

**PROPOSED PLAZA FOR THE JOHN F. KENNEDY  
CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS**

---

---

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON**  
**ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**  
**ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS**

SECOND SESSION

JUNE 4, 2002

Printed for the use of the Committee on Environment and Public Works



---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

83-694 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2004

---

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) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont, *Chairman*

MAX BAUCUS, Montana	BOB SMITH, New Hampshire
HARRY REID, Nevada	JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
BOB GRAHAM, Florida	JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut	CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
BARBARA BOXER, California	GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio
RON WYDEN, Oregon	MICHAEL D. CRAPO, Idaho
THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware	LINCOLN CHAFEE, Rhode Island
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York	ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania
JON S. CORZINE, New Jersey	PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico

KEN CONNOLLY, *Majority Staff Director*

DAVE CONOVER, *Minority Staff Director*

# C O N T E N T S

---

Page

## JUNE 4, 2002

### OPENING STATEMENTS

Corzine Hon. Jon S., U.S. Senator from the State of New Jersey .....	7
Jeffords, Hon. James M., U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont .....	1

### WITNESSES

Kaiser, Michael, president, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts ..	3
Prepared statement .....	21
Peters, Hon. Mary, Administrator, Federal Highway Administration accom- panied by: Art Hamilton, Associate Administrator, Federal Lands Highway Office; Doug Lard, Community Planner .....	2
Prepared statement .....	15
Tangherlini, Dan, acting director, District of Columbia Department of Trans- portation .....	5
Prepared statement .....	20



# **PROPOSED PLAZA FOR THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS**

**TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2002**

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m. in room 406, Senate Dirksen Building, Hon. James M. Jeffords (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jeffords and Corzine.

## **OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT**

Senator JEFFORDS. Good morning, everyone. I would like to extend a special welcome to each of the witnesses here this morning. President John F. Kennedy, in a 1963 speech at Amherst College, said it best: "Art establishes the basic human truths which must serve as the touchstone of our judgment." The performing arts teach us these important truths through Sondheim and Gershwin, through Baryshnikov and Bach. For over 30 years we have had the good fortune of having the Kennedy Center serve as our national classroom.

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts began as the National Cultural Center in 1958. During the early 1960's, President Kennedy led a charge to raise funds for this national center for the performing arts. In January 1964, Congress dedicated the National Cultural Center as a living memorial to President Kennedy, in recognition of his tireless efforts to promote the arts.

Since its opening Requiem in 1971, the Kennedy Center has presented a unique perspective in the development of our national identity through the performing arts. But to continue to serve as a national symbol for arts and a model for arts education for students, both young and old, the Kennedy Center must grow. As part of the growing process, the Department of Transportation conducted a comprehensive study of ways to improve access to the Kennedy Center. The study proposes some ambitious infrastructure enhancements to the Center, with many public and private partners.

The goal of the enhancements is to improve access to the Center and to link the Center to the national Mall and the surrounding neighborhoods. The goal of the enhancements is also to provide more rehearsal and education space for the Kennedy Center.

To meet this goal, the study proposes construction of a plaza on top of the maze of city streets and Interstate 66 running in front of the Center, and construction of a rehearsal and education center on top of the plaza. Today we convene to discuss this proposal.

I have long been a supporter of the arts and applaud the Kennedy Center's efforts and mission as an international Ambassador of the performing arts. But the proposal before us today represents a major construction project and major construction projects are expensive. I am concerned about the lack of an accurate estimate for the project, and I hope today's hearing will clarify some of the uncertainties surrounding the cost of the project.

I am also hopeful that today's panel will help us better understand the role each entity will play if the proposed plaza project moves forward. Again, thank you for coming today.

Ms. Peters, please proceed. I look forward to your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MARY PETERS, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPANIED BY: ART HAMILTON, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY OFFICE; DOUG LAIRD, COMMUNITY PLANNER**

Ms. PETERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I will submit a much more comprehensive statement for the record, but I have a few brief oral remarks I would like to make.

As you have indicated, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a wonderful attribute to this area. With me here today are Art Hamilton, who is the Associate Administrator for the Federal Lands Highway Office, and Doug Laird, a community planner who has led the Federal Highway Administration efforts on the Kennedy Center for the past 3 years. These gentlemen are right behind me and can assist me in any detailed questions.

Much of the information presented in my statement, which I have submitted for the record, is drawn from the Kennedy Center Access Study mandated by TEA-21 and transmitted to Congress in March 2001. The study was a cooperative effort of the Kennedy Center, the District of Columbia, the National Park Service and Federal Highway Administration.

The Center attracts over 5 million visitors a year. However, compromises in the Center's design, including its placement, as you indicated, Senator, between I-66 and the Potomac River, make getting to the Center very difficult. Nearly 200,000 vehicles use the roads around the Center each day. Chronic, recurring congestion is a continuing problem.

There is no direct pedestrian or bicycle access to the Center from the National Mall, and there are inadequate connections from the river front. Pedestrians and bicyclists who approach the Center from the south too frequently dash across Rock Creek Parkway to the Center. In fact, I did that myself with a bicycle just recently.

Pedestrians from Georgetown face an indirect, unlit, and underdeveloped path. In the absence of a clear walkway from the east, pedestrians sometimes sprint across Interstate 66, and the bicycle connection to the Custis Trail crosses an I-66 off-ramp. The Foggy Bottom Metro station is a half mile from the Center. The Center runs a shuttle service between Metro and the Performing Arts Cen-

ter; however, the route runs on local streets through an historic neighborhood. Visitors who choose to walk often have difficulty finding the Center, since there are no signs to guide them.

The Access Study presented many improvements to make getting to and from the Center safer and easier. Among these are, as you mentioned, a plaza set atop a deck over Interstate 66 to re-establish a local street grid to the east; modifications to E Street to link the Center with the core of the city; a stairway to link the Kennedy Center Terrace to the river front; grade separation of the complex intersection of Ohio Drive with the terminus of Interstate 66 and Rock Creek Parkway to relieve hazardous conditions and congestion; and new connections between Rock Creek Parkway and Interstate 66 to reduce traffic on the parkway, improve the traffic flow on Interstate 66, and relieve congestion and address safety hazards at the Virginia Avenue, Rock Creek Parkway-27th Street intersections.

I know the committee is concerned about the cost of this project. In my full statement, I outline the preliminary cost estimates developed during the Access Study. I also outlined some of the factors that may lead to increases in these cost estimates. An environmental assessment is underway using funds provided in the 2001 DOT appropriations act. Preliminary engineering is part of that assessment, and we expect this work to be completed in February 2003. Those projects are on schedule as we speak.

Initial site investigations are only now beginning. We will achieve greater certainty about project costs when the environmental assessment and the engineering analyses are completed in February 2003. I would be happy to provide updated cost information to the committee at that.

With a complex project of this nature, the role of each agency responsible for the enterprise should be carefully defined at the onset of a project. A detailed memorandum of agreement will provide a firm foundation for success, while including flexibility so the various parties can adapt to unforeseen circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Highway Administration is committed to work with the Kennedy Center, the District of Columbia, the National Park Service and other Federal and local level entities to improve the Kennedy Center. We look forward to working with this committee to ensure the transportation system around the Center serves it well and all residents in the area in the best possible manner.

I again appreciate the opportunity to make brief remarks this morning and would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Senator JEFFORDS. Mr. Kaiser.

