

ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE
Forty-seventh Legislature – Second Regular Session

LEGISLATIVE GOVERNMENTAL MALL COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, October 18, 2006
Senate Hearing Room 1 -- 3:00 p.m.

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

Members Present

Senator Flake
William Bell (in place of Lynne Smith)
Heidi Birch
LeRoy Brady
Thomas Chapman

Representative McLain
Kevin DeMenna
Joy Rich
Tom Smith, Chairman

Members Absent

Donald Keuth, Jr.
Roger Dee Manny

David Richert

Speakers Present

Roger Gorres, Facilities Manager, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT)
Senator Jack Harper
Representative Steve Gallardo
Matthew Salenger, representing self
Edward M. Jones, representing self
Michael Herold, representing self
Alex Pensiero, representing self
Michael McAvoy, representing self
Lois Pensiero, representing self
Carol Reed, representing self

Chairman Smith conveyed that he was appointed to the Governmental Mall Commission over 13 years ago by Jane Dee Hull who was then Speaker of the House. The Commission approves monuments and buildings that go into the Governmental Mall area with the intention of upgrading the area. When a group wishes to locate a memorial in Wesley Bolin Plaza (WBP), the Legislature must pass a bill to approve the structure, after which the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) identifies placement, determines if the structure is vandalism proof, and ensures there is no water involved because many homeless people bathe in the water. The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission then checks the accuracy of dates, etc., and the plan is

presented to the Governmental Mall Commission. This process normally takes two years, one year for design and construction and another year to raise funds. The two-year limit can be extended by having a legislator introduce a bill for that purpose. He noted that the Commission has the authority to check everything. For example, a meeting was held on the ~~Polly Klaas~~ **Armenian Holocaust** Memorial, which had some strong language against Turkish people. When the memorial was presented to the Commission, the Members toned down the wording.

Approval of Arizona Department of Transportation Modular Office Buildings

Roger Gorres, Facilities Manager, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), requested final approval for the March 17, 2006 request to install two modular buildings at the southwest corner of Jackson Street and 16th Avenue. He noted that guidance was received from the Members at the March meeting to prepare a document that addressed the criteria outlined in accordance with the Capitol District Development Guidelines, which was completed and issued one week later (Attachment 1). He subsequently conversed with Mr. Keuth who indicated that the document addressed his concerns expressed at the March meeting, especially the addition of a sidewalk and matching the visual appearance of the two buildings to adjacent structures.

He related to Mr. Chapman that he does not know the cost per square foot of the modular buildings, but will find out. When Mr. Chapman asked why the space cannot be rented and an appropriation obtained for a permanent building, Mr. Gorres explained that it would be more cost-effective to install the two modular buildings versus leasing equivalent space over a five-year period.

Mr. Chapman commented that at a time when the Commission is trying to improve the beauty of the area, the modular buildings are not appropriate. Mr. Gorres noted that ADOT's 2008 capital improvement plan contains a high-priority request for funds to study the feasibility of replacing three of the current buildings in the area with a new structure. If a new administration building is built, the modular buildings would be removed at completion of construction, which should be in the next five years, if the Legislature approves the study next year.

Mr. Brady remarked that he is not participating in the discussion or voting since he works for ADOT.

Mr. Bell moved, seconded by Mr. Chapman, that the Commission approve the modular buildings for ADOT. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-2-0-3 with 1 not voting (Attachment 2).

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Birch moved, seconded by Mr. Chapman, that the Commission approve the minutes of March 17, 2006 and August 16, 2006. The motion carried.

Chairman Smith introduced a new Member, Senator Jake Flake.

Discussion of 9/11 Memorial

Chairman Smith said there has been some controversy concerning the 9/11 Memorial. He is not representing any political party, but as a citizen of the U.S. and a resident of the State of Arizona, he would like to see if any of the comments on the memorial can be corrected, if necessary. He is also a veteran with 24 years in the Marine Corps. He has not talked to Governor Janet Napolitano or any of her staff, or Len Munsil or any of his staff, or any of their campaign committees. He did talk to Billy Shields, the Chairman of the 9/11 Memorial Commission, and George Weiss, a member of the 9/11 Memorial Commission; in fact, he walked through the memorial while Mr. Shields and Mr. Weiss explained the comments on the memorial. Chairman Smith thanked the members of the 9/11 Memorial Commission who worked on the memorial without pay and under difficult conditions, noting that while he may not agree with the results, the members' time and efforts are appreciated.

