



CHAIRMAN

LAURA M. RICHARDS, ESQ.

SECRETARY

RICHARD HOUGHTON

TREASURER

FRANCIS M. CLARKE, III

TRUSTEES

MICHAEL BERMAN

WARD BUCHER

GEORGE R. CLARK, ESQ.

W. KENT COOPER, FAIA

ANDREA C. FERSTER, ESQ.

ERIC S. GRAYE

CARROLL GREEN

DON ALEXANDER HAWKINS

MEG MAGUIRE

HON. JAMES E. NATHANSON

LORETTA NEUMANN

GEORGE H.F. OBERLANDER, AICP

CHARLES J. ROBERTSON

MARY PAT ROWAN

RICHARD WESTBROOK

JOHN YAGO

BARBARA ZARTMAN

October 9, 2008

National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, NW
North Lobby, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20004

Attn: Elizabeth Miller, AICP, ASLA
Project Officer, Sr. Urban Planner/Designer

Dear Ms. Miller:

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City is pleased to submit these comments on the *Draft National Capital Framework Plan: Destinations and Connections Beyond the National Mall*. The Committee of 100 on the Federal City has long been concerned with protecting and enhancing, in our time, the various elements of the L'Enfant Plan (1791) and the planning work of the McMillan Commission (1901-1902). The proposed *National Capital Framework Plan* is important in protecting and enhancing the Monumental Core of Washington, D.C. and in better connecting it with adjacent areas. The *Draft National Capital Framework Plan* was released on July 10, 2008 for a 90-day public review period (ending October 10, 2008).

COORDINATED CENTRAL WASHINGTON PLANNING

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City commends the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) for working together to prepare the *National Capital Framework Plan*. This proposed plan builds on the earlier planning work by the National Capital Planning Commission, *Extending the Legacy: Planning America's Capital for the 21st Century* (1997). We know that this program has involved coordination with other federal and District of Columbia planning and development agencies, as well as private organizations and civic groups.

The *National Capital Framework Plan* is a key part of a number of recent and current planning efforts for Central Washington (the original L'Enfant

Plan area and some adjacent areas). The brochure, *Planning Together for Central Washington* (published spring 2008 by NCPC), reflects the current efforts of four federal agencies (NCPC, CFA, NPS and AOC) and the District government (Office of Planning, etc.) on four significant planning programs that affect Central Washington.

Center City Action Agenda: This plan (“action agenda”), prepared primarily by the D.C. Office of Planning and the Downtown BID, was released on March 3, 2008. A number of planning and development initiatives are underway in the traditional “Downtown” as well as other studies and initiatives in the “emerging districts” of “Center City” Washington.

National Capital Framework Plan: This plan, the subject of these review comments, is summarized and discussed below. We understand that, after October 10, the NCPC and CFA will make appropriate revisions and refinements to the draft plan, and want to adopt the final plan at their respective meetings in December 2008.

National Mall Plan: The National Park Service is preparing a long-range (50 year) plan for the National Mall and the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Park. The Committee of 100 is one of a number of organizations that have been involved with the Section 106 consultation process for this plan. The original schedule called for a draft plan is to be completed near the end of 2008, with further review and comment after that time. However, work on the Plan has been extended. It now appears that a draft plan will be produced sometime in 2009.

Capitol Complex Master Plan: Work on this plan is underway by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (AOC), with consultants. It now appears that public release of this plan will not come until sometime in 2009.

Need for an Overall Summary Plan

These four major plans, and other smaller or more focused planning efforts, have proceeded on somewhat different time lines. It appears that there is a high level of internal consultation and coordination among federal, regional and District agencies, and other organizations, on these plans. **The coordination among various planning agencies is very commendable.** However, the different time lines make it difficult for policy makers, the public, and concerned organizations, such as the Committee of 100, to track and understand how these plans are supposed to fit together.

Recommendation: The Committee of 100 believes that coordination needs to continue. **When all the various key planning programs are completed (probably in mid or late 2009), some kind of overview publication should be prepared to indicate how the various plans fit together.**

EVALUATING THE NATIONAL CAPITAL FRAMEWORK PLAN

The National Capital Framework Plan deals primarily with four main focus areas, with lesser emphasis on two additional areas. Of the four main focus areas, two (**Northwest Rectangle** and the **Federal Triangle**) are north of the National Mall and the other two (**Southwest Rectangle** and **East Potomac Park**) are south of the National Mall. Two other areas are also part of the Plan, though these are somewhat secondary and receive limited attention. The first of these is the **South Capitol Street Waterfront** (a relatively small area south of the new Nationals Ballpark to the edge of the Anacostia River). The other secondary area is the **East Capitol Street Waterfront** (a relatively large area east of 19th Street, NE/SE), that includes the D.C. Armory, RFK Stadium and considerable federal parkland along the Anacostia River.