**STATEMENT OF MICHAEL KAISER, PRESIDENT, JOHN F.  
KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS**

Mr. KAISER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to appear before you today to lend my strong support for legislation that will increase substantially access to the performing arts, and to arts education, for children and adults in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States.

If enacted, the legislation before you will build upon the success of the Kennedy Center since its founding in 1971 by providing greatly enhanced physical access to those living in or visiting the District of Columbia, and by creating the resources required to improve the services of the Kennedy Center that we can offer outside of the District in all 50 States.

This legislation therefore provides a natural development of the original vision for the Kennedy Center. The Kennedy Center is both our national arts center and a living memorial to President Kennedy. I emphasize the word living, because unlike other memorials, whose beauty lie primarily in their structures, the importance of the Kennedy Center also lies within the people whose lives it touches. Each year, thousands of musicians, dancers, actors and actresses bring performances to life. Over 5 million school children in all 50 States benefit from our outreach and educational programs each year. Millions of patrons enjoy performances at the Kennedy Center, and millions of tourists visit simply to see our Nation's tribute to President Kennedy.

The reach of the Kennedy Center has grown beyond what anyone could have envisioned when the National Cultural Center was first authorized in 1958. But much more remains to be done. The proposal before this committee will ensure that the Kennedy Center's physical facilities can support our enhanced vision of this Nation's living arts memorial in two important ways. First, the legislation will expand access to the Kennedy Center. The reconfiguration of the roadways and the construction of the new plaza will make physically accessing the Kennedy Center more user friendly. Traffic will be routed more directly to the Kennedy Center and new bike trails and pedestrian paths will make alternative methods of access a reality.

These changes not only provide physical access, but also will finally link the Kennedy Center to the rest of the District. Currently, the Kennedy Center is an island in a sea of roadways. As envisioned in the Department of Transportation's report, the reconfigured roadways, bike trails and pedestrian paths will link the Kennedy Center more directly to other important landmarks and the Mall. More than four decades after it was envisioned, the Kennedy Center will finally become linked to the heart of our Capital's memorials.

Access will be increased not only in a physical sense, but also in terms of the potential audience. With the expansion of the Kennedy Center through the creation of the plaza and the construction of two buildings on the plaza, more opportunities for reaching new audiences can be realized. The increased green space around the Kennedy Center makes consideration of outdoor concerts viable. New rehearsal space that expands the possibility of master classes or a greater variety of new pieces created for smaller venues. The greater the variety of the artistic works that can be brought to the Kennedy Center, the broader the audience that the Kennedy Center can reach, a vital goal of an art center charged with serving a multicultural Nation.

The proposal will also help the Kennedy Center fulfill another important part of its mandate, to educate the Nation about the performing arts. One of the new plaza buildings will be dedicated sole-

ly to this mission. The new building will house displays on the history of the performing arts, drawing from the collections of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution. Visitors will also be able to experience life in the arts through interactive displays that allow them to take part in such activities as conducting an orchestra or designing sets and costumes.

The future of the performing arts in our Nation is dependent on educating children about this Nation's rich arts heritage and the joy of involvement in the arts. This new building, dedicated to educating our citizens about our Nation's rich performing arts history and increasing an understanding of the potential of our arts future is an essential component of fulfilling the Kennedy Center's role as our national culture center.

I am proud of all that the Kennedy Center has accomplished over the last 31 years. It has sealed its place as the center of our Nation's performing arts. It has honored President Kennedy's memory with continuous arts performances. It has educated generations of Americans about all that is great in our Nation's performing arts.

The Kennedy Center is now prepared to build upon its success in this new century. As in the past, we will work in partnership with Congress to bring the shared vision of an expanded national performing arts center to life. The new buildings in the plaza will be constructed with privately raised funds. This will be no small undertaking on the part of the Kennedy Center. However, I am confident the private funds required can be identified.

The growing enthusiasm for the activities of the Kennedy Center can be seen in the increasing levels of private support we have enjoyed recently. This fiscal year alone, the Kennedy Center will raise more private money than ever before in its history, increasing contributed revenue over 25 percent more than the previous year during a difficult economic period.

I feel confident, therefore, that the partnership and shared vision that have bolstered the Kennedy Center to a level of success not imagined at its inception will bring this project to fruition.

Everyone at the Kennedy Center is deeply grateful to this committee for its consideration of this legislation and its past support, and especially to you, Mr. Chairman, for your continuing interest in the arts and education of this Nation.

We would also like to acknowledge the tremendous support we have received from the Department of Transportation and Secretary Mineta and the District of Columbia and Mayor Williams. I stand ready to work with Congress, with the Department of Transportation and with the District of Columbia to realize this vision for our Nation's arts center. I am confident that our historic partnership will bring unimaginable benefits to our Nation through an expanded and more accessible John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Kaiser.  
Mr. Tangherlini.

**STATEMENT OF DAN TANGHERLINI, ACTING DIRECTOR,  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Mr. TANGHERLINI. Good morning, Chairman Jeffords. Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak before the Committee on Environment and Public Works. My name is Dan Tangherlini, and I am the acting director of the District of Columbia Department of Transportation. I have the honor of representing Mayor Anthony Williams today before you.

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a major national tourist attraction, and the Washington region's premier entertainment venue. In the year 2000, the U.S. Department of Transportation published the Kennedy Center Access Study that was authorized by the Congress in 1998. The District Department of Transportation participated in this study, and is assisting in the subsequent environmental analysis currently underway.

The District Department of Transportation recognizes the Kennedy Center's severe transportation access constraints. The 2000 study documents the problems, including the series of freeways and parkways surrounding the Center, which serve to isolate it from both the District neighborhoods and the National Mall. Evening commuter traffic congestion on Rock Creek Parkway and Potomac Freeway and ramps to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge interferes with the performance-bound traffic to the Center. An absence of pedestrian and bicycle facilities offering safe and direct routes to the Center, and inadequate access to the facility by public transit. The study notes that the Foggy Bottom Metro station, the Metro rail station closest to the Kennedy Center, is one half mile away.

The centerpiece of the proposed transportation access improvements would be the creation of a plaza which would carry E Street Northwest directly into the Kennedy Center. The plaza would be created by constructing a deck over the Potomac Freeway. The plaza would include a public square and two building sites on either side of the extended E Street Northwest.

The D.C. Department of Transportation strongly supports transportation improvements which will eliminate the Kennedy Center's physical isolation and connect the Center with the Foggy Bottom neighborhood and the monumental core of the city. We also support the aesthetic vision of restoring the L'Enfant plan street grid, and economic opportunities that may be created by the project.

We respectfully suggest that the Federal Government should fund this project through a special appropriation which would not impact the District's annual allocation of Federal aid, and that the Federal Highway Administration should construct the improvements. The Center's initial design concept provided pedestrian access to the Potomac River and vehicular access for the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Yet due to funding constraints, the Kennedy Center was built in its isolated environment.

The level of improvements recommended by the study to correct the original access deficiencies is extensive. The Access Study places the cost of the improvements at roughly \$270 million. By contrast, the District Department of Transportation spent approximately \$255 million in construction activity for all of fiscal year 2001. Our entire annual apportionment and allocation for the current fiscal year is roughly \$125 million.

The District Department of Transportation cautions that the proposed improvements should not be considered independently of the District of Columbia's transportation network. The District is currently engaged in a study to develop solutions to the structural and operational constraints of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge. The Kennedy Center Access Study should be closely coordinated with the bridge study.

