

**CONSULTING PARTIES MEETING #3 AND NEPA SCOPING**

MEETING	Part 1	DATE/TIME	Tuesday, May 22, 2024
LOCATION	Virtual	PROJECT	HMSG: Revitalize Building + Plaza
URL		PROJECT #	SF 1921101, SOM 220087, SA 2114

**PANELISTS**

**Smithsonian Institution**

Al Masino  
Carly Bond  
Melissa Chiu

**NCPC**

Laura Shipman

**SOM-Seldorf**

Chris Cooper  
Michael Baskett

**Stantec**

Liz Estes

**Mueller Associates**

Matt Velky

**Agenda**

- Introduction
- National Environmental Policy Act - Public Scoping
- HMSG Mission and Program Aspirations
- Potential Scope of Improvements
  - Rooftop Mechanical
  - Envelope Improvements
- Schedule and Next Steps

**1 | Introduction and Context**

*Presented by Carly Bond*

C. Bond provided general introductory remarks as well as panelist introductions.

- Reviewed and summarized the project goals
- Reviewed Section 106 process and current stage for this project
- Reviewed Character Defining Features
- Instructions on how to provide comments
  - NEPA Comments
    - Due 5/31
  - Section 106
    - Due 6/22
  - Submit comments via email to: [preservation@si.edu](mailto:preservation@si.edu)

**2 | National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) - Public Scoping**

*Presented by Liz Estes - Stantec*

Liz Estes reviewed the NEPA scoping process, which is concurrent with Section 106.

- Project is currently in scoping phase - gathering input
- Reviewed purpose & need statement
- Reviewed the preliminarily identified and dismissed topics for the Environmental Assessment (EA)
- Reviewed how to become involved in the NEPA process

**Q&A | National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) - Public Scoping**

*Moderated by Carly Bond*

- No questions

**3 | HMSG Mission and Program Aspirations**

*Presented by Melissa Chiu - Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden*

Melissa reviewed the goals of the project:

- Public accessibility
- More exhibitions and rotation of exhibitions
- Increase active engagement
- Reach broader audiences
- Expand capacity for additional artworks
- Plaza Goals and remarks
  - Reviewed current deficiencies:
    - Limited by weight capacity which precludes display of large and heavy artworks.
    - Lack of flexible spaces
    - Performance art technical challenges. Significant temporary infrastructure is required to enable performances
    - Fountain has ongoing leaks and hasn't been operational since 2018 and is currently can be an obstacle to programming
  - 1.
- Lower Level Goals
  - Expanded public space and galleries
  - Improved auditorium, for accessibility, performance capacity and infrastructure
- 4th Floor
  - Opportunity within no inner vs outer ring separation like on 2nd and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors.
    - More flexibility to display art
- Museum Aspirations
  - Increase public space available in the building from 45% to 62%, a 17% increase
  - Project will meet current needs and planned future needs

**4 | Potential Scope of Improvements - Rooftop and Envelope**

*Presented by Chris Cooper & Michael Baskett - SOM-Selldorf*

C. Cooper reviewed previous feedback from Consulting Parties Meeting #2 - the visible rooftop mechanical addition is an adverse affect and the design team & Smithsonian have begun to explore solutions to avoid or minimize it

- Requirements and needs for an improved mechanical system
  - Comply with energy recovery requirements
  - Increased ventilation requirements
  - Increased mechanical zoning requirements
  - Increased occupant load
  - Increased building area
- Impacts Due to New Mechanical Needs:
  - Nearly doubled area required to accommodate new system
  - Air intake must be located 40' above grade to comply with ISC CBR guidelines
  - Air intake must be located 100' from vehicular traffic to comply with ISC CBR guidelines
  - Piers cannot accommodate the required 4x area for vertical air distribution if all new mechanical is located in lower level without visible modifications
- Proposed solution is to split the mechanical between the lower level and rooftop.
- Reviewed changes from previous Consulting Parties meeting
  - Removed all programmable space from the rooftop and have taken the max area of rooftop to reduce height of mechanical rooftop addition
- Reviewed Mechanical Rooftop Options
  - Concept #1
    - Lower height
    - Massing centered on building ring
  - Concept #2
    - Same lower height as concept 1
    - Massing biased to inner ring
  - Use of 4th Floor for Mechanical - Challenges
    1. Water infiltration risk
    2. Acoustics and vibration transfer
    3. Maintenance and access challenges
    4. Adverse effect on removal of historic coffers
  - Next steps for rooftop mechanical:
    - Reduce height further as mechanical design develops
    - Study form and materiality

M.Baskett presented proposed envelope improvements

- Reviewed previous completed improvements under different projects
- Goals of envelope improvements:
  - Improved energy efficiency
  - Improved resistance to water infiltration
  - Comply with current blast resistance requirements

- Exterior aesthetic will remain the same, both fenestration and material
- Perimeter walls are also considered for replacement due to
  - ASR deterioration
  - Waterproofing at the plaza

## 5 | Conclusion - Schedule and Next Steps

*Presented by Carly Bond*

- Part 2 of this meeting will be held tomorrow at 2PM
- Site visit opportunity on 5/29, 9-10AM
- Project will be submitted to CFA for review at June meeting
- Project will be submitted to NCPC for review at July meeting
- Next Consulting Parties meeting is anticipated to occur in fall 2024
- Draft EA anticipated to be completed Spring 2025

## Q&A | Proposed Scope of Improvements - Roof & Envelope

*Moderated by Carly Bond - Participants name who provided the question are listed first in italics.*

*Respondents are listed in order.*

1. *Anonymous*: What is your concept for penetrations/louvers/fins for the mechanical system as these become design elements?