Addressing Past Problems

A number of the proposed actions in the *National Capital Framework Plan*, especially for the four main areas adjacent to the National Mall, involve addressing past planning and development actions that are now seen as mistakes, or at least undesirable, in progressing toward the Central Washington of the future. Most of these mistakes date from the last 50-60 years (primarily after World War II), when concepts of freeways, urban renewal superblocks and massive buildings combined to create an urban landscape that is sometimes unfriendly, sometimes unsafe, and now often considered unattractive. However, some of the problems date back further, when concepts of monumentality led to a disconnect between the “Monumental Core” and adjacent areas.

Many of these problems have been recognized for many years. Various solutions have been advanced from time-to-time, though not always outlined in a comprehensive approach. **NCPC and CFA deserve credit for working to address these problems in an overall approach.**

Time and Cost of Implementing the Framework Plan

The *National Capital Framework Plan* is presented in somewhat general terms. Understandably, there are not detailed schedules or budgets for implementation. However, it is evident that achieving the proposed results will take many years, probably extending as long as the next ten to forty years in some cases (to 2050) or even longer. Overall cost would be many millions of dollars, involving both public and private funds. However, if these problems are to be addressed and eventually corrected, it is useful to lay out a plan and begin moving in new directions. The Committee believes it is especially important not to lock in old mistakes, but to outline new frameworks in which appropriate change, over time, can move toward the desired pattern.

Whatever plan is adopted, there will be a need for more study and evaluation of different plan elements over time. Some changes in the plan will occur, in one direction or the other. The important point is to be clear on the best overall direction from the beginning. In addition, some new implementation mechanisms will be necessary in order to effectively undertake many of the

proposals in a timely manner. The Framework Plan indicates some possible approaches, including a federal development corporation, in the last section of the report (page 61). The need for implementation measures should be emphasized and receive more attention as the plan is refined. The former Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation (PADC) is a possible model. At the same time, implementation measures need to recognize the planning and development roles of the District government.

Evaluation Framework

These comments of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City are intended to address key issues and hopefully will encourage some refined thinking and reevaluation when appropriate. For each of the six areas in the plan, we believe it is appropriate to ask some overall questions. In addition, it is appropriate to raise some questions about the *National Mall Plan*, though that plan is still in a relatively early stage. We hope these questions provide a useful framework for understanding the Committee of 100's evaluation of the Plan.

Is the Overall Direction Correct? What are the primary issues that are being addressed in the Plan? Is the overall concept for an area the right direction? Are there alternative directions that might be more suitable?

Is the Solution Worth the Effort? Since almost all corrective actions will take years to achieve, and millions of dollars, is the solution worth the time, effort and money? Would it be better to leave the present pattern essentially as it is, however unsatisfactory, and use the effort and money somewhere else? Would a somewhat simpler and less expensive solution be almost as good?

Is the Solution Ambitious Enough? On the other hand, are there alternative bolder steps that might lead to a more desirable pattern in the end?

Issues or Opportunities not Addressed? Are there opportunities that ought to at least be mentioned in the Plan, possibly involving linkages to adjacent areas? Are there areas or opportunities left out of the Plan without adequate explanation.

COMMENTS ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL FRAMEWORK PLAN

OVERALL COMMENTS

In the following sections, the major existing problems or issues for each area are summarized. The proposals in the *National Capital Framework Plan* are then summarized, followed by the summary evaluation of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City. For convenience, the "Committee of 100 on the Federal City" is referred to as the "Committee".

NORTHWEST RECTANGLE

Existing Problems: The Northwest Rectangle suffers from a pattern of monumental but separate buildings, mostly federal buildings. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a presidential memorial, an important national cultural center, and an important cultural resource for the city and metropolitan area. However, it is largely separated from adjacent areas of the city, and from the National Mall, by remnants of the old Inner Loop Freeway (Potomac Freeway).