In turn, both of these projects must be considered within the larger context of land use and transportation planning in the west end. To adequately address transportation problems in the area, including the Kennedy Center, a comprehensive approach should include a corridor encompassing the Whitehurst Freeway, lower K Street, straight through to the Roosevelt Bridge, with the Kennedy Center access being part of it.

In its discussion of the Kennedy Center in the Legacy Plan, the National Capital Planning Commission states that a successful transportation plan must extend beyond physical improvements, and that behavioral changes must occur. It explains that employers must develop traffic management programs to reduce congestion and travel times, and that more people should be incented to use mass transit. A comprehensive transportation planning approach to solutions would truly weave access to the Kennedy Center into the transportation fabric of the District of Columbia.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you.

This is a very fascinating event and hopefully we will all be able to work together.

I want to recognize Senator Corzine now for any statement he might like to make.

Senator CORZINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JON S. CORZINE,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

Senator CORZINE. I appreciate your holding the hearing. I feel somewhat conflicted, since I actually am on the board of trustees of the Kennedy Center, and very much supportive of the initiatives. So I have to be careful about my conflicts of interest with regard to this. It is an important reality of the future of one of the great national cultural assets that we deal with these programs.

I hope that we will have the ability to support financially, but I also appreciate the comprehensive nature of how we need to be thinking about this in the overall budgeting affairs of the District. I'm pleased to be here and look forward to your serious questioning, since I've had my opportunity at another time and place.

I also welcome Mr. Kaiser, who has done a terrific job of leading the Center.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, and we appreciate your endeavors, working with the Kennedy Center, and look forward to working with you on this project.

Ms. Peters, as I mentioned in my opening statement, I am concerned about the potential costs of those project. In meetings between our staffs, the discussions of costs have gone well beyond the \$269 million mentioned in the Access Study. Can you discuss what factors would cause the costs of the project to increase, for example,

will there be added security costs and other costs that we haven't even considered, as well as the rather daunting price tag?

Ms. PETERS. Certainly, Senator, I would be pleased to discuss that. As Mr. Tangherlini indicated, the cost estimate, the preliminary estimated capital cost estimate at the conclusion of the Kennedy Center Access Study is right around \$270 million. This includes a contingency amount which is appropriate at this stage, given that there are a number of unknown factors.

The factors that we feel would most affect a cost increase of any kind would be the utilities, especially old utilities that may not have been abandoned and that may still be active within the project site area. Some of these may include highly secure lines that lead to the Pentagon and State Department. We have had concerns with these lines in past projects and would want to look at that.

Another factor is the Dulles Interceptor, a major sewer line which goes to the Blue Plains, that apparently goes directly in front of the Kennedy Center. Depending on parking garages and connections in between them, there could be a conflict with that particular line. Then of course the plaza. Much is yet to be determined on the size of the plaza, and the proposed buildings. There are several design unknowns, including whether the tunnel underneath will require ventilation systems or other accommodations.

In a general sense, contract growth for projects in the metropolitan Washington, DC area has averaged about 8 percent since 1997. We would need to include a 2 percent per year inflator to costs because these costs are in current or 2000-year dollars. Our Eastern Federal Lands division currently estimates about a 10 percent contingency cost for all projects in the District of Columbia metropolitan area. In projects outside of the District of Columbia metropolitan area, we would normally use about a 5 percent contingency factor.

Again, our Eastern Federal Lands division, which is the division of the Federal Highway Administration and Department of Transportation working most closely on this project normally at the planning stage would include about a 35 percent contingency factor. A 40 percent contingency factor has been included in the planning estimate to date.

As I indicated in my oral testimony, in February 2003, we will have plans at about a 10 to 15 percent completion level, and we will have completed the environmental assessment. We believe that we could have a much firmer handle on costs at that point in time.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. It's my understanding that completion of the environmental assessment will help to more accurately estimate what the project will cost. Can you discuss when the environmental assessment will be completed?

Ms. PETERS. Sir, we are on schedule right now to complete that environmental assessment in February 2003 and feel very comfortable that we will be able to complete it at that date.

Senator JEFFORDS. As you know, we are well underway in our hearing process on the reauthorization of the Surface Transportation program. I expect that we will be debating a bill in the Senate next spring. Would you outline the Administration's process

and schedule for reauthorization and give me an indication of your progress to date?

Ms. PETERS. Certainly, sir. Within the Department of Transportation right now, each of the modal administrations working with the Assistant Secretary for Policy have been developing broad general parameters for a reauthorization proposal. We intend to brief the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary on those proposals within the month of June and then begin to firm up the Administration's proposal through the late summer. We will submit the proposal with the President's 2003 budget, but certainly expect to have substantive discussions with this committee and with you, sir, in the interim.

Senator JEFFORDS. Are there ways to improve the vehicular and pedestrian access to the Kennedy Center without undertaking this major construction project?

Ms. PETERS. Senator, it is my belief that it would be very difficult to tackle the number of transportation challenges that we have in the area today without looking comprehensively at it. I think Mr. Tangherlini made an excellent point, that we not only need to look at the Access Study for the Kennedy Center, but also look at the interrelationship of those proposed changes to the Center to other projects in the area.

Based on the Access Study, we believe that the proposals made in the Access Study would best correct the transportation challenges in the area of the Kennedy Center today.

Senator JEFFORDS. Can you please discuss in detail the role your agency will play in the construction of the plaza? Specifically, can you address ownership during the various phases of the project? It is my understanding that the Kennedy Center will become the owner of the plaza at the project's completion. What about before the project's completion? Can you discuss the role you envision other entities playing in the project?

Ms. PETERS. Certainly, sir. And sir, if I may, I would like to consult with Douglas Laird. Doug has been the community planner. I want to make sure I don't misspeak in terms of the various roles during construction. [Turns to speak to aide.]

Sir, thank you for the opportunity to consult with Mr. Laird. The District owns the Interstate, the District of Columbia, and it would remain in its ownership. We would act in the role of a contractor, the Federal Highway Administration, and specifically the Eastern Public Lands Office would act as a contract administrator and contractor during the active construction of the project.

Senator JEFFORDS. Has the issue of the project air rights been resolved with the District?

Ms. PETERS. Again, let me check with Mr. Laird, but I believe that is the District's responsibility as well.

Sir, they have not yet been resolved. It is expected that the District and the Kennedy Center management will come to resolution on the use of the air rights in the near future.

Senator JEFFORDS. Mr. Kaiser, what is the Kennedy Center currently doing in the area of arts education? Could you give us a little brief information on that?

Mr. KAISER. Certainly. The Kennedy Center is the largest independent arts educator in the country. Next year we will spend \$15

million directly in arts education programming in all 50 States. We have a myriad of services, several are based here in Washington, but I think more importantly are the services we offer throughout the country.

We work in 87 cities throughout the United States to train teachers and to train school boards and school districts to bring the arts into the classroom. We have a distance learning program that allows up to 300,000 children throughout the United States to participate in any one educational program that we might host at the Kennedy Center. We maintain a web site called Arts Edge which gives lesson plans and teaching guides to teachers throughout the United States who wish to bring arts into the classroom.

We are the largest touring group of theater for children throughout the United States. We commission up to six plays a year and tour those to all 50 States each year. We bring the National Symphony Orchestra, part of the Kennedy Center, each year in what's called the American residence. For 2 weeks, the National Symphony Orchestra takes residence in a State, typically a State that's under-served, and conducts 100 master classes, teaching demonstrations and workshops in public schools throughout the State. We just came back from South Dakota a couple of months ago.