He noted that Executive Order 2003-02 signed by Governors Jane Dee Hull and Janet Napolitano specifically states that the memorial should memorialize events on 9/11, while **instruction that went out to** the artists said the events around 9/11 would be memorialized. On February 17, 2006, the Governmental Mall Commission approved the design and placement of the 9/11 Memorial, but did not approve any of the statements or comments on the memorial.

Mrs. McLain noted that she sent Chairman Smith a letter (Attachment 3) and email conveying concerns about several of the phrases on the memorial that she does not believe conform to the spirit of memorializing the events of 9/11, particularly:

“Violent acts leading U.S. to war.....” followed by several dates
“07 01 02 Erroneous US air strike kills 46 Uruzgan civilians”

She added that she is disappointed at the general tenor and tone of most of the phrases.

Chairman Smith remarked that having the piece of steel from the World Trade Center (WTC), rubble from the Pentagon, and dirt from Shanksville, Pennsylvania is a good idea, as well as the fact that the sun will shine on the concrete box on September 11.

Mr. Bell said he understands that after concerns were raised, certain members of the 9/11 Memorial Commission indicated willingness to reconvene to discuss the inscriptions, which should be done as soon as possible. Chairman Smith agreed, pointing out that the purpose of this meeting, although some people thought it should not be held until after November 7, is to present guidelines/thoughts to the 9/11 Commission.

Mr. DeMenna said he was appointed to the Governmental Mall Commission by then Speaker Jake Flake and never expected to be addressing something like this. He opined that the statements on the memorial need to be changed. The other memorials in WBP speak to different groups, but this event touched everyone, and as a result, should be built around consensus. He questioned the need for this meeting three weeks before the election since the less the issue is politicized, the better the chances are of reaching a consensus. He added that Mr. Shields and Mr. Weiss are men of the highest motives, as well as the other members of the 9/11 Commission. Chairman Smith said this is not a political gathering or political circus. The intent is to create a memorial that will meet the standard as directed by the Executive Order.

Mr. Bell stated that the 9/11 Commission labored long hours to develop the 9/11 Memorial. Since Mr. Shields and other members are willing to reconvene and attempt to bring about a consensus in terms of what should appear on the memorial and the Governmental Mall Commission did not and will not approve the wording until the 9/11 Commission comes forth with changes, this gathering is somewhat premature. Chairman Smith reiterated that the purpose of the meeting is to provide information and guidance to the 9/11 Memorial Commission, which the members can ignore or not, but it is important to provide guidance.

Senator Flake remarked that he has a strong interest in other items on the Capitol Mall, including possible abolishment of the House and Senate buildings and replacement with a building that is appropriate for the state. Since he was not aware that he would be on the Commission until a few days ago, he had only read about the 9/11 Memorial in the paper, so he walked over to see it and found that it is not easy to read. Some of the statements mentioned in the press are not appropriate and changes should be made. He talked to one of the members of the 9/11 Commission who agreed that changes need to be made and will be made, so the Members should wait for the 9/11 Commission to make those changes.

Ms. Birch advised that she was appointed by Maricopa County and agrees with Mrs. McLain's comments. This is a good opportunity for the Governmental Mall Commission to recommend consideration of the comments by the 9/11 Memorial Commission. Mr. Chapman agreed that the 9/11 Memorial Commission needs to deal with the issue and listen to what the Governmental Mall Commission Members have to say; however, the 9/11 Commission will ultimately return to the Governmental Mall Commission.

Senator Jack Harper related that he is a veteran of the U.S. Army, Arizona Army National Guard and a member of the American Legion. Every day that anti-American comments remain on the 9/11 Memorial sears the hearts of veterans. Those comments should have been erased from the memorial at the onset of public outrage, and for Mr. Shields to say the 9/11 Commission is going to wait until after the election to meet, not even committing to taking some of the comments off the memorial, is inappropriate.

He said he appreciates Mr. Shields taking the blame for some of the statements, but he is protecting the liberal Governor who bestowed a monopoly of power upon him. The comments on the 9/11 Memorial, which is supposed to commemorate the lives of the victims of 9/11, and the inappropriate critical thinking curriculum that goes along with it, that when students visit it implies that American foreign policy caused the U.S. to be attacked on 9/11 where nearly 3,000 people lost their lives, is shameful, and the Governor should take credit for what has happened.

