will come out in droves." That may be what we are attempting to do here today.

I want to make it clear from the outset that I support completion of a national memorial to President Eisenhower. I think it is important that I emphasize the word "completion." Because, from the discussions we have had with those who were very close to this particular project, from the family, from Members of Congress, I

think it is fair to conclude that funding the current design to completion will be a daunting task.

Starting in 1999, we have had a process that engaged—I am actually grateful for the labor that has been put into this project so far. For many, it has been a labor of love for our President Eisenhower. And I do want to congratulate the Commission and the staff for all their work and their persistence and their dedication to an effort.

However, today we find ourselves in a position that we hoped would not necessarily be inevitable, and we certainly hoped to avoid. Tomorrow will mark 1 year since our last oversight hearing on the Eisenhower Memorial. In that hearing we faced head on the controversies regarding the design, in particular, the scrims. Also, the question of the selection process of a designer. I left that hearing with the assurance that discussions would occur with the family and with others and with the designer itself, that perhaps modifications would be made that could bring the public closer to a consensus on this design.

Unfortunately, 1 year later, we have no conclusion and you can actually say that we have concluded that we now could have saved a lot of time and money if we had just listened to the Eisenhower family who, at the outset of the hearing, called for a redesign of the memorial. Taxpayers have now spent $60 million that has been invested in this project to date. And we are going to spend tens of million more to construct and complete this kind of project.

So, approvals have been in limbo for over a year. In that time we have received few assurances about the durability of the design, even the basic requirement—which is a basic requirement of the Commemorative Works Act. It has taken months of study and testing to see if this design can be melded and manipulated into some specification that can reasonably be called durable.

One of the goals of the hearing last year was to come away with a better understanding of the selection process. The Commission, the GSA, the NPS testified in support of the process, assured us it was fair. And why shouldn't it be? It is the same process that was replicated nationwide for a variety of Federal buildings and projects. But therein lies the problem. Somewhere along the line we failed to recognize that this is not a Federal court or a GSA convention hall. This is a tribute to a man who was noted for his modesty, and the completion should have been open to everyone.

In reading of the record, the so-called "open competition" ultimately led to an evaluation of four designs. Four designs, that is it. I can understand why certain architectural trade associations would be concerned about this bill. Heaven forbid we upset a process that is heavily favored in the design of large design firms. But can anyone really argue that four designs are adequate? Now that the clouds are clearing and we are beginning to see why this is being called—we can see why this was being called, even years before I became aware of the project, a monument to a designer with a theme about President Eisenhower. That is not the way it should be.

We need, very sincerely, a new set of eyes to look at the situation, to clearly review where the money has been spent, and where

the money will be spent in the future, and an effort to bring even greater transparency to this entire process.

Now, I hope the Committee understands that this is not a position I take lightly. There is really, in this effort, no political victory to be had. This is about President Eisenhower, and a way we can honor a man who led us through dangerous times, both in the military and in the political sense. Our goal should be to do what is right by the memory of Dwight Eisenhower, and take the time necessary to do it the right way.

Congress is entrusted with this process. And Congress authorizes different commissions. This Commission needs to be re-authorized. This is a time to re-look at the way we are doing things and to re-evaluate where we have been and where we are going, and where we wish to end.

I was struck by the words of one of our colleagues, who has since retired, one of the nicest men I have ever know, the retired Dale Kildee from Michigan, who served on this Committee for several decades. At our hearing last year he stated, "I know that Congress does not have a great deal of expertise in matters like this. But recognizing that, we do have people who have knowledge and things. We have set a process to make sure that what we do there on the monuments on the Mall are done correctly. And we have never relinquished our authority on that. We have always had problems, and we appreciate having a process. But, at the same time, we have not relinquished our authority in this area or our input on this." In fact, it is ironic that the Majority of the Commission are, indeed, Members of Congress themselves who have to make a final decision.

So, I agree with what Mr. Kildee said. We may not necessarily be experts on design and architecture, but we have a responsibility to conduct oversight and to legislate. In many respects, we represent the average American who will visit this particular memorial. And if this design doesn't make sense to us, then why, on earth, would it make sense to them, who are the ones actually footing the bill?

This is not a process that we can turn over because of a name. It is a process that must honor the memory of a President and a military commander who has done so much for this country in a way that is consistent with his life, and a way that is consistent with the purpose of a memorial.

With that, I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Grijalva, for any statements that he may have.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for holding this hearing. We are going to be—I guess we are going to be seeing a lot of each other the rest of this week, and I appreciate today all the witnesses taking time to come and talk about this legislation and, more importantly, the status of the memorial to a great American.

Almost 1 year ago today we had an initial oversight hearing on the Eisenhower Memorial. The hearing last year was the first time I became aware of the family's deep concerns about the memorial

design. The Commemorative Works Act deliberately limits the involvement of Congress once the memorial has been authorized. While this is the case, issues have been raised regarding the use of Federal funding and the function of the Commission itself.

Following the hearing last year, Secretary Salazar and several commissioners took a number of steps to bridge the gap between the design adopted by the Commission and the strong views of the family. From the testimony that has been submitted to the Committee, it is clear that the bridge was not built. In fact, the gap might—may be wider today than it was a year ago.

So, where does that leave us? Chairman Bishop has put forward legislation that invites a discussion on how to move forward. While it is clear that something needs to break the current impasse, I want the Committee to think long and hard about how we handle this issue and how decisions on the memorial might impact future memorials and the precedent that is being set.

I am here to listen today and, again, I appreciate the involvement of all the witnesses that are going to be before us today. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

[The prepared remarks of Mr. Grijalva follow:]

Statement of The Honorable Raúl M. Grijalva, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing today. We are going to be seeing a lot of each other this week. I appreciate all of the witnesses making time to come talk about this legislation and the status of the memorial.

Almost one year ago today we had an initial oversight hearing on the Eisenhower Memorial. The hearing last year was the first time I became aware of the family's deep concerns with the memorial design.

The Commemorative Works Act deliberately limits the involvement of Congress once a memorial has been authorized. While this is the case, issues have been raised regarding the use of federal funding and the function of the Commission itself.

Following the hearing last year, Secretary Salazar and several Commissioners took a number of steps to bridge the gap between the design adopted by the Commission and the strong views of the family. From the testimony that has been submitted to the Committee, it is clear that the bridge was not built. In fact, the gap may be wider today than it was a year ago.

Where does that leave us? Chairman Bishop has put forward legislation that invites a discussion on how to move forward.

While it is clear that something needs to break the current impasse, I want the Committee to think long and hard about how we handle this issue and how decisions on this memorial might impact future memorials.

I am here to listen today and again appreciate the involvement of our panel of witnesses.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Grijalva. Now, we have three panels that we are going to hear from. The first panel that I would like to welcome is Congressman Darrell Issa, who is Chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. He is also a member of the National Capital Planning Commission, so he has a unique responsibility with respect to this particular memorial.

Chairman Issa, I thank you for being here. I understand you have your own hearing that is going on across the street, so we would like to give you 5 minutes for a presentation, after which we will offer you an invitation to stay with us for the rest of the hearing if you would like to. I kind of think I know what your answer will be, but that offer will be extended.

Mr. Issa, I appreciate you coming over here. You are recognized.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And like my former Governor, I will return, or, "I will be back."

The fact is that no hearing today is more important than this one. The Eisenhower Memorial should be built, and I believe must be built. But it also has to be built in a way in which, for the next 100 years or more, the American people will get meaningful representation of history, the life of this great general, this great man, and this great President, from the memorial.

Its position on the Mall, as the Mall fills in, is now, in fact, going to be pretty unique. There is no question this monument, this memorial, cannot be built if it is inconsistent with the views of the people who knew our Commander in Chief both in time of war and peace as well as his family.

When I took over my position on the board, it seemed like it was well underway. Shortly thereafter I became aware it was well underway and not going in the right direction.

I would like to today dispel something. I would like to dispel the blame that goes to the architect. I don't believe an architect should ever be held responsible for anything, other than the proposal which is then accepted or rejected. I believe that the very steering of the many architectural proposals made is as much to blame as many would say even the selection of the architect.

Frank Gehry is a talented and sometimes controversial architect. His plans are large, grand, and often expensive. But I am here to say today that, in fact, not listening to the family, and perhaps a certain level of political inference, not in a partisan way, but in a political way, put us where we are today.

The original plans for this memorial had more to do with capturing the very events, perhaps from childhood, but through the contribution that uniquely Dwight David Eisenhower made to us winning World War II, and then winning the peace that followed. Today, however, the most controversial portion of this memorial, the most expensive, and the one most questioned for its durability, is proposed to be simply an image of trees that are indigenous to Kansas and are also indigenous to everywhere between Kansas and the District of Columbia. That doesn't represent a unique contribution.

I don't think you have to be an award-winning architect. You certainly, as just somebody who can look at the representation, you can say, "OK, the trees are interesting, but are they worth the kind of investment we have already made, the kind of questions about durability, one in which we may have to make at least two of them and replace in 30 or 40 years this very expensive structure?"

Again, this was a decision made without cost being a concern sufficiently. But also, the question of what is there. If every inch of the Mall is critical, then every inch of this memorial must be dedicated to a message, and that message must be one consistent with the mandate of Congress for recognizing the contribution of President and General Dwight David Eisenhower.

Later today you will hear from the family. I have heard from the family. I have visited the site in Los Angeles. I have looked at the models. I want to make this Committee aware. There was a time

in which even the controversial backstay represented the life of Dwight David Eisenhower in a more personal way. I visited virtually every library and memorial that I have been able to get to.

And I bring your attention to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's site. It is a little further off the Mall. And it is more famous, because, in fact, it steps you through the many years of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's contribution. I might mention that his contribution is about the same period as General Eisenhower and then President Eisenhower. That long period of time, that period of history, can, in this space, be represented in a meaningful way, in a non-controversial way, in one that the family and families for generations to come can stand behind.

So, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, I want to thank you today for bringing attention to both the fiscal cost and, in fact, the controversy that surrounds the current design. I have a vote on the Commission, but I know one thing. My vote will no longer be castable before this is built. The timeline is such that someone will replace me. So, for all of you here today, and for me and my time of having a vote on NCPC, it is clear what we have to do is steer this memorial back in the right direction, ask the question as Americans—and especially for us older Americans—does this fairly reflect the unique contribution of this great general, this great President, this great man, and the time that he lived in and the time that he made this contribution?

So, I leave you to the next panel. I will return after my other Committee is over. But what you are doing today is the most important thing for the Mall and for the District of Columbia, and for how we view that portion of history that will be done here this year. And I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for that. I know you are having another hearing in the other room. If you have the possibility of coming back, why don't we at that time see if there is any questions the Committee has for you, and we will allow you to go and finish your other Committee hearing, and then hopefully have a chance of coming back.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Would like to ask our second panel to come up. Actually, I would just like to welcome Ms. Susan Eisenhower if she would come forward. She is the grand-daughter of President Eisenhower.

We appreciate your willingness to address this Committee, again, and to represent the views of your family. It cannot be easy, but I appreciate what you are doing. We want to welcome you back here, and recognize you also for 5 minutes.

Is your mic on?

Ms. EISENHOWER. It is now.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN EISENHOWER, REPRESENTING THE EISENHOWER FAMILY

Ms. EISENHOWER. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee, I would like to echo the appreciation you have expressed with respect to the dedication that has gone into the process to establish a permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Eisenhower family is indebted to Members of Congress, to the Commission, and to architect Frank Gehry for the effort that has brought us to this point.

We wish to express our specific thanks to you, Chairman Bishop and the Committee, for the opportunity to testify today. On behalf of the Eisenhower family, we are grateful to you, Chairman Bishop, for the invitation, for introducing a bill to sustain the momentum on the building of a Eisenhower Memorial in Washington, D.C. I would like to note that my sister, Anne, is with us today, also a key figure in our family on this issue.

On hearing the news of this bill, the Eisenhower Commission Chairman, Rocco Siciliano, said in an email reported to the press, "I am saddened by Congressman Bishop's attempt to thwart the memorialization of America's greatest general and President, Dwight D. Eisenhower." My family and I respectfully but emphatically disagree. Congressman Bishop's legislation is designed to assure a memorial for Dwight Eisenhower, not to thwart it.

From the moment the current design was adopted, some individuals have been determined to link the proposed Frank Gehry design to the very future of the memorial itself. This is historically unprecedented. This apparent rigidity has damaged the effort to build this memorial, and the approach has made adversaries out of stakeholders and alienated even the greatest supporters of this process.

Mr. Chairman, you and Chairman Issa have been the first to address this impasse that has, unfortunately, developed. And we applaud you both for your efforts. We would also like to thank the cosponsors of your bill.

Continuation of the status quo, as has been pointed out, will doom the prospect of building a memorial. And you are right that no consensus on the memorial design has emerged, and that it is time to go back to the drawing board with an open process for the redesign of the memorial.

Significant stakeholders believe that the Gehry design is, regretfully, unworkable. My family, as well as countless members of the public and the media thinks the design is flawed in concept and over-reaching in scale. The recent durability study notes the limited lifetime of the metal scrims, as well as the potential ice and snow hazard to the public. It also notes that the current design to meet Presidential memorial specifications would require a duplicate set of scrims to be furnished. And, of course, the attendant costs that go with that. Yet, despite this, there has been an approach to plow ahead, despite these concerns.

For more than 10 years, my family has raised concerns and objections, and there has been sort of a sense that any objection has somehow jeopardized the building of this memorial. This could not be farther from the truth. The President's only surviving son, our father, John S. D. Eisenhower, has been clear about his desire to see a memorial, but one that reflects his father's values and enjoys a national consensus. More than once this year he has weighed in—most recently this fall—in a letter to Senator Inouye, who expressed some concern about the fact that the family had concerns about the design.

I would like to just outline five quick points from my father's letter, which I have furnished this Commission. My father writes, "Though creative, the scope and scale of the Gehry design is too extravagant, and attempts to do too much. On the one hand, it presumes a greater deal prior knowledge of history. On the other, it tries to tell multiple stories."

He also points out in point two that taxpayers and donors alike will be better served if there is a green, open space with a simple memorial. He also makes the point that we are grateful, as a family, for those who have conceived of this memorial and worked hard for its success. But there is concern that the Commission has been intent only in convincing us of the virtues of the present design, ignoring my objections as articulated by my daughters, Anne and Susan.

And then he further goes on to say that you may or may not agree with our viewpoint. However, as a family, we cannot support the Eisenhower Memorial as it is currently designed in concept, scope, or scale. "We request that lawmakers withhold funding the project, in its current form, and stand back from approving the current design."

Having said that, the Eisenhower family does support the effort to revitalize this process. This is now Susan talking on behalf of my family. There are a number of first steps that should be taken, and your bill, Mr. Chairman, does address many of these. First of all, a defunding of the current design and to put a stop to the expenditures being advanced on this particular design. Number two, an open and transparent financial accounting of monies used to date, as well as those already committed. Number three, a thorough review of the fundraising studies commissioned in the past, as well as the current effort underway, so that we can assess the financial needs of the memorial in the future. And finally, it is just a thought, but perhaps a non-partisan group could review the above-mentioned elements and suggest proposed organizational changes that might be required for building a strong, responsive commission organization and a national consensus for this memorial.

Let me close in again expressing our profound appreciation to you, Chairman Bishop, and to members of the Committee and Chairman Issa. We appreciate you holding this hearing, and for your commitment to finding a way to resolve this impasse, and for the opportunity to participate. We are deeply grateful to all of Congress for their effort to build a lasting memorial to Dwight Eisenhower.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Eisenhower follows:]

Statement of Susan Eisenhower, Representing the Eisenhower Family

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee,

I wish to express our thanks to Chairman Bishop and the Committee for the opportunity to testify today. I would also like to echo the appreciation we have for everyone—Congress the Eisenhower Commission and architect Frank Gehry—for their commitment to a memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower in Washington, DC.