These are just a few of the programs that we embark upon at the Kennedy Center. As I said, it's a very rich web of programming that we offer to try and bring arts to children throughout America.

Senator JEFFORDS. What will this project do to increase or enhance that mission?

Mr. KAISER. I think several things. No. 1, we have no real facilities at the Kennedy Center for education. There's not one classroom at the Kennedy Center, even though we have hundreds of thousands of children and classes coming to the Kennedy Center each year. This facility, the new facility, would allow us to house real educational programming at the Center, but equally importantly, would give us the facilities to broadcast our educational programming throughout America. We have no studio, even though we do the distance learning programming. There is no studio for us to be able to house and to broadcast from at the Kennedy Center. The exhibition space we anticipate itself would allow us to bring children and adults to the Kennedy Center to learn about the rich heritage of the arts in America, and again, equally importantly, we would make a virtual museum on line that would bring all of the exhibitions at the Center available to people in their classrooms and their homes.

The second building, which would house rehearsal facilities, would be open to the public and would allow the public for the first time at the Kennedy Center to see how art is put together, which we believe is a very important part of the educational process. So there are many ways that we think these new buildings will allow us to enhance substantially our educational programming.

Senator JEFFORDS. When I had the responsibility of the D.C. educational system some years back, I went and visited a program where they were teaching math through music.

Mr. KAISER. Absolutely.

Senator JEFFORDS. Has that been enhanced?

Mr. KAISER. Yes, sir, there are two ways that has been enhanced. No. 1, again, the Arts Edge web site now brings that information to teachers all over America. You don't have to come to Washington in order to learn how to, for example, use music to teach physics or use music to teach math. Equally importantly, we have instituted several programs that bring teachers from all over America to the Kennedy Center at our expense and we actively are training teachers who then go back to their home cities and serve not just the students in that population but also serve as models for other teachers in their locations.

Senator JEFFORDS. I was fascinated by the programs you have, and appreciate them.

Mr. KAISER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JEFFORDS. Mr. Kaiser, can you discuss the need for the added rehearsal space in the education center, and how will this project help fulfill your goal of the Kennedy Center as the enhanced vision of this Nation's living arts memorial?

Mr. KAISER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Kennedy Center when it was originally constructed left out several important facilities, and one of which was rehearsal facilities. We have no rehearsal facility that is large enough to adequately rehearse an opera, for instance, yet we have 26 weeks a year of opera performances in our opera house. We have no facilities for rehearsal that allow the public to watch rehearsals. We have no facilities for rehearsal that allow adequate dance rehearsals, and yet we are becoming the largest presenter of ballet and modern dance in the world.

We need the facilities to be able to continue to bring the best of art to Washington and to our Nation's capital. So I believe the rehearsal facilities would allow us to fulfill our mandate as the national arts center.

Senator JEFFORDS. This project obviously will represent a major public-private partnership, and obviously have some funding necessities. Can you explain what is needed and how you intend to be able to pay for it?

Mr. KAISER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We anticipate that the cost of building the two new buildings, which would be entirely borne by private contributions, would be approximately \$250 million. We would embark upon a serious capital campaign to raise that \$250 million. Our preliminary studies suggest that that money will be available to us, although it will be a challenge over the next several years to find that money.

We are blessed that this project will take so long, which will give us a little extra time to find the money. We are very, very comfortable that the growth in private funding to the Kennedy Center, not just from local citizens, but our increased fund raising throughout the Nation, in fact throughout the world, will allow us to raise this money. There is a tremendous interest in this major new arts facility which would be the largest arts project in this Nation in the next decade.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. I have one more here. Mr. Tangherlini, you mentioned that inadequate access to the facility by public transit is a major issue for the Kennedy Center. How will this project improve this problem, and what will the District do to help improve the situation in the meantime?

Mr. TANGHERLINI. The lack of mass transits access is compounded by the lack of pedestrian access. The closest mass transit station is one half mile from the Kennedy Center. But it might as well be 10 miles when you look at some of the difficulties you as a pedestrian would have to navigate to get from the mass transit station to the Kennedy Center. So that in and of itself makes the mass transit access even much worse for the Kennedy Center.

We are currently engaged in a broader effort to study transit routes, transit alternatives routes, additional transit routes in the District of Columbia. The Kennedy Center, particularly through the Kennedy Center access proposal, is certainly one of the places that we're looking at getting better access to, between existing transit opportunities and potential ones that we could develop.

Senator JEFFORDS. What will the District do to improve the situation in the meantime?

Mr. TANGHERLINI. Currently the District of Columbia is supporting efforts like the Georgetown bids commuter shuttle, from the Foggy Bottom station. That shuttle ties in nicely with the Kennedy Center shuttle itself. We are also working with the Kennedy Center to try to find better ways to provide pedestrian access as well as guiding systems, signs that tell people how to get to the Kennedy Center. That hasn't been as well developed as it could.

But as Administrator Peters said, there is only so much you can do when you have a place that is isolated by so many freeways and parkways that is so difficult to get to.

Senator JEFFORDS. Is the District committed to improving public transit to the facility after the project's completion?

Mr. TANGHERLINI. Absolutely. The District is committed to improving access to the Kennedy Center. We continue to have a very good relationship with the Kennedy Center and Mr. Kaiser in particular, and the Mayor is very supportive of the Kennedy Center. If there are ways we can assist the Kennedy Center in connecting it with the rest of the city, we would definitely be committed to that.

Senator JEFFORDS. And how would that be accomplished?

Mr. TANGHERLINI. Again, through programs like the Georgetown bids circulator, through specific pedestrian improvements, signage, developing transit alternatives that look at the Kennedy Center as a major trip generator, source of potential riders, and including them in our broader transit planning with the Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, WMATA or Metro.

Senator JEFFORDS. When the Kennedy Center site was chosen, the location of the Roosevelt Bridge was an issue. Today, access to the bridge remains an important issue. Today, many believe that the bridge and access to the bridge are a serious issue for the Kennedy Center and many northwest residents.

Can you discuss the challenges of bridge access and how this project can improve the current access problem?

Mr. TANGHERLINI. Absolutely. The volume of commuter traffic across the Roosevelt Bridge and on the Parkway creates a barrier and isolation from the northwest in particular, they have to cross much of that traffic to get to the Kennedy Center. Usually the shows start right at the height of rush hour, the ones that most people are trying to get to.

So this, by separating the local street network from the commuter road network, would allow better access to the system, would allow for better flow of the commuter traffic as well as allowing access through the local road network to the Kennedy Center. We believe that as we look at the Roosevelt Bridge, which has really begun to reach its engineering useful life, and ask the questions, start asking fundamental questions about access, we have to look at that bridge as well, and say, how do these two projects relate, ask ourselves as the District, have our needs changed over time as it relates to these particular two pieces of infrastructure.

Senator JEFFORDS. Senator Corzine.

Senator CORZINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me ask Mr. Kaiser about the consideration of operating results in conjunction with the project. One will be adding programmatic efforts at the same time one is trying to raise money for capital projects. Are operating results now in a position where they can be supportive of expanding additional programmatic efforts that would be associated with it? What kinds of challenges are posed there in fund raising? How does that all interrelate to the viability of the financial underpinnings of the project?