Proposals: The Plan proposes two major improvements: 1) a waterfront park linking the Kennedy Center and the National Mall, and 2) extending E Street to the Kennedy Center over the freeway. Improvements are proposed for the E Street Park Corridor and new infill sites are proposed along E Street for parks and buildings. We note that the United States Institute of Peace Headquarters and Education Center is currently under construction at the northwest corner of Constitution Avenue and 23rd Street, NW (expected to be completed in 2010) on the southern edge of the Northwest Rectangle and adjacent to the National Mall. This building and use will help change the image and activity pattern of the area. The impact of this building and activity should be noted and considered in the Plan report.

General Evaluation: The Committee believes that the general approach to restructuring and improving the Northwest Rectangle is appropriate. It incorporates some elements that have been discussed or proposed in the past.

Additional study and refinement for the park connections between the Kennedy Center and the National Mall is needed. For the E Street connection to the Kennedy Center area, the Plan seems to embrace the Vinoly Plan of several years ago that seemed to have some limitations in terms of creating an attractive link to the Center. Various alternatives were studied after that plan was released. The Committee recommends that additional alternatives be considered for linking the Kennedy Center with E Street and the surrounding area. For example, the design concept that was shown in the *Legacy Plan* seems to provide for a more hospitable space and access to the Kennedy Center.

The overall landscape enhancement of the E Street park corridor proposed in the Plan is commendable. Further study is needed of the proposed new structure in the E Street Park between 20th and 21st Streets. Designing the E Street corridor as an important bus transit route should receive more attention in the Plan.

Additional attention should be given to the linkages and development along the north side of E Street and Virginia Avenue, providing links to private development and George Washington University (GWU). Both E Street and Virginia Avenue provide a new view and visibility for the south edge of the GWU campus. The Committee recognizes that the D.C. Office of Planning would more suitably address planning for this area. The Committee is also concerned that work

on linking the Kennedy Center and adjacent development consider the need to protect and preserve the adjacent low scale portion of the Foggy Bottom neighborhood (an historic district) north of Virginia Avenue.

Additional attention should also be focused on Virginia Avenue as a symbolic corridor commemorating the history and culture of Latin America. This concept part reflects the location of the Organization of American States at Virginia Avenue and Constitution Avenue and the Pan American Health Organization at Virginia Avenue and 23rd Street, NW. A number of commemorative memorials concerning the history of Latin America are already located along Virginia Avenue. Others might be added in the future as part of the plan.

Issue or Opportunity Not Addressed: The major omission in the Plan for the Northwest Rectangle is the limited attention to the future of Old Naval Observatory Hill, which includes several historic buildings. This may be due to recent suggestions that this important site be used for some type of high security federal office space, a move that would mean continuing to seal off this important hilltop location from public use and access for years to come. The future of Old Naval Observatory Hill should be clearly addressed in the final *National Capital Framework Plan* in a way that will allow public use and access and relate that important hilltop site to the Kennedy Center and the National Mall.

FEDERAL TRIANGLE

The Federal Triangle section of the *National Capital Framework Plan* involves the Federal Triangle complex of monumental federal buildings on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, the Pennsylvania Avenue corridor (street, sidewalks and public open spaces), and the public and private buildings along the north side of the Avenue.

Existing Problem: The *Framework Plan* notes the progress that has been made in rebuilding and revitalizing Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House, an effort that dates back almost 50 years. The opening of the Newseum in April 2008 marked the end of that “initial phase”. The Plan notes remaining problems, and opportunities for additional revitalization.

Proposals: The Plan focuses on continuing actions to improve the urban landscape and to create new destinations and activity along Pennsylvania Avenue. Major attention is proposed for new uses in the Old Post Office and the Old Post Office Annex in the IRS Courtyard. In a bold statement, the Plan proposes eventual rebuilding of the FBI Building site with a new mixed-use complex of buildings, including a major new museum or cultural attraction. The Plan indicates that the opportunity to rebuild the FBI Building may come sooner than expected (though this change would likely still be some years in the future). The Plan also discusses improvements to streetscape and public spaces, such as Freedom Plaza. The plan proposes steps to animate the Federal Triangle, including the “Federal Walk”, a system of walkways connecting the courtyards

and open spaces of the Federal Triangle, intended to enhance the experience of visitors, workers and residents, and better connect the Federal Triangle and Pennsylvania Avenue to the Mall.