My sister, Anne, is with us from New York. On behalf of the Eisenhower family, we are grateful to Chairman Bishop for introducing a bill to sustain the momentum on the building of an Eisenhower Memorial in Washington, D.C.

On hearing the news of this bill, Eisenhower Commission Chairman Rocco Siciliano said in an email reported in the press: "I am saddened by Congressman

Bishops' attempt to thwart the memorialization of one of America's greatest generals and presidents, Dwight D. Eisenhower."

My family and I respectfully, but emphatically, disagree:

Congressman Bishops' legislation is designed to assure a memorial to Dwight Eisenhower, not to thwart it. From the moment the current design was adopted, some members of the Commission and the staff were determined to link the proposed Frank Gehry design to the very future of the memorial itself. This is unprecedented in the history of presidential memorials. This rigidity has damaged the effort to build a memorial. The approach has made adversaries out of stakeholders and alienated even the greatest supporters of this process.

Mr. Chairman, you and Chairman Issa have been the first to address the impasse that has unfortunately developed. We applaud you both for your efforts. We would also like to thank the co-sponsors of your bill. Continuation of the status quo, as you have pointed out, will doom the prospect of building a memorial. You are right that no consensus on the memorial design has emerged and that it is time to go back to the drawing board, with an open process for a new design of the memorial.

Significant stakeholders believe that the Gehry design is, regretfully, unworkable. My family—as well as countless members of the public and the media—thinks the design is flawed in concept and overreaching in scale. The recent durability study notes the limited lifetime of the metal scrims, as well as the potential ice and snow hazard to the public. It also notes that the current design, to meet presidential memorial specifications, would require a duplicate set of scrims to be furnished—with the additional costs that would entail. Yet despite all this, the Commission's approach is to plow ahead with a design that has virtually no support outside of a percentage of the architectural community—which has understandably rallied more in defense of architect Frank Gehry than for the specific memorial design itself.

For more than ten years my family raised concerns and objections that were ignored. We believe they were never adequately communicated to all the Commission members. Any disagreement we had with them was criticized as an attempt to scuttle the building of the memorial. This could not be farther from the truth. The president's only surviving son, our father, John S. D. Eisenhower, has been clear about his desire to see a memorial, but one which reflects his father's values and enjoys national consensus. More than once this year he has weighed in, most recently this fall in a letter to the late Senator Daniel Inouye. I am providing a copy of the letter today, but the key points he writes are this:

- *Though "creative, the scope and scale of it [the Gehry design] is too extravagant and it attempts to do too much. On the one hand it presumes a great deal of prior knowledge of history on the part of the average viewer. On the other, it tries to tell multiple stories. In my opinion, that is best left to museums."*
- *"Taxpayers and donors alike will be better served with an Eisenhower Square that is a green open space with a simple statue in the middle, and quotations from his most important sayings. This will make it possible to utilize most of the taxpayer expenditures to date without committing the federal government or private donors to pay for an elaborate and showy memorial that has already elicited significant public opposition."*
- *"Though the members of the Eisenhower family are grateful to those who conceived of this memorial and have worked hard for its success, we have come to believe that the Eisenhower Memorial Commission has no intention of reexamining the concept, even though there would be ample historic precedent for it. It is apparently interested only in convincing us of the virtues of the present design, ignoring my objections as articulated by my daughters Anne and Susan."*
- *"I am the first to admit that this memorial should be designed for the benefit of the people, not our family . . . You may or may not agree with our viewpoint. However, we as a family cannot support the Eisenhower Memorial as it is currently designed—in concept, scope or scale."*
- *"We request that lawmakers withhold funding the project in its current form and stand back from approving the current design."*

The Eisenhower family DOES support the effort to revitalize this process. Among the first steps might be to defund of the current design, including zeroing out money for staff expenditures, except to provide services related to an open and transparent financial accounting of monies used to date, as well as those already committed. A thorough review of the fundraising studies commissioned in the past should also be undertaken, as well as the current efforts underway so that we can assess financial needs going forward.

To expedite this process, perhaps an effort should be made to establish a neutral, non-partisan group to review the elements mentioned above. They could propose the

needed organizational changes required for building a strong, responsive commission that can manage an open competitive design process and succeed in building a national consensus on a new memorial design.

Members of my family wish to thank, again, Chairman Rob Bishop and the Committee for holding this hearing, for their commitment to finding a way to resolve this impasse and for the opportunity to participate. We are deeply grateful to all of Congress for their effort to building a lasting memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

[A letter submitted for the record from John S.D. Eisenhowerfollows:]

John SD Eisenhower
[redacted]

October 18, 2012

Senator Daniel K. Inouye
Vice Chairman
Eisenhower Memorial Commission
722 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye,

I am imposing on your time to offer a follow-up to a letter I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Salazar on April 10, in which I expressed my concern regarding the current design planned for the prospective Eisenhower Memorial. To my mind, though it is creative, the scope and scale of it is too extravagant and it attempts to do too much. On the one hand it presumes a great deal of prior knowledge of history on the part of the average viewer. On the other, it tries to tell multiple stories. In my opinion, that is best left to museums.

The Memorial design is so far off base that I urged a delay in the planning process for an extended period. An additional argument for a delay is our nation's economic situation. We have priorities more urgent than building such an expensive memorial right now. While no one wants to see taxpayer money come to naught, the memorial design is very controversial and unlikely to meet its financial goals. Taxpayers and donors alike will be better served with an Eisenhower Square that is a green open space with a simple statue in the middle, and quotations from his most important sayings. This will make it possible to utilize most of the taxpayer expenditures to date without committing the federal government or private donors to pay for an elaborate and showy memorial that has already elicited significant public opposition.

Though the members of the Eisenhower family are grateful to those who conceived of this memorial and have worked hard for its success, we have come to believe that the Eisenhower Memorial Commission has no intention of re-examining the concept, even

though there would be ample historic precedent for it. It is apparently interested only in convincing us of the virtues of the present design, ignoring my objections as articulated by my daughters Anne and Susan. A design alteration the Commission offered earlier this year made only peripheral changes.

I am the first to admit that this memorial should be designed for the benefit of the people, not our family. However I am astonished by Rocco Siciliano's claim that his service in the White House gives him an unusual perspective on how my father would view this design. Besides being Ike's son, I served as an aide for a while just after the War, worked in the West Wing during the last years of the Eisenhower presidency, and later, at Gettysburg, assisted him in writing his presidential memoirs. And yet I would not make a claim like Mr. Siciliano's.

You may or may not agree with our viewpoint. However, we as a family cannot support the Eisenhower Memorial as it is currently designed - in concept, scope or scale. We request that lawmakers withhold funding the project in its current form and stand back from approving the current design.

With high esteem, I am sincerely,

John Eisenhower

John S.D. Eisenhower

cc. Eisenhower Memorial Commission
Members of Eisenhower family

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Ms. Eisenhower, and I appreciate you and the family being here.

I will turn to the panel, see if they have any questions at this time. Mr. Tipton, you have been—Ms. Lummis, do you have questions?

Mrs. LUMMIS. I do, Mr. Chairman. And may I have the privilege of the floor? Thank you. Hello, Susan.

Ms. EISENHOWER. How are you?

Mrs. LUMMIS. It is nice to see you again. I haven't seen you since the Buffalo Bill Historical Center Ball. That was a lovely evening.

Ms. EISENHOWER. It was.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Welcome.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Thank you.

Mrs. LUMMIS. We are delighted to see you here. I so agree with your statements. When I look at the memorial that has been prepared to Martin Luther King, it is not the Martin Luther King that I knew and grew up with. The Martin Luther King that I grew up on was a warm, people-person.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Right.

Mrs. LUMMIS. And the monument that was done to him is cold and, to me, does not depict him in any way.

So I want to see the President that was the President when I was born depicted in a way that the American people remember him. And he was not a grand, sweeping, ostentatious individual. So

I am delighted with your testimony, and in seeing this memorial reshaped into something that your family is proud of and that we, as Americans, are proud of, and that we believe appropriately depicts a memorial to a great general and President, rather than a memorial to the artist.

So, that in mind, I do have a couple of questions. How would you describe the memorial commission's treatment of your concerns?

Ms. EISENHOWER. Well, we have expressed concerns over the course of a very lengthy period of time. We did have a family member, my brother David, who served on the Commission. He actually did not vote for this specific design, though added a voice of assent when the final voting was over. We did, to be perfectly candid, have some concerns inside of our family as to how much we should continue to speak up and what role the family really played in this process. Because my father has said in his letter that he does not believe this memorial is for our family, it is for the American people.

But we had many opportunities, regrettably, to find a way forward between the family and the Commission. And, as I pointed out in my testimony, the Commission's attitude was pretty much that if we didn't go ahead with the current design we wouldn't end up having a memorial at all, which was, frankly, a terrible position to put my family in, if I could speak so candidly. We are very respectful that this is a memorial for the American people, and we want the American people to have a memorial that speaks to them.

I think we might be in a very different position if the public hadn't been so very strongly against this design. This, by the way—I agree with Congressman Issa—has nothing to do with the talent of Mr. Gehry. But it so happens, as you pointed out, that this particular design does not convey a leadership opportunity here. Eisenhower led the country during very difficult times and, frankly, a period of financial austerity. And you know, it is not really appropriate, in our view, that something so grand and so out of scope should describe somebody who managed and modernized this country, and to move us forward during difficult times.

So we have been increasingly saddened by our relationship with the Commission. We, of course, support their work. But there, as far as I understand, no Presidential memorial that has ever been built that has been built over the objections of the family, number one. And, number two, there has never been a Presidential memorial ever built on the original design. So it is historically consistent for us to be looking at this design, and yet we were put in a very awkward and uncomfortable position. We would very much like to work with the Commission if we could get this process straightened out.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Well, thank you, Susan. And I love Frank Gehry's work. But I do agree with you that this particular design——

Ms. EISENHOWER. Right.

Mrs. LUMMIS [continuing]. Is not it. So I am looking forward to continued testimony and thoughts in this regard. Thank you so much for being here.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Thank you so much.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. I understand my friends on this side of the aisle—do any of you have questions for this witness?

The gentleman from California is recognized if you have questions.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to express my appreciation to the Eisenhower family. It is pretty neat to be in a position to speak to you or with you here.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Thank you.

Mr. LAMALFA. And so, the humility you have shown here, wanting to have this process be reflective of what General and President Eisenhower really stood for, I think, is very valuable.

People would say, yes, the President belonged to all the country, he belonged to all the American people. But I think it is extremely important that also who he is, who his legacy was, needs to have great weight placed upon it by your family here and who he was, because you would hate to go by and have that memorial be something that is way beyond who you say he is and who I believe he was. I was only a few months old when he was still President, but I was a very avid reader of his efforts in World War II and some of the things he innovated for our country post-World War II.

And so, I think the Gehry effort is a great one. But again, we define, as a people to the architect a parameter here. And I think this Committee would be very wise to reflect what those parameters are with a heavy weight toward the family on that.

So, I don't really have a question, just a commendation to you. And please hang in there and stay active in this. There is no reason to shy away. So thank you all.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Well, I am most grateful to you. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Congressman LaMalfa. Congressman Holt.

Dr. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and it is good to see you. Thank you for coming. I certainly appreciate the responsible way that the family has approached this, recognizing that the family has a stake in this, as does the general public, as do generations to come.

I am a great admirer of our witness's grandfather. My father was involved in a campaign with General Eisenhower. My mother served in the Eisenhower Administration, appointed by the President. As a boy, I met the President and liked the man very much. But more, I have just admired the way he used his power as general, as President. And I have been eager for the day when we would have a suitable memorial to him, something that would honor him and draw this generation, the younger generation, and future generations in to learn more about him.

I have followed the debate here over the years, and I understood some of the family's objections of the earlier designs. It seems to me that it has evolved in response to those. And you know, there is no accounting for taste, but I sort of like the design we have now. And it does seem to do what I would want done for the memory of General, President Eisenhower.

And so, I wonder if there aren't some more changes possible that can make it more suitable to everyone. I am sure Ms. Lummis talked about the Martin Luther King Memorial. I might talk about the Second World War Memorial, which leaves me unimpressed.

But I am sure there will always be some dissatisfaction about any memorial.

I think there have been real improvements made here. So what I wanted to ask you, if I may, Ms. Eisenhower, is what do you mean by an entirely new design? What do you mean by "fundamentally wrong"? Are there changes to what we have in front of us that could make it satisfactory to you?

Ms. EISENHOWER. Thank you very much for your comments. And I am delighted to hear that your mother served in the Eisenhower Administration. That is really wonderful.

First of all, I think we, my sister and I—and my sister, who is with me today, is a designer, she is an interior designer. And we spent a lot of time during this year—we spent a lot of time meeting with Frank Gehry, meeting with the Secretary of the Interior to discuss what, if any, changes could be made that would make a difference. And I know that Frank Gehry—I don't think it is a secret, but he is absolutely committed to these scrims.

Now, I think there is no question that it is a very innovative technology that he has developed. It is a bit of a miracle that you can actually weave metal in that fashion. But I think I agree with—I know I agree with Congressman Issa when he says that the backdrop here reflects deciduous trees that are not distinctive necessarily to Kansas or anywhere else. And it is such an expensive element of the memorial that it seems to us that that investment should be made in a different way.

Also, I think the durability design is a very sobering thing. I also consulted with some experts here in Washington. I was told a year ago that we would have to have a duplicate set of scrims kept in storage to be brought out every time the other ones had to be repaired. Since this is one-of-a-kind technology, it means that a factory is going to make this and never make anything like this again. And so, in order to be a permanent memorial, we are going to—we, with this design, would have to have a duplicate set, which raises the cost of this significantly.

And I think, as innovative as the design may have been, it was more reflective of a different time in our Nation's history. I guess that is the other way I would answer you. We are, again, back in a period of austerity, much like the 1950s after World War II. I am proud of the fact, by the way, that the Eisenhower Administration actually balanced the budget three times in 8 years and managed to work on paying down the wartime debt.

Mr. BISHOP. Don't gloat.

[Laughter.]

Ms. EISENHOWER. And I think that is part of the message here, that a memorial that is so grandiose and so large in scale sort of misses the point of what his story can offer the American public.

I hope I have answered your question.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, I appreciate that.

Dr. HOLT. Thank you. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Mr. McClintock, did you have any questions?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Yes. First, with the respect to the design of the memorial, our national memorials are for the ages. They are supposed to stand the test of time, not showcase faddish, avant-

garde, experimental designs. And with respect to the design of this memorial, I think the lawyers have a phrase for that: "Res ipsa loquitur," the thing speaks for itself.

What I am far more concerned about is the appallingly bad judgment that has brought us to this point. Bad process ultimately produces bad policy. The result of this Commission's work is just appalling. And I want to know how we came up with such a monstrosity, and what we need to do to redesign this decision-making process to be sure that this kind of outlandish result is not repeated with respect to the Eisenhower Memorial or, for that matter, any of our future memorials.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Well, thank you very much. I would just like to speak to that very briefly. And I am sure you will have an opportunity to also pose this question to other testifiers.

But I do think that the process—we lost an opportunity on the first round to open up this process broadly, so that all Americans who are architects or even studying architects would have an opportunity to compete. Look at what Maya Lin provided for this country, the Vietnam Memorial, which is exceptional, and she was a student at Yale at the time. So I do think an open process is very important.

But I would also say an open administrative process. We have discussed this with my brother at great length. I mean I think the record will show that they had very few meetings, and most of the business was handled by telephone and other written kinds of votes. There is nothing more important than the dynamism of getting people into a room and actually hashing out ideas, because it is very easy to allow more dominant Commission members to prevail under those circumstances.

I do believe that there is a strong possibility that all the Commissioners had no idea of my family's objections. And our concerns about how the process was put together were voiced repeatedly over those 10 years. And I have a feeling that the full Commission did not know this because of the way the meetings were conducted.