Mr. KAISER. Thank you, Senator. It's a very important point. We have to separate very carefully the fund raising activities for the new buildings from those for operations. Because one doesn't want to raise money for the buildings and cannibalize operating resources. We have been very encouraged that this current fiscal year that started in October, just after September 11, we will increase our contributed funds 25 percent over the year before, the privately contributed funds. There's a tremendous interest in the Kennedy Center programming and there's a growing number of donors from throughout this area, but also throughout the Nation who want to support the work of the Kennedy Center.

We have done some detailed work in-house to study whether there will be a group of donors who do not currently fund operations but who might be interested in funding a large capital venture. We are very confident that we will be able to develop a separate set of funding sources for these two buildings.

Senator CORZINE. But you will also be increasing your operating expenditures when you add these new facilities, or are plans in place, or are the operating results adequate to support the additional programmatic efforts?

Mr. KAISER. I believe so, Senator. The buildings will only open at the earliest 9 years from now. What we would hope to do, and I think what any cultural institution would hope to do is, as you start to identify new donors who pay for the capital is to turn them, once the building is built, into operating funders. They are invested in the buildings.

We are also confident that the increase in contributed funds that we've experienced for operations will allow us to build steadily the education and artistic programming that we have at the Center during the construction period.

Senator CORZINE. Do the plans in construction of the site contain contingency overruns in the way that was described with regard to the transportation activities?

Mr. KAISER. Yes, absolutely. In fact, the original estimate for the rehearsal building was substantially less than what we are currently estimating that we need to raise privately. Our hope is that we can actually build the buildings for less than we are estimating from private funds and to use any excess as endowment to support the ongoing operations of those activities.

From my experiences building another large facility, I recently built the Royal Opera House in London. What we found was that again, the donors who paid for the building became invested in the operations of the building and we were able to increase our annual fund raising 25 percent the year after we opened the building. So I'm very comfortable that we will find the resources, and I'm very comfortable that we will be able to support additional programming during the time we are building the buildings.

Senator CORZINE. Do you have any contingency plans on cutbacks if there are necessary adjustments to the program? Are those identified?

Mr. KAISER. We identify those annually in our budgeting process. So we have a very, very sophisticated financial control system now that allows us to cut back as we need to. I have ideas of where we could cut back in the future, if we felt we had a long term need to reduce the size of our operations. None of those cutbacks affect educational programming whatsoever. We have the ability, particularly, to reduce the number of certain performances that are of more cost to the Kennedy Center.

Senator CORZINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kaiser.

Senator JEFFORDS. So the last question I have for you is the air rights. Do you have to purchase those air rights?

Mr. TANGHERLINI. I'll take a stab at it, Mr. Chairman. The air rights are controlled, we've actually done some analysis, and much of them are controlled by the District of Columbia. That would be an agreement that would have to be negotiated between the District of Columbia and the Kennedy Center. We have a legislative branch that would involve themselves in those discussions as well.

Mr. Kaiser and I both met with the Mayor and the District of Columbia is very supportive of this project and would look very favorably and try to develop the most favorable terms possible for the air rights related to this project.

Senator JEFFORDS. Ms. Peters, do you have any comments on the air rights?

Ms. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, as was indicated, sometimes these can be difficult issues. Generally, when there is a will to negotiate air rights, such as exists between the Kennedy Center and the District of Columbia here, they can be negotiated. We've looked at these issues around the country and we believe that there is a good foundation for negotiating the air rights issue here.

Senator JEFFORDS. I want to thank you all for coming. I'm excited, also, it's an awesome goal that you have established. I look forward to working with you to see if we can make this project a reality. I just praise you for the work that's been done. We have a number of other problems, other than the questions of the structures that we have to obviously try to find answers to as well.

I certainly am excited and looking forward to working with you. That should indicate the way I feel about the project, I think, as

to what this committee, I will request to them. I thank you very much for your appearance today. Very helpful.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 9:45 a.m., the committee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the chair.]

[Additional statements submitted for the record follow:]

STATEMENT OF MARY PETERS, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION,  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss ways to improve access to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. With me are Arthur Hamilton, Associate Administrator, Federal Lands Highway Core Business Unit, and Douglas Laird, a Community Planner who has led the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) efforts on the Kennedy Center study for the past 3 years.

Much of the information I will discuss is drawn from the Kennedy Center Access Study, mandated by section 1214 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and transmitted to Congress in March 2001. The Access Study was a cooperative effort of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the District of Columbia Department of Public Works, the National Park Service (NPS), and FHWA. The Access Study follows from the National Capital Planning Commission's Legacy Plan (1997), which first envisioned a plaza over the Potomac Freeway to connect the Center with the surrounding community. A project steering committee of senior staff from each cooperating agency guided the study, which examined a broad range of alternatives for improving access, mobility, and safety to and around the Center. In addition, the Access Study sought input from over thirty other organizations with interests in the future of the Center and its surroundings. Four public open houses were held during the study and presentations were made to local citizen groups.

The 2001 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (section 378 of P.L. 106-346) provided \$10 million for "planning, environmental work, and preliminary engineering of highway, pedestrian, vehicular, and bicycle access to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia." An environmental assessment is now underway and is expected to be complete in February 2003. Preliminary engineering is proceeding as part of the environmental assessment. It will be completed in enough detail to provide for conceptual review and approval actions from Federal agencies in the spring of 2003.

My comments today will focus on the need for access improvements, some preliminary information about the potential costs of those improvements, and ways of structuring a plan for their implementation.

NEEDS

In its dual roles as the Nation's showcase for the performing arts and a living memorial to the late President Kennedy, the Center attracts over 5 million visitors a year. Two million patrons enjoy the Center's rich cultural offerings, while three million more come to visit the building and memorial. The Center is prominently located on the banks of the Potomac River in the city's Monumental Core. Its proximity to regional highways and transit facilities are part of the Center's success in drawing visitors and patrons alike. However, the construction of Interstate 66 (I-66) and compromises in the Center's design, including its placement between the Interstate and the Potomac River, have resulted in conditions that can make the final leg of a journey to the Center challenging, particularly for visitors who arrive by bicycle or on foot.

Patrons who attend nighttime performances at the Center must travel at the end of Washington's evening rush hour. Drivers face a host of challenges. Their principal problem is chronic recurring congestion, stemming from the truncation of I-66. These connections were left unresolved when development of a larger Inner Loop Freeway was abandoned in the early 1970's. Intersections along the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway (hereafter referred to as the Rock Creek Parkway), Ohio Drive, and Virginia Avenue are not only congested, they also suffer high accident rates.

The roads around the Center are heavily used. Nearly 200,000 vehicles traverse the complex of ramps and roadways adjacent to the Center throughout the day. Improvements must ensure that these volumes are served and that traffic is not backed up onto the Roosevelt Bridge or diverted onto neighborhood streets.

Patrons who do not drive to the Center face even greater challenges. There is no direct pedestrian or bicycle path to the Center from the east or southeast from the

National Mall, and there are inadequate connections from the riverfront. Pedestrians and bicyclists who approach the Center from the south along the Potomac River encounter a dangerously narrow portal on the east side of the Rock Creek Parkway under the Roosevelt Bridge. Pedestrians are frequently observed to dash across the Parkway near a blind corner on the Center's southwestern corner. Visitors who might stroll along the river from Georgetown face an indirect, unlit, and underdeveloped path. The Center is disconnected from E Street, which ends in a series of elevated ramps at the Center's entrance. In the absence of clear walkways, pedestrians improvise a hazardous footpath and sprint across I-66. On the Center's southeast corner, the bicycle connection to the Custis trail crosses an I-66 off-ramp.

