EYP-Loring, LLC

Meeting Minutes

PROJECT	Smithsonian Institution- Revitalization of the Historic Core (RoHC)	MEETING DATE	6/15/2022
ORGANIZER	Smithsonian Institution, Carly Bond (moderator)	TIME	2:30-4:30pm
LOCATION	Virtual/Zoom		
PANELISTS	Ronald S. Cortez – Smithsonian Institution Carly Bond- Smithsonian Institution Sharon Park- Smithsonian Institution Christopher Lethbridge- Smithsonian Institution Ann Trowbridge- Smithsonian Institution Brenda Sanchez- Smithsonian Institution Lauren Brandes- Smithsonian Institution Matthew Chalifoux, EYP-Loring Faye Harwell, RHI (Rhodeside and Harwell) Nathan Hicks, Silman Anthony Bochicchio, EYP-Loring		
SUBJECT	Consulting Parties Meeting #4		

MEETING MINUTES

Purpose – This was Consulting Parties Meeting 4 for the Revitalization of the Historic Core (RoHC) project of the Smithsonian Institution. The Historic Core includes the Smithsonian Institution Building (SIB, also known as "The Castle") and the Arts and Industries Building (AIB). The meeting was held in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The purpose of the meeting was to update Consulting Parties on the resequencing of the RoHC project, to first focus on the Castle. The AIB and the Central Utility Plant may be a future project. Consulting Parties were provided an overview of design development.

The meeting was assembled virtually and included a slide presentation, which has been posted on the RoHC project website. Attendees were asked to post questions or comments in the chat during the presentation. The majority of questions and comments were reviewed and responded to verbally during breaks in the presentation. The following is a list of the questions and comments with a summary of the responses.

Questions and Comments

<u>Written</u>

1. Q: Will the CUP will be developed in the next phase?

R: The Central Utility Plant (CUP) which has been part of previous presentations to the Consulting Parties will not be included in the RoHC Revitalize Castle project. As future projects within the historic core are developed the potential for including the CUP will be evaluated.

2. Q: The AIB has been a possible site for various new museums, for years. It has been vacant for; I think seventeen years. How will this building ever be released from this seemingly endless limbo? Might there be a sunset date for selection?

R: The process for site evaluation and selection for the two new Smithsonian Museums (National Museum of the American Latino and the American Women's History Museum) is underway and is scheduled to be completed by December 2022. The Arts and Industries Building (AIB) is one of four sites being further evaluated for use as one of the museums.

3. Q: Is fall protection part of the project?

R: Yes, fall protection is being incorporated as required to allow Smithsonian staff to safely access roof areas for regular maintenance and operations.

4. Q: Regarding the windows: there seems to be a dimension missing on the left sketch showing the applied muntins. The actual width of the applied muntins can't be compared to the actual width of the true muntins. It seems to me that once you lose the historic material and method of construction there's little sense in trying to have a "true" muntin on a metal window with multiple layers of glazing and blast resistance. I think it would be more important to have a finished product that looks as much like the historic as possible, and this could well be the applied muntin option?

R: The question is a great summary of the design challenge that faces the Smithsonian. The glazing that will be used in the replacement windows is approximately one inch thick and in a true divided lite unit would require a wider muntin to properly support and hold the glazing in place. If a simulated divided lite is used the historic muntin profile can be used, but since many of the windows will be visible from close up from the interior the appearance of the simulated divided lite may not be acceptable. The true divided lite, with the wider muntin profile, will result in a change to the exterior and interior appearance that may be considered a negative effect. The Smithsonian and the design team are developing large scale drawings, mock-ups, and viewing samples to evaluate these options. These will be shared with the Consulting Parties at a future meeting for review and input.

5. Q: What specific granite(s) are you considering, and are there precedents in and around the Castle, AIB and gardens?

R: There are a number of granites and other stones that are currently used in the landscape of the historic core. These have been catalogued and are being considered for use along with other stones.