So let me just close this idea very quickly. I came up with sort of a wild, probably unworkable idea. But I did serve as a——

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. It couldn't possibly be any worse than the process that has brought us to this point, so feel free.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Well, here is a wild idea. I served for 2½ years on the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future. That is part of my day job. And, of course, that Commission was brought together to try and break the impasse over the issue of spent fuel at U.S.-based reactors. And I was very impressed by the idea of getting an outside group in to kind of examine everything and make some recommendations.

So, my final recommendation—it is just a wild idea—might be to get a group of individuals who have not been part of this process to look at the way the Commission was organized, to look at a number of managerial issues. It could help us avert a situation like this in the future.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Well, again, I just want to express my opinion. Before we redesign the Eisenhower Memorial, which I believe is absolutely essential, we first need to redesign the process that pro-

duced this monstrous perversion of a great man, a great achievement, and a great life.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Thank you very much.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. If there are no other questions, we want to thank you for your testimony. Obviously, we would like to invite you to stay. If you need to go, you need to go.

We would ask you if you would be willing to respond to written questions that may come back to us.

Ms. EISENHOWER. It would be my pleasure.

Mr. BISHOP. And once again I want to express my appreciation for you being here. I just want you to know I have an additional burden on me on why we have to come up with a good memorial and do this process properly. The grandfather of my chief of staff was your grandfather's Secretary of Agriculture for both terms.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Is that——

Mr. BISHOP. He told me I got to do this right. So, one way or the other, we are going to get it done.

Ms. EISENHOWER. That is great, thank——

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Ms. Eisenhower.

Ms. EISENHOWER. Thank you very much——

Mr. BISHOP. I appreciate you and your family's testimony.

Ms. EISENHOWER [continuing]. Chairman Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. At this time we would like to bring up the third panel, which will consist—I need to get my glasses for this—Mr. Arthur Cotton Moore, who is a respected architect in this community, Brigadier General Carl Reddel, who is the Executive Director of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, and Mr. Justin Shubow—if I pronounced that properly—who is President of the National Civic Art Society. We appreciate all of you being here.

I am assuming everyone here has been through this drill before, so you understand the clock is before you which will give you the time that remains for your comments. We would ask you—obviously, your written testimony is made part of the record. We ask you to limit your oral testimony to 5 minutes and then we will go through a round of questions.

At some point in the next few minutes, I am going to have to go to another meeting I have at the Capitol. I will ask Ms. Lummis in a couple of minutes if she will take over. And so, if I leave in the middle of your testimony, I will apologize in advance. It is nothing personal, I will come back, as well.

So, if I can just go from left to right, General Reddel, if we could ask you to go first, then Mr. Moore, then Mr. Shubow. Is that proper?

Mr. SHUBOW. It is Shubow.

Mr. BISHOP. Shubow. I am sorry. The emphasis was wrong. I apologize for that.

If we can ask you to go first, General, you have 5 minutes. We would like to recognize you at this time.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. CARL W. REDDEL, USAF (RETIRED), EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

General REDDEL. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, and members of the Subcommittee. My name is Carl Reddel,

formerly of the United States Air Force, and now privileged to serve as the Executive Director of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to be here. I look forward not only to offering my own thoughts, but to hearing those of the other distinguished members of this panel. I am also pleased to have the chance to respond to any questions the Subcommittee may have. I have submitted written testimony that provides further detail to augment these oral remarks.

With your permission I would like to submit for the record a letter from General P.X. Kelley, former commandant of the Marine Corps, and former Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission. General Kelley now chairs the Advisory Committee of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission, and he is with us today.

I would like to also note that we have with us today Commissioner Alfred Geduldig.

As you know, the legislation establishing the Commission ensured congressional direction and control by having four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate appointed to the 12-member Commission. The Commission has benefitted immensely from their leadership and direction, especially from the three World War II veterans who served under General Eisenhower. They have provided a living bridge with the past, and a passionate commitment to sharing Eisenhower with future generations.

Sadly, we are without our former Commission Vice-Chairman, the late Senator Daniel Inouye, a World War II Medal of Honor recipient for valor. No Member of Congress was as selflessly devoted as Senator Inouye to the memorialization of great events and leaders in American history, including his leadership of the FDR Memorial Commission. Senator Inouye continually urged us to move faster, and repeatedly asked me that we dedicate the memorial while he was living. I salute the Senator, and regret that we were not able to carry out his wishes.

Since our last hearing only exactly a year ago today, the Commission has paused at the request of some Members of Congress and of the Eisenhower family, while completing the memorial design phase. This pause has provided the opportunity for the Commission to meet with the Eisenhower family and with Members of Congress who have publicly voiced objections to the memorialization.

Some of the design changes that have been made are reflected in the images shown on the screens in this room. Most importantly, these images reflect the presentation of General and President Eisenhower in heroic-sized, independent statuary, in place of the more subtle, baas relief images shown in the past. The refinement of the images you see here continues, and the Commission must now present these changes for the review of the approval agencies.

Elements of controversy continue. The proposed memorialization has both strong supporters and vocal critics. The historical record suggests that great iconic architecture is controversial. Witness the emotional disputes over representing our first President with an obelisk. Henry Bacon's design of the Lincoln Memorial is too grandiose for a humble man born in a log cabin. And the FDR memorialization debate over placing President Roosevelt in a wheelchair.

Previous iterations of Frank Gehry's design have both been praised by the Commission of Fine Arts and derided by others. History will judge if it is brilliant and if it becomes part of the historical fabric of the Capital and the Nation. In the meantime, our government has set up a method for guiding us through this process, and we have been well-served by it. The Eisenhower Memorial Commission has worked closely with its sponsoring agency, the National Park Service, and has benefitted from the management of its contracts by the General Services Administration, as well as benefitting from GSA's administrative and management experience with large building projects. These relationships have developed over a 12-year period of careful, deliberate work by the 12 commissioners benefitting from the input received at 22 public meetings during the 2-year design phase.

The Eisenhower Memorial Commission supports Mr. Gehry's proposed design changes. He immersed himself in the life and legacy of Dwight David Eisenhower as General and Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in a horrific World War, and as President of the United States at an unprecedented time of global tension and nuclear threat.

The design developed by Mr. Gehry and approved by the Commission masterfully met the challenges of a complex urban site, which he integrated and defined with artistic depictions of the Kansas landscape. The result is the creation of a beautiful urban park within which the Eisenhower Memorial resides.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the Subcommittee for the opportunity to provide this information. The Commission has been working persistently, vigorously, and sincerely in a dedicated effort to appropriately memorialize one of our Nation's great Presidents in the 20th century. We have an excellent and inspirational design, and we have a solid plan for the way ahead.

We believe this memorial will serve to educate and motivate young and old American citizens and international visitors. I am happy to take questions, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of General Reddel follows:]

Statement of Brig. Gen. Carl W. Reddel, USAF (Ret.), Executive Director, Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission

The Commission in 2012 and 2013

Since our last hearing, the Commission has been busy completing the memorial design phase. The memorial site, which was approved by Congress on May 5, 2006 (PL 110–220) is a disparate parcel which must be combined into a whole site prior to it becoming a unified square fitting of a presidential memorial. This site, through it is listed in the top three to be developed in National Capital Planning Commission's Memorials and Museums Master Plan, is a difficult site for a memorial. The design developed by Frank Gehry and approved by the Commission masterfully met the design challenges of the site while creating an appropriate, permanent national memorial to General and President Eisenhower, as mandated by the Commission's authorizing legislation.

In 2012, the Commission planned to take the preferred memorial design to the National Capital Planning Commission (which along with the Commission of Fine Arts is responsible for approval of the design) for preliminary approval. Due to opposition that surfaced in the public domain during the latter part of 2011 and early 2012, the Commission directed the design team to meet with individuals who had expressed reservations, including members of the Eisenhower family and members of Congress.

In meetings throughout 2012, including private meetings with designer Frank Gehry, Senator Pat Roberts, a member of the Commission's Executive Committee,

and Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, the Eisenhower family had several opportunities to provide direct input regarding potential changes in the memorial design. Mr. Gehry made a number of modifications to the design in response to comments he received, such as the portrayal of Eisenhower in statuary of historic size within the Memorial core. Senator Roberts, along with other key members of the Commission, made extensive efforts to mediate concerns of the Eisenhower family.

Concurrently, the Commission sought to use its available federal funds wisely, and the design team continued developing the memorial's construction documents, which are now over 90 percent complete. In addition, the Commission staff made progress, along with the General Services Administration, in construction procurement developing the electronic memorialization, pursuing the private fundraising campaign, and meeting with Commissioners on memorial quotations. These actions were intended to avoid the prospect of significant delays and attendant expense that would inevitably arise from stopping development activity while further feedback was sought on the memorial design.

About the Eisenhower Memorial Commission (EMC)

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission is a bipartisan Commission created by Congress. It is charged with establishing a national, permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower to perpetuate his memory and his contributions, specifically his service as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in World War II and as 34th U.S. President. This memorial will be of the highest caliber, joining other Washington, D.C. landmarks such as the Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt and World War II Memorials. It will honor Eisenhower's memory and celebrate his achievements, inspiring and educating all who visit. All of the Commission's activities contribute to realizing this goal.

The Commission was created on October 25, 1999 by Public Law 106–79. As amended, the law states, "The Commission may establish a permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the District of Columbia. . . ."

The Commission consists of twelve members, including eight Members of Congress.

Appointed by the President:

- Rocco C. Siciliano, Chairman (Beverly Hills, CA)
- Alfred Geduldig (New York, NY)
- Susan Banes Harris (Potomac, MD)
- Vacant (Previously filled by David Eisenhower, 2001–2011)

Appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate

- Vacant (Previously filled by Daniel K. Inouye, 2001–2012)
- Jack Reed (D/Rhode Island)
- Pat Roberts (R/Kansas)
- Jerry Moran (R/Kansas)

Appointed by the Speaker of the House:

- William (Mac) Thornberry (R/Texas)
- Vacant (Previously filled by Leonard Boswell, 2001–2012)
- Michael Simpson (R/Idaho)
- Sanford Bishop, Jr. (D/Georgia)

These Commissioners, from New York to California, Rhode Island to Texas, and of course from Kansas, are charged with carrying out the mission to construct the memorial. Commissioners are appointed by either the Speaker of the House or President Pro Tem of the Senate, in consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of their respective bodies; or by the President of the United States. All twelve of these individuals were chosen by the government to carry out the public mission of memorializing General and President Eisenhower.

Senior Leadership

Chairman Rocco Siciliano is a World War II combat-decorated infantry veteran who served as Special Assistant to President Eisenhower for Personnel Management.

Senator Daniel K. Inouye was Vice Chairman from 2001 until his death in late 2012. He was a World War II Medal of Honor recipient for valor and continuously represented Hawaii in the United States Congress since President Eisenhower signed its statehood into law in 1959. Senator Inouye, former Chairman of the FDR Memorial Commission, modeled the EMC's legislation on that previous Commission. Having served on that Commission for over four decades, Senator Inouye drew on

his background and expertise on presidential memorialization throughout his service as Vice Chairman of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission

Commission Staff

Executive Director Brig. Gen. Carl Reddel, USAF (Ret.), served as President and CEO of the Eisenhower World Affairs Institute (EWAI) following his retirement from the United States Air Force, where among other responsibilities he was a Professor and Head of the Department of History at the United States Air Force Academy. Gen. Reddel joined the Commission in June 2001.

The Commission is staffed by temporary federal employees in accordance with legislation passed in May 2008 (P.L. 110–229). Brig. Gen. Reddel, the Commission's Executive Director, leads the core staff of eight full-time temporary federal employees and one full-time (the Commission's Executive Architect) and two part-time contract consultants.

Site Selection

In 2005, the Eisenhower Memorial Commission (EMC) completed its review of 26 potential sites for the National Eisenhower Memorial. During this process, at the request of Senator Ted Stevens, the Commission pursued the possible joint development of the memorial with existing plans for a new headquarters of the United States Institute of Peace. Ultimately a proposed joint development arrangement negotiated by the Commission and its Special Counsel, in consultation with the Eisenhower family, was deemed not acceptable by the family and the Commission pursued other possible sites. In November 2004, following a request of the Eisenhower family, the Commission pursued establishing the memorial inside the Yates Building (the Auditor's Building) at the corner of Independence Avenue and 14th St. NW. However, when the matter came before the Commission in March 2005, Commissioner David Eisenhower stated it was not appropriate to put a memorial for one person inside a building named for someone else and that site was no longer pursued.

In June of 2005, after exhaustive investigation, the EMC selected its preferred location—a potentially remarkable four-acre site at the base of Capitol Hill and one of the top twenty sites in Washington, D.C. designated by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) for a future memorial. This site at the intersection of Maryland and Independence Avenues, SW, between 4th and 6th Streets, is prominent, accessible, and has strong thematic connections with Eisenhower.

All of the neighboring institutions were influenced by Eisenhower's presidency. He created the precursor to the Department of Education, immediately adjacent to the site's southern border. He also created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, whose work is highlighted at the National Air and Space Museum across the street to the north of the site. The site also boasts a stunning view of the U.S. Capitol along the Maryland Avenue view corridor, reflecting Eisenhower's exceptional respect among all Presidents for the authority of Congress.

In May 2006, Congress and the President approved P.L. 109–220, selecting Eisenhower as an appropriate subject for a memorial within Area I, the prominent area of the Capital reserved for memorials of pre-eminent historical and lasting significance to the Nation. In September 2006, both the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts voted on and approved the Commission's preferred location as the future site of the Eisenhower Memorial. The site has been informally named "Eisenhower Square."

In 2007, the EMC contracted with Skidmore, Owings and Merrill LLP (SOM) to create the Pre-Design Program to communicate to the prospective designer what the National Eisenhower Memorial should be, including goals, requirements, constraints, and opportunities. This effort included interviews with Commissioners, scholars, authors, Eisenhower family members, Eisenhower contemporaries, and many others.

Selection of Frank Gehry and the Preferred Design Concept

In 2008, the Commission engaged with the General Services Administration's Design Excellence Program for design team procurement. As agreed to by the Commission, the competition was open to any U.S. citizen with a design portfolio. The initial request for proposals garnered forty-four submissions, with four design teams advancing to final consideration.

Following the GSA design team procurement recommendation, on March 31, 2009, the Eisenhower Memorial Commission unanimously selected world-renowned architect Frank Gehry of Gehry Partners LLP as the designer for the National Eisenhower Memorial. Frank Gehry is one of the world's most celebrated architects, and has won the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Gold Medal, the Pritzker Prize,

Britain's Royal Gold Medal, Japan's Praemium Imperiale, the Order of Canada, and the National Medal of Arts.

In January 2010, the Commission announced its selection of the Gilbane Building Company for design and construction management services. Gehry Partners and Gilbane's contracts were finalized at the outset of 2010, marking the official beginning of the design process.

On March 25, 2010, the Commission chose the preferred design concept for the National Eisenhower Memorial out of four possible options. The design selected encompasses a world-class memorial and civic space including time-honored memorial elements of sculpture, bas reliefs, tapestry, and quotations in materials which will endure through the ages. From the outset, these included large representations of the General and President.

During the design phase, Frank Gehry immersed himself in General and President Eisenhower's life, traveling to Abilene, Kansas for a first-hand education on the life of his subject at the Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum. The design team also worked with Eisenhower historians and the senior co-editor of the Eisenhower papers, Professor Louis Galambos, of Johns Hopkins University, to ensure that the design elements were historically accurate and true to their subject.

Memorial Design Phase: 2010–2012

On March 25, 2010, the Commission convened to unanimously choose the preferred design concept for the Memorial out of four possible options. This design encompasses a world-class memorial and civic space combining stunning, never-seen-before elements and time-honored elements of stone and statuary.