The Foggy Bottom Metro station is half a mile from the Center—an uncomfortable walking distance for many patrons. The Center runs a highly successful Show Shuttle transit service that ferries visitors between Metro and the Center. However, the route is indirect and runs on local streets through an historic neighborhood. Visitors who choose to walk have difficulty finding their way to the Center, since it is not visible from the Metro station and there are no directional signs to guide them.

#### REMEDIES

The Kennedy Center Access Study presented many improvements that would make getting to and from the Center safer and easier, while dramatically improving the Center's setting and the West End's cityscape. Major elements of the overall improvement package identified through the Access Study are outlined below.

- **Kennedy Center Plaza:** The centerpiece of the proposed design is a plaza, set atop a deck over I-66, that would provide a new public space and stately approach to the Center from the east. The plaza would be connected to E and 25th Streets, thus reestablishing the local street grid. I-66 immediately east of the Kennedy Center would be modified to accommodate traffic beneath the plaza. The plaza, using Interstate air rights, would contain a large public square and two building sites. We understand the Center intends to develop these buildings to house exhibits on the performing arts and provide administrative and rehearsal space for the Center and the Washington Opera. The plaza would create a rare opportunity to define new civic space in the Monumental Core.

- **Riverfront Access:** A grand open stairway (with elevators for the handicapped) would link the Kennedy Center terrace to the riverfront promenade, where a floating dock could serve river boats. The open design would preserve views to the river from the Rock Creek Parkway. These changes would facilitate pedestrian, bicycle, and river access and restore an important element of the building's original design.

- **E Street Approach:** E Street would be modified at its western terminus to link the Center with President's Park and the core of the City. Through-traffic would continue to use the E Street expressway below the plaza, while local traffic would use an improved surface-level street connected to the plaza.

- **Traffic and Safety North of the Kennedy Center:** New connections would be built between the Rock Creek Parkway and I-66 in the vicinity of K Street. This would improve the Interstate's directness and convenience, diverting traffic from the Parkway to I-66. Reduced through-traffic on the Parkway would improve the riverfront promenade for pedestrians and cyclists. The improvements would also relieve congestion and address safety hazards at the Virginia Avenue, Rock Creek Parkway, and 27th Street intersections.

- **Traffic and Safety South of the Kennedy Center:** The complex intersection of Ohio Drive with the terminus of I-66 and Rock Creek Parkway would be grade-separated to relieve hazardous conditions and congestion.

- **Transit Improvements:** The E Street improvements would allow the Kennedy Center Show Shuttle to travel a direct route, thereby avoiding neighborhood streets. Alignment options for possible future light rail service, which could provide direct access to the Center, would be preserved.

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements:** The plaza and connecting facilities would provide new linkages between the Kennedy Center and the surrounding community. Safe bicycle connections would also be provided to the Custis/I-66 trail across the Roosevelt Bridge.

- **Signing Improvements:** Effective directional signs for through and local pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular traffic would be installed.

- **Parking Improvements:** The area below the plaza would provide at least 500 new parking spaces. This parking would meet the needs of the plaza's new buildings, ensuring that traffic generated by the site could be accommodated without intruding upon the scarce parking supply in the surrounding neighborhood. It could also serve the Kennedy Center's overflow parking needs.

We understand that these proposed improvements have been coordinated with, and are consistent with, the garage expansion and related site improvements that are part of the Center's comprehensive building renovation plan.

#### COSTS

Building the improvements described in the Access Study will be complex and challenging. I would also like to emphasize that throughout the course of the Access Study no specific funding sources for the various improvements were identified nor were funding plans developed for the improvements.

A preliminary capital cost estimate was developed during the Access Study. To put the estimate into perspective, several caveats must be kept in mind:

- The estimate was based on preliminary conceptual designs. The plaza's final configuration and the designs of other improvements, including any security enhancements, are likely to change as engineering proceeds. More will be known once the environmental assessment and preliminary design now underway are completed.
- Gross quantity estimates were derived from visual inspections and adjusted from base-mapping with engineering experience. They are not based on accurately measured quantities, since no such data has been available through this stage of the project's development.
- Estimates were based on typical unit costs for infrastructure construction in the District of Columbia in 1999 and were adjusted during the Access Study to the year 2000.
- Due to the very preliminary nature of the estimates, costs were not adjusted to reflect inflation over the period of final design and construction, roughly estimated to be 8–10 years.
- Improvements at the base of the Roosevelt Bridge will rely in part on the outcome of a current bridge study. The District of Columbia is now in the third year of examining bridge conditions. Bridge options could range from minor structural and geometric improvements to complete bridge reconstruction on a new alignment. The process for identifying, reviewing, and finalizing options could take several more years.
- Access Study costs were developed to provide a rough idea of the resources required to implement the improvements and nothing else.

Table 1 provides a summary of these initial rough estimates. Initial site investigations are only now beginning and costs are likely to rise as additional conditions affecting construction are revealed. For example, a major sewer line (known as the Dulles Interceptor) was brought to our attention in May 2002. An area below the Center was built around these sewers, which run along the Center's length. The sewers will limit circulation from the Center's parking garage to the new parking area below the plaza and will require us to reconsider how traffic from the Center will reach westbound I-66 and the Roosevelt Bridge. Such is the nature of conceptual design. Cost estimates can only achieve greater certainty as concepts are refined and a thorough engineering analysis is undertaken.

Table 1.—Preliminary Estimated Capital Costs (Plaza and Access) in year 2000 Dollars for Kennedy Center Access Study Area Long-Range Plan Improvements

Plan Element	Cost (millions)
Center Sector:	
• Plaza, including surface-level E Street connection to 23rd Street and 500 parking spaces on one level beneath the plaza. ....	\$223
• Riverfront Connection .....	13
North Sector	11
South Sector	19
E Street (21st to 23rd Streets)	13
Total .....	\$269

A summary of the capital and operational costs associated with the improvements is provided below. Capital cost estimates define the construction and engineering costs associated with designing and building the proposed improvements, while operations and maintenance costs give insight into the ongoing, recurring costs required by the new infrastructure.

#### CAPITAL COSTS

Preliminary capital cost estimates for the conceptual plan were developed using typical unit costs for infrastructure construction in the District of Columbia. These

estimates are based on quantities estimated through visual inspections. No exploratory work was undertaken in their development. Table 1 summarizes the estimated capital costs for major plan elements. The principal cost is for the reconfiguration of roadways and the construction of the plaza over I-66. The estimated cost of this improvement is approximately \$223 million (all costs are in year 2000 dollars), and it includes the construction of a new, surface-level E Street connecting the plaza to 23rd Street. It also includes one level of parking (approximately 500 spaces) beneath the plaza.

The plaza portion of the project presents a complex challenge, and this difficulty is increased by the need to coordinate the construction of two buildings within the plaza. The plaza and buildings cannot be built independently, because ancillary building infrastructure (such as waste sewers and utilities) must be carried to the building along or within the plaza deck itself. The project must rise as a single, coordinated enterprise.

Table 1 does not include any costs for the two buildings within the boundaries of the plaza except for grading and excavation of their footprints as part of developing the total area beneath the plaza for parking and relocated roadways. Plaza costs assume the buildings will be built. If the buildings are not built, the cost to fill these two spaces, totaling 100,000 square feet in the plaza, would add another \$25.5 million to the \$223 million plaza costs (in unadjusted year 2000 dollars).

