

Frequently Asked Questions Regarding HR 3471 World Trade Center Site Historic Study Act

1) Will this study stop or delay currently advancing re-development work at the WTC site?

NO. The bill simply requires a study and report to congress. It does NOT proscribe any further action. There is no reason a six-month study on the feasibility of including the footprints in the memorial cannot be done concurrently with the current memorial design selection process.

2) How long would the study take?

No more than six months but it could be accomplished sooner. We have requested a site tour of the footprints with preservation experts in early December and are hopeful the Port Authority will not delay this request in light of its stated desire to move quickly

3) Does the initiation of this study trigger federal control over the memorial creation process?

NO. It studies the feasibility of including the footprints and the feasibility of including the memorial in the National Park System. In light of the eventual control of the Park Service over the memorial now under discussion, it seems logical to obtain this information sooner rather than later. In fact, among nine criteria the Park Service is required to use in conducting the feasibility study are requirements that it consider local support and socio-economic impact of including the site in the System.

4) Would the results of this study, if it recommended the site for federal monument status, lead to a federal take-over of the tribute creation process?

NO. For that to happen, Congress must pass and the President must sign an additional provision. In fact, proponents of the legislation were adamant that the legislation NOT proscribe that outcome. Whether to include the memorial in the park Systems should be studied and recommended by the experts, not politicians.

5) Will this study influence the overall design of the 9/11 memorial or just affect the monument status of the footprints?

The study will report on the feasibility of including the footprints in the memorial and in the park system. If the report shows inclusion of the footprints is feasible, further action would be required to mandate their inclusion. The Port Authority and the LMDC would have the opportunity to respond in the affirmative without further legal action, and would ideally include the footprints in the memorial design without imposition of a legal requirement to do so.

(Prepared by the offices of Representatives Shays and Maloney)