General Evaluation: The Committee believes that the general approach to continuing to enhance the Federal Triangle and the Pennsylvania Avenue corridor is correct and worth the effort. More detailed planning work, and ongoing coordination and implementation is needed, involving the key federal agencies (NCPC, CFA, NPS and GSA), working with the District government and key groups (Downtown BID, Penn Quarter Association, etc.). Resolving the reuse of the Old Post Office and adjacent space is the most immediate need.

Issues or Opportunities Not Addressed: The Plan notes the possibility for reuse of some Federal Triangle buildings, namely the north wing of the IRS Building. There may well be additional opportunities for reusing some Federal Triangle buildings. Those opportunities should be noted, at least in general terms.

Over the next 30-40 years, there will also be some rebuilding of private buildings in the Pennsylvania Avenue area north of the Avenue. Design of these new buildings, and maintaining or increasing the mix of uses, will continue to be very important. Much of this design and use guidance is more in the purview of District government. However, NCPC, CFA, NPS, and GSA have a continuing role in the former PADC area. Continued coordination is essential.

The Plan gives only limited attention to physical and activity connections north into Downtown. In fact, Downtown activity and development is very important to the increased “bridge” role of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Mall and Downtown. The “Downtown Washington Cultural Corridor” includes a number of important activities in a corridor generally bordered by E and H streets and extending from Union Station on the east to the White House Precinct on the west. The growing importance of this corridor in terms of attractions and activity should be noted more strongly. Planning guidance for Downtown is largely the responsibility of the D.C. Office of Planning. However, the federal government has a strong role and interest, in view of federal properties in this corridor, such as the National Building Museum, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, the National Portrait Gallery/Smithsonian American Art Museum, the Ford’s Theater complex and the White House Precinct.

SOUTHWEST RECTANGLE

The Southwest Rectangle portion of the plan is very important and also very difficult. The timing of some decisions is critical since planning for the rebuilding and revitalization of the Southwest Waterfront and adjacent developments (Waterside Mall, Arena Stage, etc.) is taking place at the present time and that development is expected to move forward in the near future. Coordinated planning is essential. We also note that *Northwest Rectangle* and *Federal Triangle* are names that have been used for many years. *Southwest Rectangle* is a new name, apparently first used in this draft plan. Hopefully, a more dynamic name can be used for this area.

Existing Problems: The problems with the development pattern of the Southwest Rectangle derives in large part from the location and design of the railroad tracks through the area, dating from design and location decisions made in the late 19th and early 20th century. The railroad tracks divide the area. Urban renewal plans in the early 1950s attempted to address this problem, in part, by having the 10th Street Mall bridge the railroad tracks. The subsequent monumental grouping of somewhat sterile buildings along the 10th Street Mall reflects the architecture and urban design thinking of the time and has not provided the animated area or attractive link to the waterfront that was originally envisioned.

Proposal: The *Framework Plan* calls for rebuilding 10th Street SW as a narrower, more mixed use spine. Removal of the Forrestal Building would open the view to the Smithsonian Castle from along 10th Street. On the south, the Banneker Overlook would be rebuilt to provide a link to the revitalized Southwest Waterfront and a site for a major new cultural institution. Mixed use buildings, including ground floor retail, would extend along the 10th Street Mall in a compact pattern. Adjacent blocks (called squares in Washington) would be rebuilt with new buildings in a more cohesive urban design and form. Maryland Avenue SW would be rebuilt, to the extent possible, to be an important urban avenue with an enhanced view of the Capitol.

General Evaluation: The Committee believes that the general approach to restructuring and improving 10th Street is appropriate, though clearly this will take many years. The most critical immediate need is work to achieve coordination between these proposals and the plan for the Southwest Waterfront that is being finalized and will move into construction in the near future.

The Plan for redesign and reconstruction of the Banneker Overlook is crucial. One key need in this area, and in other areas of the Plan, is to deal with providing underground parking space for tour buses that are a key component of the Washington visitor industry.

The Committee would have liked to see an overall long-range solution to the railroad tracks through Southwest. Unfortunately, we have been told that such an overall approach does not appear feasible and that the revisions proposed in the Plan (which are very significant) are all that can be done. Still, this issue might be revisited in search of a better long-range solution.