The costs reflected in Table 1 include one level of parking beneath the plaza (approximately 500 spaces). They assume that excavation, columns, and foundations are part of the deck costs and that the cost for parking includes flooring, ceilings, walls, and outfitting the space for parking.

Roadway and pedestrian/bike path costs were estimated using District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT) standards for materials, including bituminous asphalt for the primary roadways and concrete pavement with granite curbing for plaza roads. Rock excavation costs were calculated for lowering I-66 and constructing parking under the plaza. Roadway excavation/demolition was included for the removal of existing roadways that would be abandoned under the new design.

The plaza construction cost assumes a concrete deck and steel girders with the deck and girders totaling approximately five feet in depth. This is the deck depth required to support roadways and vehicular traffic. The two new buildings will have their own support systems. All bridges and overpasses are assumed to consist of concrete decks with steel girders. Retaining walls are assumed to be reinforced concrete with footings.

Landscaping and urban design costs include normal landscaping components as well as specific features and surface treatments. For the plaza area, these include special surface treatment for accommodating outdoor events on the public square, a fountain feature, building entrance zones, and side/rear yards for the buildings.

The cost estimate also includes basic mechanical and electrical systems for areas underneath the plaza. The roadway area under the plaza would not be a tunnel; it would be open on three sides. The best engineering assessment at this time is that full-scale mechanical ventilation systems would not be required. However, this issue should be further analyzed during the design phase after the size of the plaza and final roadway configurations have been determined. In addition, fire and emergency access requirements should be determined at that time.

A 40 percent contingency was added to the estimated construction costs. A 15 percent planning and design fee, a 15 percent construction management fee, a 10 percent engineering/administrative fee, and a 10 percent maintenance of traffic through construction work zones fee was then applied to the post-contingency cost estimates to yield the total capital cost.

The capital costs outlined above are for a traditional design-bid-build contracting mechanism. A design-build contract might prove advantageous to coordinate the design and construction of the plaza with its associated buildings, but it would come at a higher cost and require moneys in advance. In contrast, design-bid-build contracting comes with more certainty about fiscal costs, but at the expense of a delayed schedule, which in itself will cause costs to rise with inflation.

#### OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Operation and maintenance of the improvements identified in the Access Study would incur continuing costs. These costs would include:

*Lighting.* An extensive overhead lighting system would be required under the plaza, using standard lighting fixtures on the roadway sections. If special lighting fixtures were used on the plaza, maintenance costs would be slightly higher. Street light lamps would typically be replaced on a 4-year cycle. Overhead lights under the

plaza should be re-lamped on a 2-year basis. Electrical power for the lighting systems would be the only operational cost.

*Ventilation (if required).* If subsequent design studies determine that the areas beneath the plaza require ventilation, carbon monoxide detection, closed-circuit television, heat detection and traffic control systems, regular service would be needed to ensure the systems are functioning properly. These systems would require electrical power.

*Mechanical.* Lowering the grade of I-66 may require a storm water pumping station. If a pumping station is needed, the sump pumps would require regular maintenance. Operational costs would be minimal.

*Structural.* This includes normal bridge or structural maintenance items such as drainage system cleaning, concrete repair, girder painting, graffiti removal, leak sealing, etc. Annual costs would be minimal for many years, but the long-term costs for maintaining a large elevated structure would be significant. A comprehensive maintenance program that would keep drains operating, cracks sealed, and girders rust free would extend the life of the structure. A major rehabilitation project should be expected in approximately 30 years.

*Roadway.* Items to be maintained include pavement, pavement markings, striping, curbs and gutters, and sidewalks. Pavement markings would need replacing every 5 years. Pavement, curbs and gutters, and sidewalks have an expected lifetime of 20 years between major rehabilitations. Minor maintenance, such as pothole and sidewalk repairs, would occur annually or when required.

*Signs.* Signs would require maintenance to repair knockdowns (from accidents) and graffiti removal. If overhead signs are used under the plaza, they would require regular maintenance to replace bulbs and/or lighting fixtures on the sign structures. There would also be some costs for electrical service.

*Landscaping.* Trees and shrubs would be trimmed and/or pruned on a regular schedule and replaced when necessary.

*Snow and Ice Control.* All roadway surfaces would require application of abrasives and/or salt during inclement winter weather.

*Cleaning.* All roadways would require regular sweeping and flushing, and the roadsides should be kept free of litter.

Annual maintenance costs, except for the regular replacement of streetlight lamps, snow removal, and cleaning would be relatively low for many years. After 10 years or so, annual costs would start to rise as various elements reach the end of their service lives. Major rehabilitation work should be anticipated in 30 years. The costs for maintenance and operation for all elements of the new deck, pedestrian bridges, and roadways are estimated at approximately \$100,000 per year. This estimate is based upon current DDOT expenditures for major roadways.

#### ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

With a complex and highly visible project of this nature, the roles of each agency responsible for the enterprise must be described as carefully as the project itself. We know that strong institutional arrangements and clear understandings of responsibilities are critical to keeping the project on schedule and containing costs. These agreements will provide a firm foundation for success, but they must build in sufficient flexibility so the parties can adapt to unforeseen circumstances.

A detailed memorandum of agreement (MOA) is the best way to meet these goals. This would provide the various agencies with a complete understanding of their requirements and allow their roles to evolve as the project progresses. The agencies involved include the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, DDOT, NPS, and FHWA. Elements of the MOA are outlined below.

For each party, the MOA would identify:

- Jurisdictional and maintenance responsibilities for the project;
- Administrative, financial, and project implementation and management oversight;
- Engineering and other services in connection with the survey, design, construction, and improvements of the project.

The body of the MOA would identify individual agency roles in more detail including:

- Lead agency for project development and what this entails, such as final design approval and funding requirements and responsibilities.
- Cooperating agency or agencies and what this entails, such as providing consultant assistance contracts, permits, and right-of-way plans.
- Definition of the standards under which the project is to be designed and constructed, such as American Association of State Highway and Transportation Offi-

cials (AASHTO) design standards for roads and National Building Code and National Electrical Code for buildings.

- Final disposition of as-built plans and project records.
- Responsibilities for providing comments and concurrences on milestones in the development and implementation of the project.
- Funding and how it is provided, and in accordance with what applicable rules and regulations it will be administered.

The MOA would also include standard clauses required by law, including references to the Anti-Deficiency Act, Non-Discrimination, Prohibitions on Lobbying, and coordination of responsibilities under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, FHWA is committed to work with the Kennedy Center, the District of Columbia, the National Park Service, and others at the Federal and local level on possible access improvements to the Kennedy Center that would improve the safety and efficiency of all transportation modes in its vicinity. We look forward to working with this Committee over the coming years to ensure that the transportation system around the Kennedy Center serves the Center and all residents in the best possible manner.

Thank you again for the opportunity to discuss the results of the Kennedy Center Access Study. I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

---

#### STATEMENT OF DAN TANGHERLINI, DIRECTOR, D.C. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Good morning Chairman Jeffords and members of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Thank you for this opportunity to speak before the Committee. My name is Dan Tangherlini and I am acting director of the Department of Transportation, District of Columbia Government.

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a major national tourist attraction and the Washington Region's premiere entertainment venue. In the year 2000, the U.S. Department of Transportation published the Kennedy Center Access Study that was authorized by Congress in 1998. The District Department of Transportation participated in this Study and is assisting in the subsequent environmental analysis currently underway.