In 2010 and 2011, the Commission and design team successfully completed several rounds of meetings with federal review agencies—the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA), the National Capital Memorial Advisory Committee (NCMAC), and the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) (see Appendix I). The design team continued to refine the preferred design concept and alternatives throughout this time, culminating in the endorsement by the Eisenhower Memorial Commission of Frank Gehry's progress on their preferred design in July 2011.

Throughout much of 2011, the design team conducted significant research and testing on potential materials and vendors for the memorial's stunning tapestries, to great positive effect. In late summer 2011, Eisenhower Memorial Commission and CFA and NCPC Commissioners and staff viewed and evaluated tapestry samples from three separate vendors. The Commission hung the best of the tapestry 'mock-ups' on-site in late August and again in September, receiving near-universal acclaim for their transparency and beauty, along with respect for the determination of the design team to get this important feature of the design correct.

In September of 2011, the Commission of Fine Arts unanimously approved the memorial's design concept, noting that the scale was correct, and expressing great enthusiasm for the development of the design and the artistic quality of the tapestry mockups. They further noted that the sophistication of the design and the proposed artistic treatment "will transform the site and the context of adjacent federal buildings."

The stunning tapestry mock-ups also earned admiration from the U.S. Secretary of Education, who welcomed the memorial as a new neighbor in a letter wholeheartedly endorsing the memorial design in October 2011. The Architect of the Capitol also expressed its support for the design in a letter that same month, applauding the Commission's "decision, courage, and commitment of time" to work within the Section 106 process to better the design.

The Commission and design team participated in a series of NEPA/Section 106 meetings throughout 2010 and 2011, named for the section of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), which requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. The 106 process concluded with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in March 2012, which outlines agreed-upon measures that the agency will take to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic attributes. A parallel process also addressed the impact of the memorial design on the environment through the Environmental Assessment (EA). The Memorandum of Agreement is necessary before the National Park Service (NPS), the memorial's sponsoring agency, can issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), which is the result of the EA. This must occur before NPS can issue a construction permit for the memorial, and before NCPC can approve the memorial's design. This process enables public comment provided by any interested parties, including memorial neighbors, the government of the District of Columbia, and the public, whose comments were considered carefully by the design team.

In March 2012, the FONSI was issued. This issuance of the FONSI allowed the National Park Service, the memorial's sponsor, to take the Commission's preferred

design concept to NCPC to obtain preliminary approval. Throughout the design phase, the Commission and design team worked to mitigate potential obstacles in attaining design approval, keeping Commissioners, their staff, and the staff of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and the Committee on Natural Resources informed during this process.

Although extensive testing on the durability of the materials used for the memorial was always a requirement, this testing was moved up in the design and construction schedule to respond to requests made by the NCPC. The design team performed these tests in consultation with the National Park Service and NCPC staff and at the request of NCPC. The initial study of tapestry engineering and testing data has found that the stainless steel materials are satisfactory. The next stage of testing on the welds will be presented to NCPC prior to final approval.

As a Congressional commission, EMC and design team staff have met with and been particularly responsive to members of Congress, responding to formal and informal requests for information, including a Committee on Natural Resources-Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands hearing in March 2012. Throughout 2012, the Commission provided fulsome responses to inquiries regarding its activities and the evolution of the memorial design, and has welcomed every opportunity to meet with interested parties, hear comments on the proposed memorial, and address issues that have arisen.

Congressional and Presidential Commissioners played a direct and important role during this time, and EMC staff continues to work in concert with them and their staff to enable communication and feedback. In a May 2012 meeting, the Commissioners endorsed moving forward with the preferred design that was unanimously agreed-upon in 2011. As an on-going process which commenced in 2012, Commissioners have also provided input to staff on the initial stages of determining quotations for the memorial.

The Commission intends to continue its constructive and positive engagement with District of Columbia leaders, including Eleanor Holmes Norton, the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development Victor Hoskins, and Councilman Tommy Wells, who represents the district within which the Memorial site is located. In 2013, an economic impact report was prepared which estimated the financial gain for the District as a result of the memorial. The report, prepared by Dr. Stephen Fuller and Agnes Artemel of George Mason University's Center for Regional Analysis, concluded that the memorial will generate $30.1 million in annual visitor spending in the District that would not have been spent in the District in absence of the memorial. This would generate $39.1 million a year to the District Gross State Product.

The Commission also continues to cooperate with agencies at the federal level, including its on-going partnership with the Department of Education (DoEd) to establish an attractive and useful promenade between the memorial and the main entrance of the neighboring Lyndon B. Johnson building. Commission staff has maintained coordination with officials from Secretary Duncan's office and GSA in order to enhance and activate the area adjacent to the memorial. This work builds on the letter the Commission received from Secretary of Education Arne Duncan in October 2011, which expressed his pleasure at the memorial design and "the great potential for public engagement that the memorial will bring" to the DoEd, including enhancements such as space and facilities for new exhibits, meetings, events, and even retail. In 2013 and throughout the construction phase, the Commission will continue to work with the DoEd to bring this plan to reality.

The Commission also works in partnership with the National Archives and Records Administration and the Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum in Abilene, Kansas. This relationship enables the Commission to benefit from established federal resources in order to ensure that the memorial is an authentic representation of the Eisenhower historical legacy.

Over the years, taxpayers have created a superb data base in the Eisenhower Library. Eisenhower's national memorialization will enable the sharing of this existing resource with the nation and the world. This partnership continues to be particularly useful as the Commission develops the E-Memorial, which is the on-site and off-site electronic memorialization of the president and general. The Commission expects that, once the memorial is completed, its prominent presence in the nation's capital will draw further attention to the library, cementing the reciprocal relationship between both entities. E-memorial development was a priority for the Commission in 2012, and the first phase of the E-memorial, focusing on the Commission's website, has already been completed.

The National Park Service, the memorial's sponsor, continues to play a key role in completing the design phase of the memorial and moving onto the construction phase. The completion of the FONSI in 2012 and the attainment of preliminary and

final approval from NCPC in 2013 are necessary prior to ground-breaking. NPS and the Secretary of the Interior have played an active role in moving the National Eisenhower Memorial closer to fruition. In 2012, the NPS commissioned a Total Cost of Facility Ownership report which concluded that the expected cost of memorial operations and maintenance is comparable to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. NPS' leadership in sponsoring the memorial at NCPC and CFA approval reviews will ensure that memorial construction continues without delay in 2014 and 2015.

Description of the Memorial Design

The National Eisenhower Memorial in Washington, DC uses the traditional memorial forms of sculpture, bas relief, tapestries, realistic images and quotations, to honor Ike's unparalleled achievements in behalf of his country. For over 1,000 years, societies have employed these classic elements to recognize and memorialize their great leaders. In the design for this first presidential memorial to be built in our 21st century, Frank Gehry, America's foremost architect, has designed a memorial which speaks to Ike's great achievements while recognizing his humanity.

Unlike other presidential memorials in Washington, DC, the Eisenhower Memorial will be located within a new urban park space, flanked by District streets. The Eisenhower Memorial is set within four acres of new parkland directly across from, and south of, the National Air and Space Museum. The memorial honors Eisenhower's achievements as the Supreme Allied Commander in World War II and as the 34th U.S. President in heroic-scale free standing bronze sculptures and bas reliefs on monumental stone blocks. Quotations from some of his most memorable speeches will be inscribed on nearby walls. Completing the powerful sculptural composition, a human-scale realistic statue of Eisenhower as a young man will be looking out to the images of the great military leader and president he will become. The setting for the memorial is elegantly created by an 80-foot tall limestone-clad columns supporting woven, stainless steel tapestries, which depict the Kansas plains where he grew up and where he developed the values and character which helped guide him to greatness.

Pedestrians will arrive at the site from all four corners of Eisenhower Square, entering by passing under one of the tapestries, and converging in the center at the memorial itself. The positioning of the stone sculptures and bas reliefs and the quotations wall create an area for quiet contemplation within, but separate from, the more active urban civic space. The memorial visitors will be able to talk to National Park Service rangers to learn more about Eisenhower. Group seating areas are provided throughout the site for school groups to gather and participate in presentations and discussions with their teachers.

The memorial is separated from its nearest neighbor, the U.S. Department of Education, by the 50-foot wide LBJ Promenade. This pedestrian promenade design provides an unprecedented enhanced opportunity for the Department to engage with the public through interactive exhibits and other forms of outreach. An overlook at Promenade level provides a large, elevated gathering space for the Department and for visitors to view the memorial.

The memorial design masterfully creates an allee of trees along the portion of Maryland Avenue which formerly traversed the site. The commanding vista along the allee to the east directs the memorial visitor's eye to the dome of the Capitol, in part to recognize Eisenhower's extraordinarily collaborative and productive relationship with Congress.

E-Memorial

In March 2004, the Commission adopted a formal resolution in which it declared that the Eisenhower Memorial would be composed of both a physical memorial and a living memorial. The living memorial was described as including "sponsored historical or policy research, publications, public presentations, commemorations or programs that will advance and perpetuate the legacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower and his contributions to the United States of America." In an effort to further define this latter concept, the Commission authorized a grant of up to $400,000 to the Eisenhower World Affairs Institute, then headed by Susan Eisenhower, with a mandate to coordinate with the existing Eisenhower legacy organizations and to develop a proposal suitable for adoption by the Commission. The report produced by the Eisenhower World Affairs Institute reflected a lack of consensus of the legacy organizations and did not embody actionable recommendations for Commission as to how its objective of a living memorial might be achieved.

In 2007, the six legacy organizations jointly agreed that their existence represents the Living Memorial to Dwight Eisenhower and they unanimously supported the idea of electronic representation of themselves and their work within the physical

elements of the memorial. This concept, which we refer to as the E-Memorial, is presently being developed.

The National Eisenhower Memorial will be the first national presidential memorial of the 21st century and the first to incorporate an electronic companion memorial. The Commission has selected the New York City-based, award-winning media design firm, Local Projects, to design the E-Memorial.

The E-Memorial consists of an on-site component and an off-site (website) component. Through a downloaded app, visitors will use their personal mobile devices to enhance the visit to the physical memorial. This app will provide a superior educational experience. There will also be resources available for teachers planning a visit. National Park Service Ranger commentary will be available for those who choose not to use their personal electronic devices. This technology is flexible enough to be updated. The Commission is coordinating with the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas, and the National Archives and Records Administration, to ensure that these already-established federal resources have a role in the continued interpretation of the E-Memorial, to ensure that the information remains accurate and interesting.

Federal Contracting and Oversight

The U.S. General Services Administration-National Capital Region (GSA–NCR) Public Buildings Service is the contracting agent for the Eisenhower Memorial Commission for the above work. The National Capital Region GSA office is designated to assist public commissions such as the EMC in the procurement and management of the above types of contracts. The Commission's Design and Construction Management Consultant directly serves GSA staff in executing these responsibilities.

Funding

At the outset of the Commission's activities, a study was undertaken of Presidential memorials in Washington DC. It was determined that there are six national Presidential memorials, to Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy.

These memorials were principally funded by the government, the most recent of which was the FDR memorial which was 89 percent federally funded. Members of the Eisenhower family have expressed concerns since the initial days of the Commission that any private fundraising for the Memorial could negatively impact the fundraising of the legacy organizations. Initially, it was intended that there be no private fundraising for the Eisenhower Memorial.

As the Commission is a member of the Legislative branch, as opposed to a private initiative, it has been entirely funded by federal funds. In 2008, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior advised the Commission that it was expected that there be a private funding component for the Memorial. No specific amount was given. In 2011, the Commission hired Odell, Simms & Lynch, a firm with fundraising experience for memorials and other public projects, to lead a private fundraising effort.

The estimated cost for the construction of the memorial, including operating the Commission, site preparation, construction of the memorial, GSA fees, and a construction management firm, is $114.8. The Commission has requested 80 percent federal funding, approximately $90 million. For FY2012, the Commission received one third of its request, $32.9 million to begin construction of the memorial. Because preliminary approval from NCPC is delayed until later this year, the EMC does not need FY 2013 construction funds.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we at the Commission—both our Commissioners and staff—are appreciative of the opportunity to come before you today for this discussion of the memorial. As you can see, the Commission has been working for well over a decade in a sincere and dedicated effort to memorialize one of our Nation's great Presidents of the 20th century.

The commission has been faithful to the proscribed GSA processes for both the design competition and contracting protocols. It is important to note that in terms of both time and money, a large investment has been made. The selection process yielded the premier designer and architect of the 21st century to lead this landmark effort.

This has been a deliberative and extensive process from the beginning, with over 23 public meetings that provided a forum for public comment. The Commission has greatly benefitted from the participation of the Eisenhower family via David Eisenhower's participation as a Commissioner for a decade. As well, members of the family have appeared at Commission meetings and Frank Gehry has held several meet-

ings with the family, particularly over the last year, to obtain their input, and has made changes to the design as a result.

The Commission of Fine Arts has unanimously given its concept approval of this design, citing the beauty of the tapestries and the appropriateness of the memorial's scale. As we stand today, the design stage is near completion.

It is time to build this memorial.

APPENDIX I
PUBLIC MEETINGS HELD FOR THE EISENHOWER MEMORIAL DESIGN

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Date	Meeting	Location
2/19/2010	Soft Launch	NPS, 1100 Ohio Drive
4/21/2010	Scoping	Old Post Office
5/21/2010	Section 106	NPS, 1100 Ohio Drive
3/1/2011	Section 106	NPS, 1100 Ohio Drive
3/30/2011	Section 106	Old Post Office
6/20/2011	Section 106	Dept. of Ed. (LBJ Bldg)
8/31/2011	Section 106	GSA ROB
10/4/2011	Section 106	NPS, 1100 Ohio Drive
10/19/2011	Section 106	NPS, 1100 Ohio Drive
11/16/2011	Section 106	NPS, 1100 Ohio Drive

TOTAL: 10

AGENCY MEETINGS Open to the Public

Date	Agency
3/25/2010	Eisenhower Memorial Commission – preferred design concept
4/20/2010	National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC)
5/20/2010	U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) - info
6/3/2010	National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) - info
1/20/2010	CFA – concept approval
2/3/2011	NCPC – concept comments
2/16/2011	NCMAC
7/12/2011	Eisenhower Memorial Commission – revised concept approval
9/14/2011	NCMAC
9/15/2011	CFA – revised concept approval
10/6/2011	NCPC - info
5/15/2012	Eisenhower Memorial Commission – presentation of design development

TOTAL: 12

"To perpetuate his memory and his contributions to the United States."
-U.S. Public Law 106-79

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER
MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Rocco C. Siciliano
Chairman

Senator Jerry Moran
R/Kansas

Senator Jack Reed
D/Rhode Island

Senator Pat Roberts
R/Kansas

Rep. William (Mac) Thornberry
R/Texas

Rep. Mike Simpson
R/Idaho

Rep. Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
D/Georgia

Alfred Geduldig

Susan Banes Harris

Appointments Pending

Carl W. Reddel
Executive Director

Andrew J. Demetriou, Esq.
Special Counsel

April 1, 2013

Representative Cynthia Lummis
113 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Dear Representative Lummis,

We sincerely appreciated your thoughtful questions during the recent House Natural Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation hearing on the National Eisenhower Memorial.

During that hearing, I made a commitment to report back to you regarding some of your questions concerning the estimated cost of the Commission's design and construction activities during FY 2012. The attached document is our response to your question. It outlines the expenditure of approximately $9 million dollars that have been spent from the $30.9 million in funds appropriated for Design and Construction of the memorial in FY 2012.

I would be pleased to provide you or your staff with an in-person briefing if you would like further information. Thank you very much for your continued interest in General and President Eisenhower's memorialization.

Sincerely,

Carl W. Reddel

Carl W. Reddel, Brig. Gen., USAF (Ret.)