6. Q: Faye--can you please indicate how the perimeter security has been revised since our last staff consultation meeting?

R: Slide 46 of the presentation illustrates the previous concept, slide 47 the revised proposed concept. Significant changes include extending the design study to the east to 12th Street, across the entire entry plaza to the Freer Gallery, shifting the line of the perimeter security away from the curb edge, utilizing more of the existing landscape features as part of the perimeter security system, and incorporating site furniture (hardened) as part of the system.

7. Q: Can you explain again about the "Olmsted" light fixture? When does it date from? Is it being used at its historic height? It seems very tall for an early light fixture.

R: The "Olmsted" light fixture was designed specifically for the National Mall in the 1930s by J.W. Gosling of General Electric laboratories and approved for that use by the CFA in 1936. An Art Deco cylindrical cast-iron luminaire is suspended atop a steel fluted post on a cast-iron base. The present configuration of the fixtures along Jefferson and Madison Drives dates to circa 1975. The proposed fixture included in the presentation (visualizations and elevations) has an overall height of 24 feet, which is typical of the fixture elsewhere on the National Mall.

Verbal

8. Q: The approach/design of the perimeter security is conceptually tight and logical. Additional work is required on key details to make the design as unobtrusive as possible. This includes the stepping at the ends of the wall elements, coursing, the texture of the stone, etc.

R: We agree, the detailing of the components requires additional development. At this preliminary level of design, we are focused on confirming the location of the system components and the basic design of each.

9. Q: Using a stone in the landscape that tries to "blend" with the Seneca sandstone of the building, such as the Carnelian granite can be challenging. A more neutral color, such as gray, may be a better option.

R: The team is assembling stone samples to review at the site. A range of colors and textures will be evaluated. During a future consulting parties meeting samples of stone alternatives will be presented and reviewed.

10. Q: The seismic joint cover layout and its relationship to elements around the building (areaways, the Porte Cochere) result in some very wide joints and odd intersections. The layouts require further development to minimize their visual impact.

R: The seismic joint layout is continuing to be developed in coordination with the structural design and the landscape. Keeping the line of the seismic joint as straight as possible provides benefits from a construction and performance perspective. The design team is also developing the designs of the joints themselves and coordinating with the selection of potential stone inserts. The objective is to construct a mock-up that can be viewed at the site.

11. Q: What will be the lifespan of the new metal windows? The wood windows that are being replaced are not that old (approximately 1990) and they are in poor condition. Will the new windows have a longer life?

R: Most window system manufacturers provide a warranty of 20 to 25 years. Good quality metal windows when properly maintained should have a much longer lifespan. The windows that are being considered for use in the Castle will be similar to the windows that were recently installed in the AIB.

12. Q: Will the thermal improvements to the roofs impact the ridgelines?

R: Yes, where the roof assembly is being thickened to accommodate insulation, the ridgelines will shift up slightly. The team will be studying how these changes will impact the details where roofs intersect with other elements such as walls or roof objects such as the cupola on the East Wing.

13. Q: Some of the information relating to replacement windows had not been presented before (e.g. proposed materials, true vs simulated divided lights). Please submit detailed information and consult prior to making any decisions about the replacement windows.

We are pleased with the revised perimeter security concept but also request the Smithsonian to consult further with us regarding details such as the appearance of the "bench walls" – especially on either side of the port cochere. More detailed renderings of these proposed features would be very helpful in evaluating their compatibility with this highly visible location.

R: The Smithsonian acknowledges that there was a lag between Consulting Parties Meetings 3 and 4, and that the purpose of the meeting today was to provide an overview of design development on actions such as window replacement and perimeter security. Consulting Parties meetings will continue through 2023 for consultation on the design actions for the Castle.

END OF MEETING

The slide presentations from Consulting Parties Meeting 4 (06/15/2022) is available on the project webpage. Written comments are welcome through 15 July 2022, to <u>BondC@si.edu</u>.