Senator Harper said this is not the first time the Governor pandered to the anti-American, blame America first crowd. Last year, Cindy Sheehan showed up in Arizona and urged the Governor to urge the President to withdraw Arizona Army National Guard troops. That was a time when every anti-American statement made it on a website for terrorists, which would incite and encourage terrorists to attack U.S. soldiers. It was not until he surveyed the Members of the House Judiciary Committee to find there were enough votes to impeach the Governor should she jeopardize U.S. troops overseas by pandering to Cindy Sheehan, that she finally took action.

Chairman Smith interjected that this discussion is not supposed to be political and the purpose is not to point fingers at anyone.

Senator Harper concluded by stating that only one thing encourages the Governor to take action in the best interest of this country, which is the threat of removal from office. Mr. Shields should not imply that the 9/11 Commission should wait until after an election to fix the memorial. It needs to be taken care of immediately and not wait until an arbitrary date to take a look at it with no commitment to fix it.

Representative Steve Gallardo encouraged the Governmental Mall Commission to let the 9/11 commissioners do what the commissioners were appointed to do, which is put together a memorial that the entire state can be proud of. Addressing an issue so close to an election will fuel fires and emotions that do not need to be fueled. Mr. Shields stated that he will bring the Commission together, but he cannot commit to making any changes because he only has one vote. Whether or not any changes need to be made will be decided by the 9/11 Commission, so for the Governmental Mall Commission to address this is going in the wrong direction. This is a very sensitive issue and playing on the emotions of the victims is bad for the state and the memorial.

He remarked that the Governor had no control over the actual building of the memorial. She only appointed the 9/11 Commission members, along with Governor Hull, so trying to point the blame at the Governor is wrong. Senator Harper's attempt to turn this Commission into disgusting political theater is not needed. He requested that the 9/11 Memorial Commission be allowed to gather together after November 7 to develop a plan to present to the Governmental Mall Commission. This is something that is near and dear to everybody's hearts so it is only right to have a memorial at the mall of which everyone can be proud.

Senator Flake asked what November 7 has to do with this if it is not a political issue and wondered why the 9/11 Commission cannot get on with the work. Mr. Gallardo agreed that this should be addressed immediately, but indicated that for the Governmental Mall Commission to take a step before the 9/11 Memorial Commission has a chance to address the issue is wrong. Right now there is such a heated election with Republicans and Democrats vying for critical offices in the state who will use this kind of issue for partisanship. Mr. Shields agreed to reconvene the Commission, and perhaps that was the earliest date the Commission could meet, he does not know, but the 9/11 Commission should address the issue as soon as possible.

Mrs. McLain wondered if the 9/11 Commission members will come up with anything different since the members will be the same. Mr. Gallardo responded that as a member of the Governmental Mall Commission, she has an opportunity to voice her concern to every member of the 9/11 Commission. He suggested that she forward a copy of her letter to Mr. Shields and other members of the 9/11 Commission rather than the Governmental Mall Commission addressing something the 9/11 Commission already intends to do.

Mr. Smith noted that the first agenda item involved putting in modular buildings by ADOT. The Governmental Mall Commission voiced objections to the plans, corrections were made and the plan was brought back today for approval. This is the same scenario where the Governmental Mall Commission members will voice accumulative objections or suggestions for the 9/11 Commission to act on as it so desires.

Mr. Gallardo pointed out that there was an opportunity the first time around to object to some of the comments, but there were no objections. The 9/11 Commission should be allowed to develop a new plan to present to the Governmental Mall Commission to make comments. He indicated to Mr. DeMenna that he believes changes are needed as there was some miscommunication about the intent of the actual design, which was to memorialize 9/11, so the 9/11 Commission needs to look at and readdress some of the comments.

Matthew Salenger, representing self, explained that he is a member of the artist's team for the 9/11 Memorial. Providing letters in support of the memorial, some from veterans (Attachments 4 through 16), he noted that some of the people questioned the same comments the members questioned, but after looking into it, found that the inscriptions were part of the entire experience of 9/11. Every member of the artist's team has a father who is a veteran. Maria Salenger has a brother who volunteered for the Army and is currently stationed in Iraq. He was in Arizona on vacation and saw the memorial, and none of these people have a problem with the text.