Enclosure

CC: The Honorable Rob Bishop
The Honorable Raúl Grijalva

Commitments and Obligations from the FY12 Design and Construction Appropriation ($8.7M expended out of $30.9M received)

- Extension of design phase due to delay with review agency coordination and approvals [National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and Commission of Fine Arts].
  - Historic Preservation Act-Section 106 Consultation Process.
  - Testing of tapestry and stone as required by NCPC and NPS. (Tapestry testing of this magnitude is typically a construction phase expense. This testing was moved forward into the design phase at the request of NCPC).
- Continuation of design and construction document preparation as a result of agency delays.
  - Preparation of additional three-dimensional study and presentation models for agency review and approvals. o Preparation of artist's and engraver's mock-ups and maquettes
  - Installation of additional stone mock-ups at the request of NPS. These mock-ups are typically done during the construction phase.
- Revisions to construction contractor procurement process.

- Cost estimating and scheduling.
- Extended project management and contract administration.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, General.

Mr. Moore?

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR COTTON MOORE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. MOORE. Yes. My name is Arthur Cotton Moore. I am——

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Moore, can you pull that closer to you? And once again, pull it closer to your mouth. It is not easy to hear.

Mr. MOORE. Yes, thank you. I am an architect and planner in Washington, and I come here in defense of the historic plans of the Nation's Capital, which I think are threatened by the present course of the Eisenhower Memorial. Next, please.

It is a planned city, and there are two grand plans, the L'Enfant Plan and the McMillan Plan of 1901. One of the things that both these plans stressed was two grand radiating avenues radiating out from the Capitol. One, we know, is Pennsylvania Avenue. The other is Maryland Avenue. And the—go to the next one, please—you can see that the armature of the city is very clearly depicted in this slide. Could we go to the next one?

One of the things that L'Enfant did, he specified very clearly what would be the width of the streets. And so, underlined up there at the top is that these two—only these two—grand avenues would be 160 feet wide. Can we go to the next one?

And the McMillan Plan of 1901 came and said this was the right way to go, this was the important thing. Maryland Avenue was very important, and it should be 160 feet wide. Can we go to the next one?

What we are presented with, however, is that, instead of 160-foot-wide avenue through here, we have what is called a 50-foot cartway. The dominant elements are these large columns and these screens or tapestries. Can we go to the next one? The model clearly shows what is there, what is being proposed, a box. And this is, of course, very inhospitable to the grand boulevard that L'Enfant and McMillan proposed.

Let's go to the next one. In fact, what it does is, in fact, it cuts off the left arm of the grand plan. And, therefore, we think it is inappropriate. Let's go to the next one. What we thought we were going to get was a grand avenue, just like Pennsylvania Avenue. And, of course, we are not getting that. Let's go to the next one.

One of the things that is a problem with Maryland Avenue is the trains have run down using the bed of Maryland Avenue. But in 1990 we showed how you could build Maryland Avenue above the tracks. And I've got a—next. Here is actually Maryland Avenue, the portion we have built. It is 160-feet wide, and it works quite well, and it is, of course, focused on the Capitol. Let's go to the next.

And the various planning bodies agree with this and have supported this—to build Maryland Avenue all the way to the Capitol. Let's go to the next one.

Now, what I would like to show you very quickly are two alternatives. If, in fact, the inner section of Pennsylvania Avenue and

Constitution Avenue work very well, as you probably all know, and if you repeated that as a mirror image for Maryland Avenue and for Independence Avenue, you would get what is shown in the lower part of that slide. Now, go to the next one.

What they would do is, although there would still be plenty of land south of Maryland Avenue, I like this new pattern, having two sections, because there are two roles that President Eisenhower was known for, Supreme Allied Commander, and a very successful two-term President. Let's go to the next one.

This is, basically, a suggestion from the Eisenhower family that perhaps a statue, or something much more simple would be something appropriate. In this case, I have shown two statues, one of them expressing the role of the Supreme Allied Commander, and one as President. And these would, of course, be an excellent gateway to the brand new Maryland Avenue, which is so much a part of the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans. Let's go to the next one.

And, indeed, these two elements could be linked under Maryland Avenue—let's go to the next one—which is much like the National Gallery West Wing and the National Gallery East Wing. Let's go to the next one.

A second alternative, just to show that we don't have to stick with this site, this is the contemplative area—let's go to the next slide—which is very close to the World War II Memorial. Let's go to the next slide. The idea being here that there might be still two statues, one of them as general, facing the World War II Memorial, and a second one as President, facing the White House. And this could take place on a map, done in paving, of the world, indicating the major battles of the Second World War, and this could serve as a history lesson for generations to come. Let's go to the next slide.

So, whether it is that, or this one, or some other one, it is clear that there are—let's go to the final slide—it is clear there are very many opportunities to not destroy the historic plans of Washington. And I rest my case on that, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Moore follows:]

Statement of Arthur Cotton Moore, FAIA, Washington, D.C.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I thank you for this opportunity.

I appear before you today with only one goal: To defend and protect the L'Enfant Plan—which is on the National Register of Historic Places, thereby preserving the openness of Maryland Avenue and its 160 foot wide vista of the Capitol.

Washington was created as a completely planned city. Its first plan, by Pierre L'Enfant in 1791, was validated, reinforced, and enriched by the McMillan Commission in 1901. Together they form the planning constitution for our Nation's Capital.

The basic framework of the L'Enfant/McMillan Plans was a mall extending from the Capitol westward to the Washington Monument, bracketed by two grand radiating diagonal boulevards: Pennsylvania Avenue, extending from the Capitol to the White House, and Maryland Avenue, extending from the Capitol to the Potomac River, the principal means of commerce in the early days of the Republic. L'Enfant not only laid out the streets and avenues of the Capital—he also specified the width of the streets, specifically calling for Pennsylvania and Maryland Avenues to be the broadest in the city: each 160 feet wide.

George Washington was intimately involved with the planning of the Capital. There exists not only a painting of the Father of our Country with the L'Enfant Plan spread out on a table before him, but the letter he signed, sending the Plan to the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval.

In 1900, largely at the instigation of the American Institute of Architects, the McMillan Commission was formed, and after much study, it found the L'Enfant Plan

to be the best and proper basis for the development of our Nation's Capital. The Commission concentrated on more of a three-dimensional elaboration of L'Enfant's Plan, doubling the size of the Mall to include the sites for the Lincoln Memorial and the Jefferson Memorial. All the McMillan amplifications of L'Enfant's Plan were done strictly within its spirit, geometry, and specifications.

Incredibly, the current proposal for the Eisenhower Memorial does not respect this august planning heritage. Contrary to the requirements of the 106 process, this historical background clearly played no role in the site selection and design development. Also, while the 106 process calls for real alternatives to be considered, only three variants on a single theme have been offered—and each has giant columns (supporting large metal screens), forming a dominant box which denies the diagonal nature of Maryland Avenue as the mirror sister of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Only one variant allows any semblance of a vehicular street, and that was a narrow road. There is a constant reference to a 50 foot cartway, or vista, which is consistently encumbered with objects right where the 160 foot grand avenue is supposed to be, pursuant to the Historic Plans. It should be noted that streets in non-federal Colonial Georgetown are wider than this cartway by 10 feet. In any case, the models show that the dominant elements form an enormous rigid box completely denying the diagonal nature of Maryland Avenue as the mirror sister of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Importantly, from the inception of the city, for the last 213 years of development in this section of the Southwest, none of the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of public and private buildings, have been allowed to encroach into the 160 foot right-of-way of Maryland Avenue. The Eisenhower Memorial would be the first project to do that, and it would clearly violate the letter and intention of the Historic Plans, and make a dead-end discontinuity for Maryland Avenue.

Although emphasized in both the L'Enfant/McMillan Plans, Maryland Avenue is the major missing element, because in 1901, in order to get the train stations off the Mall, Congress gave a perpetual-use right for the trains to run down Maryland Avenue. For almost 200 years, no one was able to figure out how to bring Maryland Avenue to reality with the trains there.

In 1986, I proposed a solution to this conundrum in the Washington Post: Because the trains ran in a ditch under the north/south streets, I realized that Maryland Avenue could be put in as a structure above the trains, connecting directly with the north/south streets. (As the Architect of the Portals Development, I put in a section of Maryland Avenue, proving the viability of the scheme, which has a host of benefits including greatly improved access, security and new land for development. The Portals' prototype can be extended to realize a fully completed Maryland Avenue.)

The DC Office of Planning has recently incorporated this program in its Small Area Plan for the Southwest, which has been adopted by the City Council—and—the National Capital Planning Commission has recently incorporated it in its Framework Plan and its Eco-District Plan.

In order to distinguish real alternatives, as called for in the 106 process, rather than the minor variants presently being offered by the Eisenhower Commission, I would like to proffer two alternatives:

(1) The first begins with the idea that Maryland Avenue and Independence Avenue should come together in a fashion which is the exact mirror of the intersection of Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue to the north. In each case, the diagonal avenue would be dominant as L'Enfant specified. The intersection of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues works quite well for traffic, and it could be assumed to work equally well at the intersection of Maryland and Independence Avenues. Furthermore, the symmetry fundamental in the L'Enfant/McMillan Plans would be maintained.

Although there could be many different concepts with this layout, I would like to offer one as an illustration. The Eisenhower family has expressed an interest in a more modest proposal, principally featuring a statue. In this example, in my power point, I show two statues representing the two major roles in which Dwight Eisenhower served our country: One as Supreme Allied Commander for the European theater in World War II, and the other as a two term President of the United States.

The two statues could serve as a gateway to Maryland Avenue as entrance sculptures, much as has been done elsewhere at important points like at the entrance to Memorial Bridge. The paving around the statues could list or represent his extraordinary achievements in each of these roles. The two areas around the statues could be linked under Maryland Avenue just as the National Gallery West Wing is linked to the East Wing under Fourth Street. This underground connection would afford an opportunity for further exhibits about his life and service to our country.

(2) Another alternative which demonstrates the possibility of a new site altogether, could be at the contemplative area northwest of the World War II Memorial. This site, which is virtually never used, could contain the two statues expressing his two major roles as General and as President, with the one as General facing the adjacent World War II Memorial, and the other as President facing the White House. The paving around the statues could represent the world, and piezoelectric-activated lights could show the key battles of the war. Since there are fewer and fewer remaining veterans of that war to explain this significant conflict, this could serve as a history lesson for generations to come.

In any case, these are two real alternatives that rely on simple statues and paving, and are far more modest and less costly than the variants on a single theme proffered by the Memorial Commission. More important, however, is that these proffered alternatives conform to—and do not violate—the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans.

With respect and gratitude,

Arthur Cotton Moore FAIA

The Washington Post

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 2012

Liking Ike, disliking the memorial

What was most disappointing about The Post editorial promoting Frank Gehry's design for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial ["The memorial to Ike," April 9] was its failure to mention the effects on the sensitive Maryland Avenue site and on Washington's urban DNA: the 1791 L'Enfant Plan and the 1901-02 McMillan Plan.

AL MUTO/AFP/GETTY IMAGES

Dwight D. Eisenhower

Both plans envisioned Maryland Avenue as the mirror image of Pennsylvania Avenue north of the Mall and radiating out from the Capitol, with equally stunning vistas to and from that symbol of American democracy. The fact that Maryland Avenue has never achieved its intended brilliance, and instead has been cut up, neglected and turned into a parking lot, is not a reason to ignore it. Nor it is a reason to place a 4-acre, 80-foot-high "roofless building" across its axis.

This is not a controversy that can be dismissed solely as a matter of expertise, taste, family objections, architectural style or even urban design. It's about something far more fundamental — something concerning history, memory, the legacy of President George Washington in the design of Washington and the role of modern memorials in the American story told in the capital.

The Eisenhower memorial and the plans for Washington deserve more attention and intelligent discussion than has taken place. With this important design project, we have a rare and wonderful opportunity to create a meaningful memorial and to implement another long-deferred element of the L'Enfant Plan, recognized to be one of the great urban design plans of all time.

JUDY SCOTT FELDMAN, *Rockville*

The writer is chair of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall.

The New York Times

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 2012

What Is the Right Way to Honor Ike?

TO THE EDITOR:

Witold Rybczynski raises a legitimate concern that seeking compromise and consensus on Frank Gehry's Eisenhower Memorial could "ultimately weaken the memorial design." But in dismissing memorial critics, he doesn't seriously consider a crucial point. This design ignores and indeed eclipses an existing revered work of art: the L'Enfant plan for the city of Washington.

In the 1791 plan, Maryland Avenue was envisioned to be the mirror image of Pennsylvania Avenue north of the Mall. Pennsylvania Avenue was cleaned up starting only in the 1970s.

It took the visionary Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan to cut through the red

M. K. PERKER

tape and entrenched interests to make that happen.

The Eisenhower Memorial site on Maryland Avenue is a wonderful opportunity to follow that lead and create a new work of public art that contributes to the historic plan, not turns its back on it.

JUDY SCOTT FELDMAN
Chairwoman, National
Coalition to Save Our Mall
Rockville, Md., March 24, 2012

ARTHUR COTTON MOORE FAIA

ACM is a sixth-generation Washingtonian, a graduate of St. Albans School, Princeton University, and Princeton University School of Architecture.

He is a national award-winning, internationally recognized Architect, Preservationist, and Planner. Since 1965, ACM has practiced in 38 cities across the United States, and has received over 70 Design Awards, including two National Residential Design Awards from *Architectural Record* Magazine, and three National AIA Honor Awards.

ACM projects have been published in over 2,700 articles in magazines and newspapers throughout the United States, Europe, Scandinavia, and Japan, and have been included in many books. His buildings have been in group architectural exhibitions at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, Columbia University's Center for the Study of American Architecture, and Columbia University's Avery Library Centennial Archive Exhibition, "Contemporary Architectural Drawings."

He has served on design award juries throughout the country, including regional and state AIA programs, as well as the country's two most prestigious—the National AIA Honor Award Program, and the National *Progressive Architecture* Magazine Design Award Jury. He is one of 600 Architects around the world included since 1980 in all editions of the British compilation *"Contemporary Architects,"* recognizing 20th/21st century Architects on an international level.

ACM has traveled to 113 countries, several multiple times, to photograph and study their Architecture, and has written on Architecture, urban affairs, preservation, and art.

He has lectured widely at universities and professional conferences, including several lectures at the Smithsonian Institution, where in 1978, he gave a four-part series entitled "The Architecture of the Absurd." In 1979, he gave the Annual Guest Lecture at Trinity College in Dublin. In 1982, he gave the Henry Hornbostel Memorial Lecture at Carnegie-Mellon University, and in 1985 was honored by the Hirshhorn Museum with an invitation to give a Retrospective Lecture on his work, marking the 20th anniversary of his practice.

ACM has had solo painting exhibitions in New York, Chicago, Washington, and Paris, and has participated in group painting shows in New York and Cologne. His travelling museum exhibition, "Visions of the Future," was shown in museums in Prague and Poland. His "Industrial Baroque" furniture series was awarded *Architectural Record* Magazine's 1990 Award for Excellence in Design.

His first book, *"The Powers of Preservation,"* which focused on his historic building work and urban planning projects, was published by McGraw-Hill in 1998. His next two books, to be published in 2013, are *"Interruption of the Cocktail Hour," (*a Washington yarn) and *"Washington Comiks,"* a book of paintings of our nation's capital.

www.arthurcottonmoore.com

Mrs. LUMMIS [presiding]. Thank you for your testimony. And now, Mr. Shubow, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIN SHUBOW, PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONAL CIVIC ART SOCIETY

Mr. SHUBOW. Distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for inviting the National Civic Art Society to testify today. As a nonprofit dedicated to the classical and humanistic tradition of public art and architecture, we believe our monuments play an essential role in defining our national identity and crystalizing our historic memory.

Regrettably, the current proposed Eisenhower design is not up to the task. We thus recommend an open, democratic, and fair design competition that is respectful of the public interests.