The District Department of Transportation recognizes the Kennedy Center's severe transportation access constraints. The 2000 Study documents the problems including:

- The series of freeways and parkways surrounding the Center which serve to isolate it from both District neighborhoods and the National Mall;
- Evening commuter traffic congestion on the Rock Creek and Potomac Freeway and ramps to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge which interferes with performance-bound traffic to the Center;
- An absence of pedestrian and bicycle facilities offering safe and direct routes to the Center; and
- Inadequate access to the facility by public transit. The study notes that the Foggy Bottom Metrorail Station, the Metrorail Station closest to the Kennedy Center, is one-half mile away.

The centerpiece of the proposed transportation access improvements would be the creation of a plaza, which would carry E Street NW directly into the Kennedy Center. This plaza would be created by constructing a deck over the Potomac Freeway. The plaza could include a public square and two building sites on either side of the extended E Street NW.

The District Department of Transportation strongly supports transportation improvements, which will eliminate the Kennedy Center's physical isolation and connect the Center with the Foggy Bottom neighborhood and the Monumental Core of the City. We also support the aesthetic vision of restoring the L'Enfant Plan street grid and economic opportunities that may be created by the project.

We respectfully suggest that the Federal Government should fund this project through a special appropriation which would not impact the District's annual allocation of Federal Aid, and that the Federal Highway Administration should construct the improvements.

The Center's initial design concept provided pedestrian access to the Potomac River and vehicular access from the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, yet, due to funding constraints, the Kennedy Center was built in its isolated environment. The level of improvements recommended by the study to correct the original access deficiencies is extensive. The Access Study places the cost of improvements at \$269 million. By contrast, the District Department of Transportation spent approximately

\$255 million in construction activity in fiscal year 2001. Our entire annual apportionment and allocation for the current fiscal year is \$126 million.

The District Department of Transportation cautions that the proposed improvements should not be considered independently of the District of Columbia's transportation network. The District is currently engaged in a study to develop solutions to the structural and operation constraints of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge. The Kennedy Center access project should be closely coordinated with the bridge study.

In turn, both of these projects must be considered within a larger context of land use and transportation planning in the West End. To adequately address transportation problems in the area, including the Kennedy Center, a comprehensive approach should include a corridor encompassing the Whitehurst Freeway, Lower K Street, and the Roosevelt Bridge.

In its discussion of the Kennedy Center in the Legacy Plan, the National Capital Planning Commission states that a successful transportation plan must extend beyond physical improvements and that behavioral changes must also occur. It explains that employers must develop traffic management programs to reduce congestion and travel times.

A comprehensive transportation planning approach to solutions will truly weave access to the Kennedy Center into the transportation fabric of the District of Columbia.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

---

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL KAISER, PRESIDENT OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Michael Kaiser. As president of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, I am pleased to be able to appear before you today to lend my strong support for legislation that will increase substantially access to the performing arts, and to arts education, for children and adults in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States. If enacted, the legislation before you will build upon the success of the Kennedy Center since its founding in 1971 by providing greatly enhanced physical access to those living in or visiting the District of Columbia and by creating the resources required to improve the services the Kennedy Center can offer outside of the District in all fifty states of the union. This legislation, therefore, provides a natural development of the original vision for the Kennedy Center.

The Kennedy Center is both our national arts center and a living memorial to President Kennedy. I emphasize the word "living" because unlike other memorials whose beauty and majesty lie primarily in their structures, the importance of the Kennedy Center also lies within the people whose lives it touches. Each year, thousands of musicians, dancers, actors and actresses bring performances to life. Over 5 million schoolchildren in all 50 states benefit from our outreach and educational programs each year. Millions of patrons enjoy performances at the Kennedy Center and millions of tourists visit simply to see our nation's tribute to President Kennedy.

I am proud of all that the Kennedy Center has done to meet its national mandate. The reach of the Kennedy Center has grown beyond what anyone could have envisioned when the National Cultural Center was first authorized in 1958. But much more remains to be done. The proposal before this Committee will ensure that the Kennedy Center's physical facilities can support our enhanced vision of this nation's living arts memorial in two important ways.

First, the legislation will expand access to the Kennedy Center. The reconfiguration of the roadways and the construction of a new Plaza will make physically accessing the Kennedy Center more user-friendly. Traffic will be routed more directly to the Kennedy Center and new bike trails and pedestrian paths will make alternative methods of access a reality.

These changes not only will provide pragmatic physical access, but also will finally link the Kennedy Center to the rest of the District. Currently the Kennedy Center is an island in a sea of roadways. As envisioned in the Department of Transportation's report, the reconfigured roadways, bike trails and pedestrian paths will link the Kennedy Center more directly to other important landmarks and the Mall. More than four decades after it was envisioned, the Kennedy Center will finally become linked to the heart of our capital's memorials on the Mall.

Access will be increased not only in a physical sense, but also in terms of the potential audience. With the expansion of the Kennedy Center through the creation of the Plaza and the construction of two buildings on the Plaza, more opportunities

for reaching new audiences can be realized. The increased green space around the Kennedy Center makes consideration of outdoor concerts viable. New rehearsal space expands the possibility of master classes or a greater variety of new pieces created for smaller venues. The greater the variety of the artistic works that can be brought to the Kennedy Center, the broader the audience that the Center can reach—a vital goal for an arts center charged with serving a multicultural nation.

The proposal will also help the Kennedy Center fulfill another important part of its mandate—to educate the Nation about the performing arts. One of the new Plaza buildings will be dedicated solely to that mission. The new building will house displays on the history of the performing arts, drawing from the collections of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution. Visitors will also be able to experience life in the arts through interactive displays that allow visitors to take part in such activities as conducting an orchestra or designing sets and costumes.

The future of the performing arts in our Nation is dependent on educating children about this nation's rich arts heritage and the joy of involvement in the arts. This new building dedicated to educating our citizens about our nation's rich performing arts history and increasing an understanding of the potential of our arts future is an essential component to fulfilling the Kennedy Center's role as our nation's cultural center.

I am proud of all that the Kennedy Center has accomplished over the last 31 years. It has sealed its place as the center of our nation's performing arts; it has honored President Kennedy's memory with continuous arts performances; and it has educated generations of Americans about all that is great in our nation's performing arts.

The Kennedy Center is now prepared to build upon its success in this new century. As in the past, we will work in partnership with Congress to bring this shared vision of an expanded national performing arts center to life. The new buildings on the Plaza will be constructed with privately raised funds. This will be no small undertaking on the part of the Kennedy Center. However, I am confident the private funds required can be identified. The growing enthusiasm for the activities of the Kennedy Center can be seen in the increasing levels of private support we have enjoyed recently. This fiscal year, alone, the Kennedy Center will raise more private money than ever before in its history, increasing contributed revenue 25 percent over the prior year during a difficult economic period.

I feel confident, therefore, that the partnership and shared vision that have bolstered the Kennedy Center to a level of success not imagined at its inception will bring this project to fruition. Everyone at the Kennedy Center is deeply grateful to this Committee for its consideration of this legislation and its past support and especially to you Mr. Chairman for your continuing interest in the arts and education of this nation. We would also like to acknowledge the tremendous support we have received from the Department of Transportation and Secretary Mineta and the District of Columbia and Mayor Williams.

I stand ready to work with Congress, with the Department of Transportation and with the District of Columbia to realize this vision for our nation's art center and am confident that our historic partnership will bring unimaginable benefits to our Nation through an expanded and more accessible John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