Mr. Salenger used the Vietnam War Memorial at WBP as a precedent to validate the appropriateness of the Arizona 9/11 Memorial. The information included in the Vietnam Memorial, which has stood for the past 20 years to honor the men and women who served during that war, provides a balanced description of the times for several generations to reflect upon, including references to the My Lai massacres, students killed at Penn State, the Pentagon papers, and the fact that the U.S. bombed North Vietnam on Christmas, etc., that are very similar to the types of statements on the 9/11 Memorial (Attachment 17).

He submitted that any memorial is open to interpretation. The 9/11 Memorial is intended to provide for a diverse range of thoughtful interactions to take place. The charge, as given to the artist's team in a brief, was to create a memorial that would educate students for many generations. The inscriptions that raised the most eyebrows from people who claimed the memorial is critical of America are not critical, but simply state a feeling or factual event, and the meaning derived from the statements is up to the person viewing them. About 30,000 people across the state helped make this memorial. The 9/11 Commission members held on to their diverse beliefs and views throughout the entire process, but were able to act as a single body and produce a product that would reflect tolerance, respect and most important, unity (written remarks, Attachment 18).

Chairman Smith pointed out that specific instructions were provided from the Governor as to what to memorialize for the 9/11 Memorial; whereas, money was raised for the Vietnam War Memorial, which was developed and erected by Vietnam veterans.

Mr. Salenger indicated to Mr. DeMenna that he does not believe changes are needed to the 9/11 Memorial. The artist's team was given information that it was to include educational material, which was done. He indicated to Mrs. McLain that the statements were not intended to convey condemnation of the war in Iraq or imply that misleading statements led the U.S. into war.

Edward M. Jones, representing self, indicated that he is a member of the artist's team, which found consensus with the Commission to reduce the number of inscriptions from 350 possible statements to those that appear on the memorial. The inscriptions are "straight from the horse's

mouth” and nothing is anti-American or anti-war. None were ever intended to be disparaging toward this great country. Throughout the consensus and dedication, there was never any negative behavior; it was only after this issue became political that the negative attitude surfaced. He indicated to Mr. DeMenna that he would not be in favor of making changes.

Mr. DeMenna opined that the definition of consensus is broader than the Commission and the artist community. However it happened, the publicity the engravings received has redefined consensus so that it reflects veterans, Senator Harper, people like himself, and others, which is the standard he meant to apply. Mr. Jones wondered if a consensus can be reached, noting that many people will find it very inappropriate to make a change to the memorial, but if so, he will be back for another meeting.

Michael Herold, representing self, stated that his brother died on 9/11 and surmised that the artists tried to get too fancy. He has another brother and sister who live in Arizona and all they wanted was a stone in the ground stating “In memory of the victims of 9/11.” The sphere is nice, but this is not political. He has driven a bus for 28 years and does not even know who Len Munsil is. The last two years he and his sister went to Winslow, where there is a nice memorial near the freeway. He waited for a memorial in Phoenix, but when he saw the 9/11 Memorial, he cried. He asked that the statements be removed and replaced with “In memory of the victims of 9/11.”

Senator Flake remarked that Winslow is in his district. There are two large scraps of metal with a simple plaque at the memorial and a great patriotic ceremony is held that is very appropriate, which he attends every year.

Alex Pensiero, representing self, testified that he is not involved in politics, but he studied the memorial and believes it depicts history, which he thought was the intent. He grew up during World War II, is very patriotic, attended the U.S. Military Academy and lost 13 close classmates in Vietnam. When he visits the Vietnam Memorial, he is embarrassed to read items like Lt. Calley and My Lai, etc. He is also a high school history teacher, so he does not see anything wrong with the statements on the 9/11 Memorial. He clarified for Mr. DeMenna that he does not believe changes are necessary, but likes the process in which people disagree and sit down and talk.

Michael McAvoy, representing self, related that he moved to Arizona one-and-a-half years ago from New York. On 9/11, his brother, John, a New York City fireman, was in the towers when the towers collapsed and his lifelong best friend was on the 104th floor. He is representing them, their families and his mother who was recently in Arizona. When his mother saw some of the inscriptions on the 9/11 Memorial she asked, “What does this crap have to do with 9/11?” The website for the 9/11 Memorial that the Governor approved says the memorial is to honor those who lost their lives on 9/11, but he does not know what an erroneous air strike in a country 14,000 miles away 10 months later has to do with his brother and best friend being killed.

He stated that someone testified that this memorial is to unify, but it is dividing people. He did not go to New York City on 9/11 because he was proud that Arizona was building a memorial. He was present on September 9 when steel from the Trade Center arrived. He walked over and started reading the inscriptions, which made his stomach turn. “Head of terrorist organization speaks to U.S. people” gives credence to Bin Laden and “Erroneous U.S. air strike” is a knock

on the U.S. military. He does not know how those honor people who died on 9/11 and he will not go to the memorial again unless the inscriptions are changed. He likes the steel, but would prefer to see the victim's names instead of the inscriptions. He added that he does not agree with waiting until after the election, which in itself is a political statement. September 11 needs to be memorialized correctly and it should be done as soon as possible.

When Mr. Chapman asked if he attended any of the public hearings held by the 9/11 Commission, Mr. McAvoy explained that he moved to Arizona in April of last year and found out about the memorial in July. He called Mr. Shields and another member of the Commission because he wanted to be on the Commission, but he was told it was full. He offered to help in any way, but was told to wait and perhaps he would be involved in the school curriculum, which did not happen. His phone calls were not returned until he left a nasty message. He still wants to be on the Commission because he received an email from the firemen at his brother's firehouse in New York City stating that after seeing a video of the memorial and going to websites, the memorial is despicable and does not represent the Fire Department of New York or honor those who were killed on 9/11. There are many memorials on the east coast to those who died that day with no agenda or political statements, from which people leave feeling respectful, which is how it is supposed to be.

Lois Pensiero, representing self, stated that she is the mother of Maria, one of the design people, and the mother-in-law of Matthew Salenger. She sent a letter to Mr. Shields stating that she hoped there would be respectful dialogue outside the realm of politics, which everyone has respected today. She visited the memorial many times and read the inscriptions, and it occurred to her that the artist's team and the Commission fulfilled what they hoped, which is to not only honor what happened that day, but to help people remember. The purpose of history is to help people remember and learn. Some of the inscriptions make her sad and some make her proud to be an American because of what happened after 9/11. 9/11 was not a single isolated event, and because there is such a multiplicity of views and ideas presented, all of the inscriptions should be considered extremely carefully as they are a part of what happened at that time.

Ms. Pensiero added that her son finished his time in the reserves after many years, to her relief, but a short time later, he decided to re-enlist. He has been in Iraq for a year and was home last month for a short leave. He saw the memorial and did not take offense at the statements because he is a student of history and believes things should not be "pushed under the rug." In the U.S. people look at what has happened, and hopefully, learn from it. She indicated to Mr. DeMenna that she does not believe changes are in order; the statements work together to provide a forum for people, which was the intent.

Mrs. McLain stated that she does not believe anyone, except a few people, expected that the 9/11 Memorial would be a forum. It is important to study history and learn from mistakes, but a place is also needed to honor the people who died. The 9/11 Memorial is not the place for what she is suggesting. Ms. Pensiero said she understands and respects that, but believes the 9/11 Commission did not want a headstone.

Carol Reed, representing self, said she does not know anyone who perished on 9/11, except fellow citizens, which she still feels deeply five years later. When she heard about the memorial, she went to WBP and looked at the sayings. She had to climb up on the concrete to read the inscriptions because she did not want to wait five hours for each saying to become focused;

therefore, she has an issue with the physical design as well. She spent two hours taking photos, not only of the 9/11 Memorial, but all of the other memorials, to show people around the country that Arizona knows how to build a respectful memorial that honors victims and gives a timeline of the events of the day because it was humiliating and embarrassing to see the pictures of the 9/11 Memorial going out to everyone on the Internet. She opined that the 9/11 Memorial is an abomination and her preference would be to have it removed from state property.

Regarding the fact that many people are saying this is not political, she disagreed. This is a representative republic and she votes based on what people do. The Governor appointed the 9/11 Commission members. The Governmental Mall Commission, as she understood from Chairman Smith, was not given a list of sayings that were going to be placed on the memorial or an opportunity to approve or reject the sayings before the sayings were set in steel. That is an enormous mistake that should be corrected, and if all that is done is to remove some of the most egregious offensive sayings, she asked that the Governmental Mall Commission approve those down to the letter and not wait for the sayings to be set in steel.