How did we get to this turning point? The initial error was the decision to use GSA's Design Excellence program. That program was created to select licensed architects for the design of Federal courthouses and office buildings, not memorials. In fact, the very creator of Design Excellence, former GSA chief architect Edward

Finer, strongly urged the Eisenhower Commission not to use the program for the memorial.

The decision to use the Design Excellence program was an utter reversal of our tradition of public competitions for national memorials. And, if I may correct the Chairman, no actual design was submitted in the competition. The final four were so-called design visions, which are still secret to this day. Instead, the emphasis was on the entrants' prior works, firms, and reputation, all factors that favor the architectural elite.

One does not need to be an experienced architect to come up with a brilliant memorial. One can be a student, a sculptor, an amateur. Not only was the selection process severely restricted as to who could enter, it was a closed process that solicited only 44 entries. This is hundreds fewer than the number of entries and open competitions for previous national memorials.

The result of the closed, exclusionary memorial competition was the strange choice of Frank Gehry. Whatever his merits as an architect, he has never built a memorial. The result is a grandiose, deconstructionist design that is now estimated to cost $142 million. Made of industrial—and it is made of industrial steel cables that Mr. Gehry's firm has described as a shroud. Whether or not it is permanent, it does not appear permanent.

The design is entirely discordant with our tradition of Presidential memorials. It also violates the urbanism of Washington, D.C., as Mr. Moore demonstrates in his testimony. Mr. Gehry's plan has been widely opposed by leading architects, pundits, and critics of all aesthetic and political orientations. We encourage you to visit our Web site, civicart.org, where you can find a compilation of 70 articles and editorials against the design.

In short, the memorial is irredeemably wrong in its process, aesthetics, and cost. Congress has no choice but to go back to the drawing board and pass a bill to ensure that we build Eisenhower the monument he deserves.

What, then, must that memorial be? Monuments are civic art that calls us to solemnly reflect on who we are and what we value. They are heroic in scale, timeless, durable, and dignified. They present an idea to aspire to, rather than present mundane reality. They must be made of noble materials, such as marble and bronze, not industrial materials such as concrete and steel. Monuments ought to be clear and unequivocal in their meaning. They should evince a few simple ideas in a way that is graspable by ordinary Americans. They must be legible without a guide or key, and certainly without a visitor center or an iPad. Monuments are statements, not question marks.

A traditional man of old-fashioned virtue, President Eisenhower disdained modern art and architecture, which he did not believe represented the taste and values of the American people. He warned in 1962, "We see our very art form so changed that we seem to have forgotten the works of Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci. What has happened to our concept of beauty and decency and morality?"

America can and will build Eisenhower a monument that will prove his fears unfounded. The talent to do so is here. Now is the time to find it. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shubow follows:]

Statement of Justin Shubow, President, The National Civic Art Society

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Grijalva, members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for inviting the National Civic Art Society to speak today. As an educational nonprofit dedicated to the classical and humanistic tradition in public art and architecture, we believe that our most important monuments play an essential role in defining our national identity and crystallizing our historic memory. Civic art and architecture is the mirror in which the civilization sees itself.

One year ago it was conventional wisdom that the design of the Eisenhower Memorial was a done deal, a fait accompli soon to be cemented with quite real facts on the ground. But what has been groundbreaking is the surge of attention from Congress and the public. The more they have dug and discovered, the more they have got behind the wrecking ball aimed at Frank Gehry's avant-garde design—a design that has turned out to be more fragile than anyone could have imagined.

How did we get to this point? Any memorial competition is only as good as its professional adviser. In this case, that adviser was Daniel Feil. The Eisenhower Commission hired Mr. Feil as its executive architect and appointed him its agent to run the design competition. Mr. Feil is an urban planner who is best known for working on mega-projects such as Reagan National Airport. To the best of our knowledge, he has never worked on a memorial.

Mr. Feil chose to run the competition according to the General Service Administration's Design Excellence Program. This was a fundamental mistake since that program was created to select licensed architects for federal office buildings and courthouses. It was never intended for memorials. The very creator of Design Excellence, former GSA chief architect Edward Feiner, strongly urged Mr. Feil not to use the program for the Eisenhower Memorial.

The decision to use Design Excellence represents an utter reversal of our tradition of competitions for national monuments and memorials. Whereas formerly we held competitions of designs, Mr. Feil ran a competition of designers. At no point in the competition was an entrant required to submit an actual proposal for the memorial. Instead the emphasis was on the entrants' portfolio, résumé, and reputation—all factors that favor the architectural elite. While this might be appropriate for hiring an architect to design a federal office building, it makes no sense for a memorial. One does not need to be a licensed architect to come up with a brilliant design for a memorial. One can be a student, a sculptor, an amateur. When Maya Lin won the open, blindly reviewed competition for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, she was an unknown college student. A present-day Maya Lin could not even have entered the Eisenhower competition, let alone won.

Not only was the competition limited to licensed architects with substantial portfolios, it was a closed competition that solicited only 44 entries. This is hundreds fewer than the number of entries in open competitions for previous national memorials. It was also a secretive process. To this day we do not know the identities of all the entrants, we have never seen what Mr. Gehry submitted, and we do not know who sat on the evaluation board.

The former chief architect of GSA is not the only distinguished opponent of the competition. Another is Paul Spreiregen, who is arguably the leading expert on design competitions, and who literally wrote the book on the subject. Mr. Spreiregen served as an adviser for design competitions in Washington, D.C., including the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the World Bank Headquarters. He has vociferously objected to the Eisenhower competition. He wrote in the *Washington Post,* "Why weren't all American designers given the opportunity to submit proposals for the Eisenhower memorial? The method for doing that is a very well-organized and well-managed open-design competition. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Pentagon 9/11 Memorial, the 9/11 Memorial in New York City and the Gateway Arch in St. Louis are ample evidence of the reliability of open-design competitions. The design process for the Eisenhower memorial should have been open to all. It still can be, if the Gehry design is rejected."

In the 1990s, when the commission overseeing the National World War II Memorial competition held a closed competition nearly identical to that in this case, there was widespread public outcry and the original competition was scrapped in favor of an open one. The Eisenhower competition has ended up in exactly the same situation. Failing to understand the past, the Eisenhower Commission was condemned to repeat it.

It is true that Robert Ivy, CEO of the American Institute of Architects, submitted a letter to this Subcommittee announcing that the trade organization opposes the proposed bill. The letter says that AIA neither opposes nor supports the design, but

rather asserts that the process that chose it should not be overturned. (Note that the letter does not disclose that Mr. Ivy was one of the members of the evaluation board that selected Frank Gehry as the designer).

How ironic is it, then, that the guidelines in AIA's own *Handbook of Architectural Design Competitions* would strongly encourage the competition for a project of national importance to be an open, blindly reviewed process in which entries are publicly displayed. The actual competition violated all of these guidelines. To quote the handbook:

Open competitions are appropriate under the following circumstances:

- The nature of the project suggests that all architects have an equal opportunity to be selected on the basis of design merit
- The project requires the widest exploration of potential solutions made possible by an open competition

[...]

Exhibitions [of entries] provide a fine opportunity to stimulate public consideration of architectural design. They also help to stimulate the competitive spirit of participants. Knowing that their work will be displayed along with that of their peers can be a stimulus to competitors. For all these reasons, as full a presentation as possible of the submissions should be attempted.

Note that the AIA handbook was made possible by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts, and thus the guidelines have even wider scope than the interests of the trade association.

The result of the poorly run, undemocratic Eisenhower Memorial competition was the bizarre choice of Frank Gehry, an architect known for his deconstructionist style, project-cost overruns, and prior design flaws. In the 1990s, before Design Excellence came into existence, Mr. Gehry said, "My name was put up for a courthouse, and the General Services Administration that runs the government buildings just laughed at the idea." On another occasion he said, "The American government won't even hire me to do anything. In fact we submit for courthouses every once in a while, and we get funny letters back, and people on the selection committee, the GSA guys, just guffaw to think of someone like me doing the project."

As one might expect, his Eisenhower design's style, form, materials, content, scale, and scope are totally anathema to and discordant with the National Mall and the Monumental Core. Indeed, Gehry has repeatedly stated his rejection of harmony as a principle of architecture and urban planning. Furthermore, his incredibly expensive Memorial is ugly and offensive to the eye according to the standards of the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans as well as traditional and current public standards of beauty. The largest element of the Memorial's design is a gargantuan "tapestry" of industrial steel cables. The screen is larger than the iconic Hollywood sign in Los Angeles. Viewed close up, the coiled steel resembles the snakes on Medusa's head. We fear that the tapestry would come to be called the "iron curtain."

The main "tapestry" and two smaller ones nearby are supported by ten enormous pillars (so-called "columns") 80-feet tall and 11-to-12-feet in diameter. The towers are so large that Gehry has admitted, "They are almost buildings. . . . [T]hey are huge in this scheme. So they are more like buildings." The oppressively sized pillars would make visitors feel like ants.

Opponents of the highly unpopular design include the entire Eisenhower family along with George Will, David Brooks, David Frum, Ross Douthat, George Weigel, Pulitzer Prize-winner David Shribman, and former NEH Director Bruce Cole. Newspapers that have come out against it include the New York Post, Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, the Topeka Capital-Journal, the Washington Examiner, and the Kearney Hub (of Nebraska). Articles in opposition have appeared in The New Republic, the Wichita Eagle, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, National Review, the Weekly Standard, the Washington Post, the Baltimore Sun, the Boston Globe, Human Events, Foreign Policy magazine, and many more.

Opposition has come from across the political spectrum, and from architects and critics both congenial and opposed to Modernist architecture. As a supplement to our testimony, we have included an index of over 70 selected articles, editorials, and letters critical of the Eisenhower Memorial. An 190-page compilation of those articles can be found at our website, www.civicart.org.

In addition to the criticism of Gehry's design, the durability of the experimental structure—a cable wire mesh held in tension between the giant pillars—has been called into question by the government's materials experts. In the most recent technical report submitted to the National Capital Planning Commission, the Department of the Army's expert recommended that an identical set of duplicate tapestries be built to serve as enormous spare parts when the tapestry becomes degraded or damaged. This would entail spending tens of millions of dollars beyond the $142

million the Memorial is already estimated to cost. The government's experts have even warned of the possibility of dangerous snow and ice falling on visitors.

In short, the Memorial design and process have been wrong in their aesthetics, wrong in their economics, and wrong in their physics. And perhaps Representative Darrell Issa's House Oversight investigation will find that the process was wrong in its ethics.

Congress now has no choice but to go back to the drawing board and pass a bill to ensure that President Eisenhower gets the Memorial he deserves. We must keep in mind that the client here is not the congressional Eisenhower Commission but the Congress that created it. Ultimately, however, the client is the American people. Nothing could be more democratic than an open competition that provides opportunity for comment from both Congress and the public.

Sadly, the bill under discussion today must make explicit what used to be assumed without question. Consider the act creating Flight 93 National Memorial, which commemorates the flight's passengers and crew. Congress explicitly stated "For the purposes of this Act, the terrorists on United Airlines Flight 93 on September 11, 2001, shall not be considered passengers or crew of that flight." That Congress was felt the need to insert this language shows that something has gone terribly awry among the artistic and architectural elite.

What then are the universal requirements of a monument? Monuments are civic art that cause us to solemnly reflect on who we are and what we value. They are heroic-sized, timeless, and possess grandeur. They present an ideal we aspire to rather than warts-and-all reality. Sacred and transcendent, they inspire instead of demoralizing us. They must honor, not merely remember their subjects. They must be made of noble materials—such as marble and bronze—that have proven their durability over millennia, not industrial materials such as steel and PVC piping. Monuments are permanent and must appear permanent, unlike a scrim or a shroud. Monuments ought to be clear and unequivocal in their meaning: They should evince a few simple ideas in a way that is graspable by ordinary Americans. They must be legible without a guide or key, and certainly without a visitor center or iPad. Monuments speak to us even without signage. You can be inspired by a monument even if you do not know who is represented or what that person did. Monuments are not museums and they should not try to tell stories. They are not inkblots that leave things to the interpretation of the visitor. Monuments are statements, not question marks. Maya Lin rightly said that her intentionally ambiguous Vietnam Memorial is an "antimonument."

In addition to satisfying all of these requirements, the Eisenhower Memorial must continue our Founder's classical vision for the nation's capital as embodied in the L'Enfant and McMillan Plans and the design of our core buildings of government. The memorial must harmonize with the best of our tradition of presidential memorials, the National Mall, and the Monumental Core. There is no better way to honor Eisenhower the general, the president, and the man than in the unmistakably American idiom that the American people love and cherish.

A traditional man of old-fashioned virtue, President Eisenhower disdained Modernist art and architecture, which he did not believe represented the taste and values of the American people. He warned in 1962, "We see our very art forms so changed that we seem to have forgotten the works of Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci . . . What has happened to our concept of beauty and decency and morality?"

America can and will build Eisenhower a monument that will prove his fears unfounded. The talent is there. Now is the time to find it.

Index to Selected Articles, Editorials, and Letters Critical of Frank Gehry's Eisenhower Memorial

Compiled March 27, 2013 by the

National Civic Art Society
www.civicart.org ★ info@civicart.org ★ (202) 670–1776
904 Massachusetts Ave. NE, Washington, DC 20002

A PDF file containing all of these articles can be found at our website: www.civicart.org

Exact location:
http://www.civicart.org/Eisenhower/Articles_Critical_of_Frank_Gehry_Eisenhower_Memorial.pdf

Belz, Herman; *An insult to Ike;* Baltimore Sun, June 11, 2012
Bethel, Tom; *A Monstrosity, Not a Monument;* The American Spectator, December 2011–January 2012 Issue
Bevilacqua, Matt; *Washington's Monument Problem;* NextCity, February 10, 2012
Blackson, Howard; *Eisenhower Memorial controversy puts focus on urban design;* Better! Cities & Towns, March 29, 2012
Bootsma, Erik; *Why a classical memorial better honors Eisenhower;* Greater Greater Washington, June 9, 2011
Bromund, Ted; *Ordered Liberty and Controlled Chaos;* Commentary Magazine, March 7, 2012
Brooks, David; *The Follower Problem;* The New York Times, June 11, 2012
Brussat, David; *The Eisenhower memorial flap;* Newsday, March 12, 2012
Cooper, Robbie; *What Wasteful Spending? $90M Spent (so far) on a Memorial That Hasn't Been Built;* Urban Grounds, March 27, 2013
Campbell, Robert; *Pressing pause, for cause, on the Eisenhower Memorial;* The Boston Globe, October 13, 2012
Cheaney, Janie; *The proposed Eisenhower memorial reflects a nation that has forgotten greatness;* World, January 30, 2012
Editorial Board; *Some don't like Ike's memorial;* The Topeka Capital Journal, January 13, 2012
Cohen, Richard; *With Eisenhower, art does not imitate his life;* Washington Post, April 9, 2012
Cole, Bruce; *Doing Right by Ike: Let's give him the memorial he deserves;* The Weekly Standard, July 2–9, 2012, Vol. 17, No. 40
Crosby, Greg*; Do They Really Like Ike?;* The Tolucan Times, April 5, 2012
Driehaus, Richard; *It isn't too late to get the Eisenhower Memorial right;* Washington Post, March 27, 2013
Eisenhower Family, *Letters asking NCPC to halt Frank Gehry's Eisenhower Memorial,* January 9, 2012
Ferguson, Andrew; *Re-Gendered Ike;* The Weekly Standard, March 12, 2012
Frank, Jeffrey; *Rescuing the Eisenhower Memorial;* The New Yorker, March 25, 2013
Frum, David; *Redesign the Ike Monument;* Daily Beast, February 21, 2012
Greenberg, Paul*; I Still Like Ike;* Arkansas Democrat Gazette, December 14, 2012
Grenfell, Milton; *Rybczynski is wrong on the Eisenhower memorial;* Better! Cities & Towns, April 9, 2012
Grenfell, Milton; *A test for the Eisenhower Memorial;* Better! Cities & Towns, May 23, 2012
Gunther, Paul; *Designing an Eisenhower Memorial On The Mall In DC;* Huffington Post, February 7, 2012
Hauenstein, Ralph; *Honoring Ike—a veteran's perspective;* Stars and Stripes, August 8, 2012
Hopkins, Christopher; *How Should We Remember Ike*?; National Journal, April 20, 2012
Howard, Sabin; *What happened with Frank Gehry on the Eisenhower Memorial;* Sabin Howard Sculpture, December 7, 2012
Hudson, Audrey; *Monumental Mistake: Eisenhower Memorial;* Human Events, May 2012
Jost, Daniel; *Monumental Prices;* Landscape Architecture Magazine, June 20, 2012
Joynt, Carol Ross; *A Q&A With Susan Eisenhower About the Fight Over Her Grandfather's Memorial;* Washingtonian, January 8, 2012
Kabaservice, Geoffrey; *Why Won't the GOP Stick Up For Dwight Eisenhower;* New Republic, March 7, 2012
Editorial; *Ike earned his memorial, but make it fit the man;* Kearney Hub, March 13, 2012
Knight, Paul; *Architecture, urbanism and the Eisenhower Memorial;* Better! Cities & Towns, August 15, 2012
Krier, Leon; *Eisenhower Memorial, Washington, DC;* Metropolis Magazine, February 14, 2012
Langdon, Philip; *Honoring Ike—and adding appropriately to the nation's capital;* Better! Cities & Towns, March 10, 2011
Langdon, Philip; *The trouble bedeviling the Eisenhower Memorial;* Better! Cities & Towns, February 8, 2012
Leigh, Catesby; *Monstrosity on The Mall;* National Review, June 21, 2012
Lewis, Michael; *Decline of American Memorials;* Impris, April 2012, Vol. 41, No. 4
Lewis, Roger; *Gehry's design for Eisenhower memorial misses the mark;* The Washington Post, January 30, 2012