The issue of adequate pedestrian connections between the Southwest Rectangle, the Jefferson Memorial/Tidal Basin area of the National Mall, and East Potomac Park is not fully addressed in the Framework Plan. It may be that some alternative approach, such as an elevated platform or elevated walks connecting these areas, would address this issue and could be done in a shorter time period at less cost. This problem needs more attention as the Plan is refined.

Issue or Opportunities Not Addressed: The *Framework Plan* focuses on restructuring and revitalizing the 10th Street corridor and providing an improved connection to the Southwest Waterfront. This primarily involves the area between 9th and 12th Streets SW. In the long range, change is likely for some other buildings in the area between 12th and 14th Streets, SW and the

area east of 9th Street, SW. These opportunities in these areas should be noted in the Plan in general terms and be addressed in later studies.

EAST POTOMAC PARK

Existing Problems: The *Framework Plan* indicates concern that East Potomac Park is currently inaccessible and underused. The collection of highway and rail bridges at the west edge of East Potomac Park somewhat seals off and limits access from the Jefferson Memorial and other parts of the National Mall. Overall, East Potomac Park is reclaimed filled land that is slowly sinking, subject to flooding, and its seawalls are crumbling.

Proposal: The *Framework Plan* calls for increasing access to East Potomac Park through a series of new bridges from the Southwest Waterfront and a new canal through East Potomac Park to improve boat access to the Washington Channel. The Plan proposes that, as the existing bridges reach the end of their useful life, they be consolidated and rebuilt somewhat to the south, thereby providing more open space south and east of the Jefferson Memorial. The Metrorail line is to be placed underground in a tunnel and a new Metrorail station is proposed to provide access to the Jefferson Memorial and East Potomac Park. A festival green, a new civic open space of 25-30 acres, is proposed adjacent to the Jefferson Memorial. This space would be used for a variety of outdoor activities.

General Evaluation: The Committee believes that the East Potomac Park proposals are interesting. It is also clear that the bridge relocations are a long-term proposal and that some of the related actions (the new civic space, the canal and other improvements) would therefore also be long-term improvements. In the near term, the issues of sinking land, crumbling seawalls, and the possibility of rising river levels need to be addressed. As more detailed studies are undertaken, the benefits to be obtained related to the cost, especially in view of proposals and costs for other areas, need to be further evaluated. We note that the illustration in the report of the new civic space makes it appear larger than it would be in reality.

Issue or Opportunity Not Addressed: In the discussion of the Southwest Rectangle proposals (above) we noted the possibility of above grade pedestrian connections between Southwest, the Tidal Basin area of the National Mall and East Potomac Park. Such alternative approaches to providing connections might be done at less cost than some present proposals.

NATIONAL MALL PLAN

The four main study areas addressed in the Plan (Northwest Rectangle, Federal Triangle, Southwest Rectangle and East Potomac Park) are adjacent to the National Mall. Two of them (Federal Triangle and Southwest Rectangle) slightly abut the Capitol Complex. The National Park Service is currently preparing the *National Mall Plan*. Many organizations are involved with commenting on aspects of that Plan. The Committee of 100 on the Federal City has been

involved in the consultation process with the National Park Service on that Plan. A draft plan for the *National Mall Plan* was to be released in late 2008 but that schedule has apparently been extended to sometime in 2009.

It has been noted that the continuing development of the area south of the Mall (in Southwest and Southeast) means that the National Mall will now be more of a central location, rather than simply on the southern edge of Downtown. Because of the importance of the *National Mall Plan*, the Committee suggests that the adopted *National Capital Framework Plan* include a section, perhaps a page or two, indicating the type of issues that the National Park Service is currently addressing in its planning work.

We note also that, because of internal administrative boundaries, the National Park Service is not currently including the White House Precinct (Ellipse, White House Grounds, Lafayette Park and adjacent blocks) in the National Mall Plan. A number of the consulting organizations, including the Committee of 100, have suggested that this area should be included in the National Mall Plan. We suggest that, for clarity, this area be noted in the Framework Plan. As work proceeds, we hope that the National Park Service will include the White House Precinct as part of the *National Mall Plan*. This would improve the usefulness and clarity of that Plan.