Ms. Reed added that she does not believe handicapped disabled people would be able to climb up on the memorial, but would have to sit and roast in the Arizona sun for five hours, which is not a good idea. Except for a few victims whose last names are not even listed on the memorial, it does not memorialize anyone, except maybe the Uruzgans who were killed about a year later. She also questioned what the sinking of the Lusitania, Pearl Harbor, and the Bay of Tonkin had to do with 9/11 and why those dates are on the memorial.

Mr. Chapman asked if she attended 9/11 Commission hearings. Ms. Reed responded that she learned about this meeting in the Sunday newspaper. Now that she knows about the state websites, she plans to attend every Governmental Mall Commission meeting, and the Enduring Freedom Memorial better look like the picture that is portrayed.

Chairman Smith remarked that he is the chairman for that memorial and it will. He thanked everyone for attending and opined that if the purpose of the memorial is to memorialize the events on 9/11, he does not believe it does. The inscriptions never mention that the planes were hijacked by terrorists and flown into the WTC by the terrorists. This memorial is supposed to stand for generations, but 20 years from now, if a father brings his son or daughter to see it and the child asks why the pilot flew into the WTC, the father could easily say "I don't know." There is sufficient information available to identify the flights, where they were coming from or the destinations, and WTC should be spelled out because 15 or 20 years from now people may not even know what it is. The number of passengers and flight crews that died when the planes flew into the towers should be mentioned. There should be an indication of how many people died when the towers collapsed and what happened to the policemen and firemen who rushed into the burning inferno to rescue people, the fact that the plane went down in Shanksville, Pennsylvania and the crew said "Let's roll," which was a signal to take on the terrorists. Those are items that are important for future generations to know exactly what went on. Also, one statement says the President asked for a moment of silence, but the President's name is not mentioned, and it should be. A memorial and statements should be clear, concise, self-explanatory and not beg questions.

Mr. Chapman said in examining what the artwork is supposed to do, it should be a place for thought-provoking experiences that invite open dialogue, which occurred today from both sides,

and that is what democracy is all about. He expressed appreciation for everyone who attended and expressed an opinion.

Mr. DeMenna stated that this is the process at work and he wishes it had been front-loaded this way. He opined that the hearing could have begun and ended with Mr. McAvoy's comments. He appreciates everyone who spoke, but Mr. McAvoy's standing is unique. It is incumbent upon the 9/11 Commission to consider the discussion and testimony, and in particular, the items outlined in letters from Mr. Manny (Attachment 19) and Mrs. McLain. He hopes changes will be made and limited exclusively to what happened on that day.

Senator Flake remarked that he only spent a few minutes at the 9/11 Memorial, but if he had an hour, he does not believe he would have gotten "heads or tails" out of what is presented. He agrees with what Mrs. McLain believes should not be on the memorial and Chairman Smith's comments were very appropriate about what should be on the memorial.

Chairman Smith noted that Mr. Manny prepared a memorandum that he would like included for the record (Attachment 19) and asked that Mrs. McLain's letter be provided to Mr. Shields and Mr. Weiss.

Mr. Bell thanked everyone who attended and expressed comments about the memorial, which have been helpful, but pointed out that he does not want to discount the fact that many good people served on the 9/11 Commission and put forth a great deal of effort to develop the memorial. Mr. Shields indicated that he is willing to reconvene the Commission, which is in order. Mr. Bell encouraged the 9/11 Commission to get on with the process as soon as possible and bring back the product of their work to the Governmental Mall Commission.

Mrs. McLain remarked that she spoke with a member of the 9/11 Commission and expressed regret that she did not take a more active role by attending the meetings. She trusted that the members would do an appropriate job, but that trust was misplaced, so when the Commission meets again, she will be present.

Chairman Smith recommended that ADOA meet with the 9/11 Commission members and cover up the comments or remove the 42-foot piece of steel containing the statements until it can be replaced in order to stop the hoopla that is going on about the memorial. Mr. Bell responded that ADOA is not yet in possession of the memorial, so he does not want to give the impression that ADOA is capable of or willing to do that until the work of both Commissions is concluded.

Chairman Smith indicated that the 9/11 Commission can then have the responsibility of covering up the comments or removing the 42-foot section containing the comments.

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Linda Taylor, Committee Secretary
October 26, 2006

(Original minutes, attachments, and tape are on file in the Office of the Chief Clerk.)