Lewis, Roger; *Gehry's Eisenhower Memorial design needs to be rethought;* The Washington Post, April 6, 2012
Lungren, Daniel and Aaron Schock, Letter to NCPC rejecting Eisenhower Memorial design, February 27, 2012
Maggie; *$62M Spent on Eisenhower Memorial Not In Existence PLUS $2M a Year for STAFF SALARIES Since 1999;* Maggie's Notebook, March 18, 2013
Malouf, Dan; *Gehry Eisenhower memorial actually not daring enough?;* Greater Greater Washington, March 26, 2010
Mantyk, Evan, *New Design Could Save Troubled Eisenhower Monument;* Epoch Times, December 12, 2012
McCrary, Lewis; *Eisenhower and the Art-Architecture Complex;* The National Interest, March 27, 2013
Mercer, Marsha; *The Eisenhower memorial is a monumental headache;* TriCities, July 16, 2012
Mills, Nicolaus; Rethinking the Eisenhower Memorial, what is a fitting tribute to Ike?; The Guardian, July 4, 2012
Neff, Blake; *Another Monumental Dispute on the Mall;* New Criterion, October 24, 2011
Editorial Board; *More like Ike;* New York Post, March 17, 2013
O'Brien, Kevin; *Diminishing Eisenhower in D.C. memorial;* Cleveland Plain Dealer, January 12, 2012
Pogrebin, Robin; *Eisenhower Memorial in Criticism Barrage;* The New York Times, March 19, 2013.
Quigley, Bernie; 'Deconstruct' the Eisenhower memorial committee, The Hill, March 21, 2012
Roche, Sam; *Consider MIT, etc., and halt Ike memorial plan;* Providence Journal, September 26, 2012
Roche, Sam; *Time to Start Over on the Eisenhower Memorial;* Roll Call, January 21, 2013
Roche, Sam; *A Way around the Eisenhower Memorial Impasse;* Metropolis Magazine, November 11, 2012
Roche, Sam; *Flawed Selection Process Mars Eisenhower Memorial;* Huffington Post, June 12, 2012
Roff, Peter*; I Like Ike—Just Not His Planned Memorial;* U.S. News, February 22, 2013
Roff, Peter; *Consensus: The Design for Ike's Memorial Has Got to Go;* U.S. News, March 22, 2013.
Schoenberg, Irving; *Ike—and Me;* National Review, July 14, 2012
Scruton, Roger; *Monumental Egos;* The American Spectator, April 2012
Shribman, David; *Which Ike to like?;* Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, February 12, 2012
Shubow, Justin; *Let's Not Politicize The Eisenhower Memorial;* Huffington Post, March 1, 2012
Shubow, Justin; *A video-game Eisenhower Memorial?;* The Daily Caller, October 24, 2012
Shubow, Justin; *Frank Gehry's 'Eisen Curtain' must not descend upon the National Mall;* The Daily Caller, October 12, 2011
Smith, Brandon James; *Memorial design mocks Eisenhower's legacy;* The Wichita Eagle, January 13, 2012
Smith, Marion; *Postmodern Memorial Will Strip Eisenhower's Legacy;* The Founry, March 1, 2012
Sullivan, Gregory; *The brilliance of Dwight D. Eisenhower;* Times of Trenton, March 14, 2012
Taxpayers Tab; *The Least Expensive Bill of the Week;* National Taxpayers Union Foundation Taxpayers Tab Issue #10, March 22, 2013
Thadani, Dhiru; *A misshapen memorial to President Eisenhower;* Better! Cities & Towns, July 6, 2011
Tobin, Jonathan; *Why Don't They Like Ike?;* Commentary Magazine, February 20, 2012
Walt, Stephen; *Who likes Ike? Not Frank Gehry;* Foreign Policy, February 7, 2012
Editorial Board, *Ike doesn't deserve ugly 'iron curtain';* Washington Examiner, June 2, 2012
Weigel, George; *Gehry's Ghastly Eisenhower Memorial;* National Review Online, January 10, 2012
Will, George; *Eisenhower Memorial misses the man;* The Washington Post, February 17, 2012
Wind, Eric and Erik Bootsma; *The Problems with Gehry's Eisenhower Memorial;* First Things, March 29, 2012

Wind, Eric and Jack Carlson; *The Nation Mall's Monumental Mess;* American Thinker, October 29, 2011
Wind, Eric and Jack Carlson*; Ike wouldn't like it;* New York Post, September 21, 2012
Winters, Michael; *The Eisenhower Memorial Controversy;* National Catholic Reporter, February 16, 2012
Wolf, Franck; Letter to NCPC rejecting Eisenhower Memorial design, February 10, 2012

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. Shubow, and thank you, gentlemen, one and all.

The Chairman will yield to herself for 5 minutes for questions.

First of all, Mr. Shubow, when you look at the design, do you see a statement of national identity and the crystallization of history that you suggest should be the goals of a national monument?

Mr. SHUBOW. As Mr. Gehry has repeatedly stated, the main design element are the enormous tapestries, which are held by giant pillars 80 feet high and 11 to 12 feet wide. Those pillars are so big, they are larger than the columns inside the National Building Museum, which are among the biggest in the world.

What is on that "tapestry"? It is steel, spindly trees without leaves. What does that mean? It is permanent winter. And I think we can all agree that the allegory for that is death. So thus, when I look at trees without leaves, that could be any landscape in America, and overwhelmed by oppressive pillars. No, I do not see what Eisenhower represented, and I do not believe that the American people would even understand what is supposed to be represented.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Well, I stopped one day at Eisenhower's home in Kansas, and there are these massive oaks that are just very beautiful, in full leaf when I was there. And I would agree that depicting trees in the winter is not the scene that my mental image creates.

Here is a follow-up question, and this is more with regard to the process. Again, for Mr. Shubow, can you explain the connection between the inappropriate process that you believe was used to select the Eisenhower Memorial design, and the subsequent failure of the design to generate support among not only people like me, the Eisenhower family, and other commentators that you have heard?

Mr. SHUBOW. That is an excellent question. Perhaps one of the main reasons this memorial is barely on the public's radar screen, let alone Congress's radar screen, is that the entire competition was run secretly. No plans or so-called visions have ever been publicly displayed.

As you may know, the Eisenhower Memorial Commission has included, as a supplement to its testimony, a letter from the American Institute of Architects' CEO. The irony is—and the CEO is opposing the bill at issue today—the irony is, according to the AIA's own handbook of design competitions, they encourage, for works of national importance, public consideration of architectural designs, so that the public gets involved and excited. And, of course, that would improve the fundraising.

Mrs. LUMMIS. And that is in the AIA's own official guidelines?

Mr. SHUBOW. Yes, you can find it online.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. Shubow. At this time I would yield to the Ranking Member, Mr. Grijalva, for questions.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Madam Chair. So I get a better understanding, these questions will probably be—some will be for the whole panel, this first one is for the entire panel.

In Chairman Bishop's legislation, it has a provision that essentially overturns the entire Commission membership, and the bill also prohibits Federal funding. Finally, the Chairman's bill requires a new design. And can this all be accomplished in 3 years? That is a question for one or all.

Mr. MOORE. How long? Excuse me. How many years?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Three.

Mr. MOORE. I certainly believe so.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Sir? General?

General REDDEL. From the experience of watching the Commission work, the complexity of the process, the Commemorative Works Act requirements, and the review and approval process, I believe it would be extremely difficult to do that.

Mr. SHUBOW. I would say if you look at the competition that was held for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, it was a very simple competition. In fact, the program was just 36 words. In this case, we have three different booklets that goes on for dozens and dozens of pages. So, what I am——

Mr. GRIJALVA. That is the—I am not done yet, thank you.

Mr. SHUBOW. OK.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Unless we over-reach and change the process itself in the legislation, then we are still dealing with that process and that time line. Am I correct, General?

General REDDEL. The way I have come to understand the process, the process has become complex and appropriately deliberative, especially in recent years, the last couple of decades, the competition for space, highly prized space, the need to deliberately think in terms of serving the public for all time perpetually. And, as a result of that, the review process is complicated. And the requirements are there and in place. So, it is not appropriate, and would be very difficult to circumvent or to accelerate through that process.

In the Commission's case, they first had to decide what an appropriate concept was, where it should be, looked at 26 alternative sites, and so on. So it is a very complicated process.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me follow on that. I think most of us would agree that the Commemorative Works Act has worked well in proving this rigorous approval process and the siting and the design of new memorials that you mentioned, General.

And this is for the entire panel. And no one on this Committee is even suggesting, I don't think, amending that process. And instead, I think most of you all want a new design. That seems to be the issue. So, help me understand this, is it a breakdown of the process, or is it a personality breakdown?

General REDDEL. I believe each one of us might have a different response to that.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Just go to——

General REDDEL. First of all, I would like to assure the Committee members here today that the Commission took very seri-

ously the legacy and attempted, at its very outset, to mobilize, in fact, this country's very best expertise in Eisenhower, to codify that, and to bring it to a stage where it could be appropriately given to an artist to develop. So that, the mention of the legacy, was taken very seriously.

My own professional background as former professor and head of the Department of History at the Air Force Academy tilted me in that direction, and we went to General Goodpaster, we went to the editors of the Eisenhower Papers. We went to, literally, the world's expertise to specify those elements.

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK. Sir? Mr. Moore?

Mr. MOORE. Yes. Well, I won a competition to do the Library of Congress. And we actually—in 3 years, we not only won the competition, but we did the whole design. So——

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK, thank you.

Mr. MOORE [continuing]. I think that 3 years is quite a lot of time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I appreciate that. Sir?

Mr. SHUBOW. As for the process, what it has given us is a design that is widely unpopular, incredibly expensive, probably not permanent. And so, therefore, that is why we are at this——

Mr. GRIJALVA. So you would suggest that the process is the problem, not the personalities.

Mr. SHUBOW. Well, I would think that there are actually multiple problems here.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Would you——

Mr. SHUBOW. The process is easily the initial one.

Mr. GRIJALVA. So you would suggest this legislation should not only undo the membership of the Commission, defund it from a Federal site, but perhaps go as deep as changing the process of the Commemorative Act?

Mr. SHUBOW. No, I don't believe we should change the Commemorative Works Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Oh, OK.

Mr. SHUBOW. It explicitly says in its purpose that the design should reflect a consensus of the lasting national significance of the subjects involved. And it is——

Mrs. LUMMIS. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SHUBOW. OK.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you so much. Next we go to Mr. McClintock, the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Ranking Member's concern that this bill will delay construction of the memorial, I think it needs to be pointed out that this memorial is likely never to be completed in its current form, because it will never be funded in its current form. This requires us to step back and redesign the process in a manner that will produce an appropriate design.

General Reddel noted controversies involving the design of the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, of the Washington Monument, with the implication that, well, these are just normal controversies, it is an affirmation of the design. Well, I would say to General Reddel that if I were to place pictures of the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, the Washington Monument, and this design to-

gether, and asked the question, "Which thing doesn't belong with the others," the answer is self-evident and intuitive, which I think speaks volumes of how inappropriate it is.

Mr. Shubow, you mentioned what a memorial should be, the principals that should guide the design of any of our memorials and monuments here in Washington. And it was beautifully stated. Would you mind restating it, or—if you have that there in your text? Otherwise, I have the printed copy; I will read it.

Mr. SHUBOW. Well, there are multiple——

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Well, let me just point you to the paragraph. "Monuments are civic art that cause us to solemnly reflect on who we are and what we value." Do you have that in your text?

Mr. SHUBOW. I do, and I am quite glad, actually, that you specifically mention that, because the Eisenhower Memorial Commission has repeatedly said that this memorial is primarily intended for children. In effect, they are describing it as a tourist attraction, a theme park. If you even look at their renderings, there are children playing with kites. There is going to be the so-called eMemorial, where people are encouraged to pull out their iPods, their iPads, and other electronic devices to use augmented reality to look around the memorial.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Let me——

Mr. SHUBOW. When you go to the Lincoln Memorial, there is no need for any of that.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Your point is well taken. But what I really want to focus on are the words that you spoke, which I think are just a beautiful description of what we ought to be focusing on. You said that, "These monuments are heroic-sized, timeless, and possess grandeur. They present an ideal we aspire to, rather than warts-and-all reality. Sacred and transcendent, they inspire instead of demoralizing us. They must honor, not merely remember their subjects. They must be made of noble materials, such as marble and bronze, that have proven their durability over millennia, not industrial material, such as steel and PVC piping. Monuments are permanent, and they must appear permanent, unlike a scrim or a shroud.

"Monuments ought to be clear and unequivocal in their meaning. They should evince a few simple ideas in a way that is graspable by ordinary Americans. They must be legible, without a guide or key, and certainly without a visitor center or iPad. Monuments speak to us even without signage. You can be inspired by a monument, even if you do not know who is represented, or what that person did. Monuments are not museums, and they should not try and tell stories. They are not ink blots that leave things to the interpretation of the visitor. Monuments are statements, not question marks."

That is the most beautiful description of what we ought to be focused on that I have seen. I think that in whatever future legislation we adopt, this ought to be the preamble of it. I want to commend you for the most clear-headed statement I have seen on this subject, and I would leave off as I began, that these memorials are meant for the ages to stand the test of time.

Mr. SHUBOW. Thank you.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. McClintock. And now we will go to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Holt.

Dr. HOLT. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am trying to understand really what the problems are here. I am not sure that I have heard that this is wildly unpopular. There are certainly some people who have strong objections to it. But I have also heard comments in favor of the design, or something like the current design. There is no—and I want to make sure that we are not just getting into warring designs.

Mr. Moore, you have presented something that would be at Constitution Park, replacing some of the grove of trees there, I believe. There are other designs possible. And it is worth noting that the designs in Washington, the monuments that we have, and memorials, are very different: Washington and Lincoln and the Korean War and Martin Luther King and Freedom Plaza.