SOUTH CAPITOL STREET AND EAST CAPITOL STREET WATERFRONT AREAS

In addition to the four main precincts discussed above, the *Framework Plan* includes summary discussion of two areas: 1) an area on *South Capitol Street* between the new Nationals ballpark and the Anacostia River waterfront, and 2) the *East Capitol Street Waterfront* area east of 19th Street, extending to the Anacostia River. Both of these areas were addressed in the *NCPC Legacy Plan* (1997), *The Anacostia Waterfront Framework Plan* (D.C. Office of Planning, 2003) and in various planning studies since that time.

The area generally shown for *South Capitol Street* includes the site of the “Florida Rock” project and a portion of the Anacostia waterfront. The Florida Rock project (office/hotel/retail, residential) includes an esplanade along the Anacostia River (a portion of the Washington Waterfront Walk) and civic open space connecting the grand staircase from the ballpark to the riverfront. The project has been coordinated with NCPC, recommended by the D.C. Office of Planning and approved by the D.C. Zoning Commission. The Committee feels that development of this area needs to proceed in the context of the overall planning for the Anacostia Waterfront, including connections to adjacent areas. The final Framework Plan should be more specific on the status of overall plans, the developments that are proceeding in the near future, and what issues need further study and refinement.

The *East Capitol Street Waterfront* area provides significant opportunities in terms of available land, relating to the Anacostia waterfront, and to the Hill East development area to the south. There is also the advantage of the existing Stadium-Armory Metrorail Station. The Committee is

interested in a plan for this area that will build on these opportunities but will also be concerned with limiting impacts on the residential neighborhoods to the west of 19th Street NE/SE. As with the *South Capitol Street Waterfront* area, it would be useful if the final Framework Plan could be more specific on the status of other plans and what elements need further study.

RELATED ISSUES

Concern with the Effect of Sea Level Rise: There is one important issue that should be mentioned in the *National Capital Framework Plan* and that needs more attention immediately. There is a general concern that global warming will lead to sea level changes over the next 50-100 years that could have some effect on the tidewater Potomac River. If there is such an effect on the Potomac River, it could very well have some future effect on the area in the National Mall Plan, East Potomac Park and the Southwest Waterfront. However, there is apparently no detailed information as yet on what this effect would be, even though this could potentially have significant impacts on some of the plans that are being outlined. We urge that special efforts be made to determine the magnitude of such potential changes and to factor this information into the final *Framework Plan*.

Washington Waterfront Walk: The Washington Waterfront Walk (WWW), the 11-mile connected waterfront walk (pedestrians, bicycles) from the Georgetown Waterfront to the National Arboretum, is one of the key new elements that came out of the 1997 *Legacy Plan* prepared by NCPC. The WWW is related to many of the areas in the *Framework Plan* (Northwest Rectangle, National Mall, Southwest Rectangle, East Potomac Park, South Capitol Street and East Capitol Street). This waterfront walk is mentioned in the Framework Plan but it should have greater emphasis. The Committee believes this is one of the important elements of the new Central Washington that is being created in the 21st Century.

Editorial Issues: If possible, several “editorial” matters should be addressed in the final plan in addition to the more substantive points indicated above. The historical sections at the beginning of each area discussion should be reviewed and revised where appropriate to provide a better sense of how each of the areas evolved. The base map needs updating in a few cases (always a problem in a dynamic city like Washington).

NEXT STEPS

The Framework Plan notes that further study and refinement will be required on most elements of the Plan. The release date of the Plan (June 10, 2008) and the relatively short review period have somewhat limited the opportunity for public discussion, analysis and comment. We have noted the need for a summary planning document when other key planning programs (the *National Mall Plan* and the *Capitol Complex Plan*) are completed in 2009. It would be useful to have some process for more structured public consultation at that time.

Committee of 100 on the Federal City Comments on the
Draft National Capital Framework Plan
October 9, 2008
Page 12

In closing, the Committee of 100 on the Federal City wants to again acknowledge the extensive work and concern by the National Capital Planning Commission and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts that has gone into preparing the *Draft National Capital Framework Plan*. We hope our comments will be useful in refining and clarifying the Plan. We look forward to seeing the revised Plan.

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City also looks forward to continuing to work with the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, and other involved planning agencies and groups, to refine and implement these important plans for improvement and continued revitalization of Central Washington.

Sincerely,

John Fondersmith

John Fondersmith, AICP
Representing the Committee of 100 on the Federal City

Laura Richards

Laura M. Richards, Chair
Committee of 100 on the Federal City

cc: Thomas Luebke, Secretary
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts