

**FAMILIES ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**LMDC – 20<sup>th</sup> floor**  
**May 24, 2004 - 5:30 pm**

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF MINUTES**

This meeting began with a moment of silence. Anhoula Katsimatides opened the meeting asking for the council's thoughts on the family room on the 20<sup>th</sup> floor of One Liberty Plaza and its future. A discussion ensued with the family members regarding the short-term and long-term use of the family room. Everyone provided wonderful feedback, which will be taken into consideration if any issue arises pertaining to the relocation of the family room.

The meeting is turned over to Anita Contini who quickly introduces Amy Peterson, Leslie Davol and Betty Chen. Anita briefly mentions the progress that the Memorial Center Advisory Committee has made and that a meeting has been set up to have this committee present their work to the FAC for their comments. She then addresses the main agenda topic for this meeting. It is for the FAC to meet with the Memorial Design team and give their feelings and thoughts and input before the team begins working. She introduces Michael Arad and Gary Handel (who are now working together at the same company), Doug Findlay (part of the Peter Walker, landscape architecture firm), and Max Bond, of Davis Brody Bond, Associate Architects.

Michael Arad gave a brief powerpoint presentation about his memorial design called Reflecting Absence. He discussed his inspiration for the idea, how the design will work and fit within the Master plan and be integrated and linked directly to the city. He talked about the meaning behind the two pools of water, the landscape of the plaza level and the importance of the bedrock level. Doug Findlay then elaborated on the landscape ideas for the plaza and the importance of maintaining the feeling of this area as a respite to the city. Max Bond mentioned how honored he and his firm felt to be working on this project.

At this point, the family members began to ask questions of the team and give their feedback about specific issues. Some of these were pertaining to: winter conditions (snow, ice, fog, steam rising from the voids may be problematic); possible materials that may be used to make sure that the memorial is noticed by people and not just considered an average park; irreverent use of the plaza as simply a conduit for every-day pedestrian traffic to get from one side of the city to the other; projected number of visitors to the site annually and daily; whether Fulton and Greenwich Street should be used for pedestrian or vehicular traffic; how to buffer the traffic and sounds; security concerns, providing a safe experience for all; delineating the entire 16 acres so visitors can understand what was the entire WTC site; the need for seating at the names level or inclining the name wall so people don't sit on the names.

The issue of bringing back historic artifacts to the site was raised, in particular the idea of placing something at grade level, not only underground. Suggested items were the sphere,

the façade of the building, possible benches that were not destroyed, perhaps at the entrance of the Memorial Center at grade level. Anthony Gardner mentioned how pleased he was that in the Sec 106 process, the agencies have recognized that the box beam column footprints at bedrock are historically significant and he asked for the design team to look for ways to access these at bedrock for the general public. There could also be a private place for families only.

The question of Greenwich and Fulton Street use came up again and Betty Chen gave this response, “ The current master planning in our EIS envisioned Fulton Street and Greenwich Street built through the site, but the actual functioning and operations of those streets, whether they are fully pedestrian, partially pedestrian, completely vehicular, that still remains to be determined and whether the Port Authority can operate those streets or the city,..., that’s to be discussed....”

More landscaping questions were asked such as, the types of trees being considered, using the trees to possibly reflect the numbers of people who died, greenery in the wintertime.

At this point Monica Iken raised the issue of seeing the victims’ faces at the memorial, not just within the Memorial Center/interpretive space. It was important to family members to go beyond the names at the Memorial and see a visual/image of their loved ones, especially because so many will visit the unidentified remains room. Mary Fetchet then raised the issue of having a separate space for each individual victim, perhaps in the unidentified remains room or in the perimeter of that space, some kind of an individual marker. Many members agreed to wanting this individual marker or perhaps faces projected onto walls – not to compete with the names at the memorial level or changing Arad’s basic design. If the families choose not to visit the memorial center, they feel that the memorial must be able to stand on its own. Edie Lutnick states that family leaders have been meeting to draft a proposal addressing the randomness of the names and will submit it when ready.

Anthoula Katsimatides asks for final comments from the council members who also thanked the design team for listening to them and with this the meeting was adjourned.