And so, I am trying to understand whether the problem is with particulars, and everybody has different particular objections, and whether it can be brought into more complete acceptance by changing some of those particulars. Whether it is just that Maryland Avenue is not as grand now as L'Enfant intended, and nor is it as grand as Pennsylvania Avenue is. And I am sure the Maryland delegation here and the Minority leader, Ms. Pelosi, would love to have Maryland Avenue as grand as Pennsylvania Avenue. But that is a problem that exists apart from this monument.

Is the objection that the trees don't' have leaves? Is the objection that the panels are too high and boxlike? So can we fix this by putting leaves on the trees and satisfying more people? Or making sure the panels are not rectilinear and perhaps lower—I don't know. But we could be redesigning this forever. And, as I said earlier, I am eager to see a memorial worthy of this great American.

And, by the way, I mentioned earlier that my mother had served in the Eisenhower Administration. She turns 100 years old this year. She remembers the President fondly, and said to me just last night that we do want to respect the concerns and the wishes of the family. But she also acknowledged, as has the family, that this belongs to ages into the future, and not just the family.

So, let me ask you, Mr. Cotton, in the short time I am allowed now, is it that the panels are too high and too boxlike? If this design were moved to Constitution Park in place of that grove of trees, would you object to the design? Or is it what it does to Maryland Avenue that offends you?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, I would like to answer that. Basically, the panels and the columns could even be redesigned to allow Maryland Avenue to go through.

Maryland Avenue has actually been endorsed by the National Capital Planning Commission——

Dr. HOLT. It would help me understand it better if you answered the question.

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Dr. HOLT. If this design were moved to Constitution Park, would that remove your objections?

Mr. MOORE. It would, it would, because I think that what we are trying to do here—and I was only showing you alternatives that don't interfere with the historic plan of Washington——

Dr. HOLT. Well, I found your alternatives attractive.

Mr. MOORE [continuing]. Which has been around for 213 years.

Dr. HOLT. I understand that.

Mr. MOORE. And there has been no incursion into the 160-foot reservation for Maryland Avenue. So it can be realized exactly as L'Enfant and McMillan—and we intend to do that.

Dr. HOLT. Thank you. Well, I have not allowed enough time for other comments. I just go back to remembering the fierce objections to Maya Lin's design of the Vietnam Memorial. I mean fierce objections. It is now highly regarded, and a place of reverence, even. So I think maybe there is a lesson there. Thank you.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. Holt. And there is definitely a lesson here, because as we have gone along just the dais here, I like the concept of keeping Maryland Avenue's original orientation open and available. Some others here not so much. I don't like the way that Martin Luther King was depicted in that memorial, others do. Some like this design, I'm not really smitten with this design for the Eisenhower Memorial. So even just among the people here, you see the kind of diversity of opinion that makes these things so difficult.

So, not myself being terribly artistic, I am going to switch to the dollars for my next round of questioning. General Reddel, of the $30 million in taxpayer dollars that were appropriated in December 2011 for construction—and I understand that in front of this Committee about a year ago the Commission stated that $9 million had been obligated—how much has been spent? And what was it spent on? And is there any left?

General REDDEL. The money you are referring to that was given to us for design and construction remains basically there with, I believe, something like $7 to $9 million having been expended in support of completion of the design activities preparatory for construction.

Mrs. LUMMIS. OK. And could you tell me what that entails? What goes into preparation for construction? Is it design drawings?

General REDDEL. Well, I would like to answer that question technically and correctly. And in order to do that, it would be best, really for me to try to get back to you, ma'am with the details on that.

Part of the effort here and the monies expended have been tied to the delay in the process as we have made an effort to bring us completely as possible to an end of the design process itself. And——

Mrs. LUMMIS. I would be most grateful for a complete accounting of that $30 million to date, and planning was curtailed in order to accommodate discussions such as the one we are having today. Might that be provided to this Committee?

General REDDEL. Of course, yes. Yes, indeed, ma'am. We can do that.

Mrs. LUMMIS. And I would like to visit about the lack of transparency in the process. What is the goal of avoiding transparency?

General REDDEL. Well, first of all, I would like to suggest that there has been no conscious effort by the Commission to avoid transparency. The Commission has complied from the very beginning with the Commemorative Works Act, the other provisions for hearings. The 22 meetings we had on a regularly scheduled and

publicly available basis over the 2 years of the design process I put forward as an example of what is a public process.

The degree to which people began to participate in that process or make contributions in that process on their own volition is a matter up to them. Some individuals did not participate in all those 22 meetings. Some came, some did not. But I bring that point up because there has never been a concern by the Commission to be secretive or not to share the results.

And I would like to suggest that even our Web site today is an effort to put the facts forward as best we can. The minutes of all of our meetings are available there. And, in fact, people can judge for themselves by reading those minutes the degree to which we were deliberate, informed, and tried to benefit from the history of the past.

The other thing is that we were benefitting, I believe, from an unusual amount of breadth and bipartisanship in the effort to do the memorial right for this great American. And I bring that up in part because I didn't know Senator Inouye had done so much for memorialization. And his advice was extremely important for us. And he would be the last individual to say somehow we should be secretive in the process. At the same time, on the Republican side, from the day that Senator Ted Stevens was involved, now with Senator Pat Roberts from Kansas, there has been a real effort to try to share as much as we can the results of our work.

So, the sense that it was a closed-door process is, from my viewpoint, as you can gather, not fully correct.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, General. And I will look at your Web site.

I might also ask both of our other witnesses to respond, as well. Mr. Moore?

Mr. MOORE. Yes. Me, I have attended. And in conjunction with Judy Feldman, who is the Chair of the Coalition to Save our Mall, we have been attending the 106 process, the historic preservation process.

One of the dictates of that process is to consider the historic context that you are putting your memorial in. And, in fact, the historical context is the great plans of Washington, L'Enfant and McMillan. So, we feel that was not regarded, and we have said so at the 106 meetings.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thanks, Mr. Moore. My time has expired. And so I want to just give Mr. Shubow 10 seconds to respond to the same question, as well.

Mr. SHUBOW. Sure. I would stress that there are no minutes from the crucial meeting at which the Commission chose Frank Gehry. When the Commission was asked about this, they said they had no official meeting at that time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you. Mr. Grijalva.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes. And pardon me for asking questions in an attempt to gather information about the consequences, intended or unintended of the legislation or the precedence that might be set. Because as we rush this forward, questions will remain.

And one of them, some have called on this panel and others, for the end of Federal funding for the memorial in addition to a new design. So if we amend the original authorization to reflect these

two changes, no funding, new design, what then is the oversight role for Congress? I can begin with you, General, if you don't mind. They are tied to—well——

General REDDEL. Well, I gather we are dealing with hypotheticals here.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Hypothetical would be that this legislation moved forward and passes and is signed by the President. A series of hypotheticals.

General REDDEL. Well, in realistic effect, it would set aside the cumulative work of the congressional Commission, which was tasked by law to do what it has done. My impression is it would set that work, the invested money, taxpayer money, and time—the Commission expended $10 million over the period of time to come to terms with where the memorial should be, and the direction that it should take, given the diversity and complexity of the President-and-General's legacy. That work and the subsequent work would be, in effect, limited, curtailed, and delimited in a very real, real way. In other words, to set that effectively aside.

And the other thing I would point out is there has been a considerable continuity of effort with the commissioners through time. They have learned about the process, they have learned from each other. They have come to terms with the complexity of dealing with these things. And so, that experience would, from my viewpoint, be set aside. And that would not be insignificant.

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK, thank you. I yield back, Madam Chair.

Mrs. LUMMIS. OK. Mr. Holt.

Dr. HOLT. Thank you. I didn't allow time for the General or Mr. Shubow to answer my earlier question, whether you think that there are a finite number of specific changes that could be made to the design before us to make it acceptable to obviously not everybody, never everybody, but to the principal objectors.

Mr. SHUBOW. I would say that the design is not salvageable.

Dr. HOLT. Not salvageable. OK.

Mr. SHUBOW. Putting aside what is on the tapestries, any structure of this kind, if you look at it close, looks like Medusa's head. You have never seen photos of the tapestry up close. The only way I found them was digging at the Commission of Fine Arts. They are giant steel cables. It looks like something you would find on a bridge.

In addition to that, I would note that being a steel "tapestry," it is likely that it will end up being called The Iron Curtain, which I believe is not appropriate as an Eisenhower——

Dr. HOLT. Yes, I had read the family's objections that tapestries were what are found in structures in totalitarian countries. I guess I don't understand that.

But General, what possibilities do you see of further changes in the existing design to address—and in part you might talk about some of the changes that have been made to bring it to this point.

General REDDEL. Right. Well, in addressing that question——

Dr. HOLT. To address objections.

General REDDEL [continuing]. I am, of course, as you might imagine, hesitant to speak for the architect himself, and I don't pretend to do that. So I will give you my view in an effort to respond openly and candidly to your question.

My impression of the architect is that he has a method and a process which is unusually open and flexible that he listens repeatedly to inputs, and that he does make significant changes. I did attend the meeting that he held in New York City in December 2011 as an initial effort on his part with Susan and Anne Eisenhower as representatives of the family, and watched at that meeting where, from my viewpoint, he very consciously chose that he would address the question of not giving enough significance to the General and the President, in terms of his greatness. And he quite literally moved away from the baas relief images that he had, and created the independent, heroic-sized statuary, which continues to be under additional refinement.

He has listened, I believe, very carefully to the descriptions of the time and seasons of the year, as they are reflected in the artistic work of the tapestries themselves. In contrast to some of the things you have heard today, the Commission of Fine Arts was emphatic about its belief that he had achieved the artistic effect they had, in effect, directed him to achieve.

So there are, really, obviously, two sets of opinion in this. And I have gone on with my view of his flexibility as an artist and as an architect, because I believe he does listen, and that he has made repeated efforts to have people visit him at the studio. Congressman Issa, who was with us earlier, you may recall said that he has visited the studio and taken a look at this. To my way of thinking, that door has always been open and is open today.

Dr. HOLT. Another question, General. How many commissioner vacancies are there, currently?

General REDDEL. We currently, with Senator Inouye's passing, now have a total of three. So we have a Presidential vacancy. We also have a senatorial vacancy. And then, Congressman Boswell from this chamber was our last——

Dr. HOLT. And this legislation would create all vacancies. One commissioner would be able to continue, I guess. Is that a correct interpretation of the legislation?

General REDDEL. Yes, the commissioners are not term-limited, as it now exists. In other words, they——

Dr. HOLT. And this would—I see.

General REDDEL. They have continued.

Dr. HOLT. Another thing that I am—and it is maybe not for you, any of these witnesses, to clarify. As I read the bill, it says a design would be selected for the memorial, as an alternative.

So, it doesn't necessarily mean that this design is in the trash heap. There would be another choice. There is alternative A, which exists now. This would require that there be selected an alternative to the current design, which, as I read it, would be alternative B. It surely would delay things, but it might not require junking what exists.

Anyway, the only thing worse than art designed by a Committee is art designed by a Congressional committee.

[Laughter.]

Dr. HOLT. So I hope we can find a way to bring this to general acceptance so that we can have a memorial to this great American. And——

Mrs. LUMMIS. Those were fine summary remarks, Mr. Holt.

Dr. HOLT. I think that is the end of my time. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. I would like to thank you gentlemen and gentlelady for your valuable testimony and patience, and the Members for their terrific participation. Members of the Subcommittee may have additional questions for the witnesses, and we ask you to respond to these in writing.

General, you have already heard my request for a full accounting of the $30 million.

And we look forward to receiving that. The hearing record will remain open for 10 days to receive these responses.

If there is no further business, the Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:37 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

[A press release submitted for the record by The American Institute of Architects follows:]

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Press Release:

Architects Issue Statement Opposing House Bill Eliminating Funding for Eisenhower Memorial

Contact: John Schneidawind 202–626–7457
johnsctaeidawnd@aia.org http://tmtter.cpSAIA_Media

For immediate release:

Washington, D.C.,—March 15, 2013—The American Institute of Architects (A1A) today issued the following statement in opposition to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Completion Act, introduced Wednesday by Rep. Rob Bishop (R-Utah). Among other things, the legislation would mandate an alternative to architect Frank Gehry's design for the Eisenhower Memorial and would eliminate further federal funding for the project.

Please attribute the following statement to AIA Chief Executive Officer Robert Ivy. FAIA:

"Representative Bishop's legislation allows Congress to exercise governmental authority in a wholly arbitrary manner that negates the stated selection process It is nothing more than an effort to intimidate the innovative thinking for which our profession is recognized at home and around the globe. We intend to vigorously oppose it."

"The AIA doesn't offer any assessment on whether the Eisenhower Memorial Design is good or bad. The Congressman says the intent of his bill is to seek consensus around a design for the memorial. We wonder how his bill can achieve that stated consensus when it specifically bans the current design proposal."

[A letter submitted for the record by General P.X. Kelley, USMC (Ret.), Former Chairman, American Battle Monument Commission, and Former Commander, U.S. Marine Corps, follows:]

1600 North Oak Street, #1619
Arlington, VA 22019

18 March 2013

Honorable Rob Bishop
House Natural Resources Committee
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Bishop,

I am writing to you in my position as Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission (EMC). In addition to my current role as a senior advisor to the EMC, I had the privilege of serving as the Chairman of the American Battle Monument Commission (ABMC) for several years directing the planning and construction of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC. You might say that, in addition to being the 28th Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, I am the most senior veteran of Washington's "memorial wars."

Building a national memorial can be complicated, chaotic, and often unpredictable. A successful outcome requires tenacity, perseverance and decisiveness. Not everyone will like every aspect of a memorial – its design, commemorative quotations, location, or other features. The selection of an architect, a design, and an appropriate site, and the process of obtaining approval for these and other matters relating to the memorial, can take years, even decades. Approvals must come from a diverse array of government and civic institutions and bureaucracies. From venue, to design, to materials and construction protocols, numerous people and organizations have a say in the outcome.

The very purpose of our national memorials is to provide diverse audiences from across the country and around the world the opportunity to honor America's heroes and statesmen. However, as Abraham Lincoln observed, you can't please all of the people all of the time. I very much respect the Eisenhower family's desire to continue their role in establishing the memorial following David Eisenhower's decade of service on the Commission. The time he served on the EMC, and the contribution he made to the memorial effort were of tremendous, enduring value. And yet, I know from experience that what resonates with national and international visitors may not always be in harmony with the family's preferences, much less proponents of certain design philosophies who have arrived late in the process.

In the past year and a half, as it moved toward the approvals process, the Eisenhower National Memorial has experienced many of the same growing pains that the ABMC encountered while creating the World War II Memorial – disparate opinions on placement, design, materials and more. In the case of the World War II Memorial, this debate ultimately helped build a healthy

process for the evolution and refinement of decisions that strengthened the memorial's design, message and impact.
Dwight D. Eisenhower was an exemplary American and a great international statesman. From his modest beginnings in America's heartland, to his ascension to the world stage, his leadership had an enduring impact on our Nation and the world. His life and legacy should be honored in a manner appropriate to his status as an American hero and an international leader.

Those of us associated with the EMC – Secretary George Shultz, Senator Bob Dole, and General Richard Myers, to name a few – respect and appreciate your interest in the Eisenhower National Memorial. However, the effort to memorialize General and President Eisenhower has been well underway for over a dozen years and we are deeply concerned that H.R. 1126, should it be enacted into law, would needlessly cripple the Commission's twelve years of progress. In addition, the law would negate the work accomplished by the Commissioners – the majority of whom are your Congressional colleagues – who have all labored long and hard to bring to life the great vision of our friends, the late Senators Stevens and Inouye, whose legislation created the Eisenhower National Memorial in 1999.

Respectfully,

General P.X. Kelley, USMC (Ret.)
Former Chairman, American Battle Monument Commission
Former Commandant, United States Marine Corps

○