*Response C.Cooper*: All MEP considerations on rooftop must be considered "architecture" and designed architecturally as part of the entire rooftop. Solution is not defined yet but will be carefully considered and ideally consistent to be similar to the facade of the drum.

2. *Gio Esposito*: Have you considered owning the mechanical ring on the top floor by pushing the mechanical space to the outside wall of the building? This would provide the opportunity to play with material and color to sort of "crown" the structure. Also, the mechanical ring on the inside wall of the ring decreases natural light within the courtyard considerably. How much does this bare weight on your decision? Has this been studied?

*Response by C.Cooper*: Owning the mechanical is important to the design team. Mechanical on the outside edge fundamentally alters the proportion of the drum at the exterior. All options are still on the table at this stage of design.

3. *George Kousoulas*: In agreement with rooftop equipment but suggests going to option 1. Option 2 looks like a mistake - seeing something you are not meant to see. Option 2 adversely affects the inner ring of the drum. Avoid chamfer or pitched roof for section of mechanical. What would Gordon Bunshaft do in 1974 with the penthouse?

*Response by C. Cooper*: Noted for future development

4. *Tom Luebke*: Technical requirements for the mechanical approach are very clear. Appreciate the intent to make the addition look intentional and architectural. Consider a steeper slope towards

the outer ring. Concerns the project is not ready for the CFA Concept Submission based on the development of the roof schemes - it is still a diagram.

*Response by C.Cooper:* Noted for future development. Will consider comments regarding CFA submission

5. *Gio Esposito:* Does the rooftop mechanical space require structural improvements? For example, additional columns or dropped ceilings?

*Response by C.Cooper:* No additional columns or drop ceilings.

6. *John Edwards:* It appears from the section that roofing the mechanical penthouse is increasing its height (and accordingly its visibility). Why roof that equipment, which is commonly just screened but not roofed? Creating a shadow line on the penthouse or a contrasting material seems to just draw more attention to it, rather than visually minimizing it.

*Response by M.Velky:* The benefits of enclosing the mechanical equipment results in better weathering for the equipment.

7. *Todd Grover:* What is the floor to ceiling height on the 4th floor? Also can you please go through the reason that equipment cannot be put on the 4th floor again? Specifically detailing why it would take up the whole floor.

*Response by C.Cooper:* Full footprint is required for 4 Dedicated Outdoor Air System (DOAS) and 4 Air Handling Unit (AHU) units and maintenance access. There is loss of efficiency with rectangular equipment in a circular building. Piers are an obstacle on the 4th floor. Floor to floor heights don't allow for vertical stacking of equipment. Unit clearances can be shared but need to allow for air distribution

8. *Daniel Fox:* I would agree that the design should prioritize the Mall/exterior views over the interior courtyard condition. And separating form from material is problematic for concept review.

*Response by C.Cooper:* We are in agreement.

9. *Todd Grover:* Follow up question: In Option 0, you were able to get it in just 2 sections that were only 13' high? Isn't that correct?

*Response by C.Cooper:* Correct

10. *Andrew Lewis:* Ductwork not present in Option 0. Can some of the equipment or ductwork be considered to be placed on Level 4? Pure geometric forms are critically important as a character defining feature. Curious about views from the inner courtyard with Options 1 and 2.

*Response by C.Cooper:* Ductwork was on top of the units in Option 0. Lower, consistent mechanical ring may be the best solution to align with "pure geometries".

*Response by M.Velky:* Several different options have been explored for mechanical on the 4th floor, all of which take away from the programmatic opportunities on the 4th floor. Design team is striving for balance between roof visibility and the 4th floor program.

*Response by C.Bond:* Upcoming consulting parties meeting can show more analysis on this topic.

11. *Anonymous:* Did you examine an option with mechanical systems distributed between the 4th floor and the roof?

*Response by C.Cooper:* Yes but this option was dismissed due to the same challenges listed for the 4th floor mechanical option.

12. *Sarah Batcheler:* Were you able to learn anything from the recent renovation and mechanical system replacement at the Beinecke Library at Yale, another Bunshaft building?

*Response by M.Baskett:* We consulted with the team at the Beinecke in depth. The main difference between the buildings is that the Hirshhorn has the limitation of the piers which are our considerable pinch points. Chemical, Biological, and Radiation (CBR) protection requirements exist for HMSG but maybe not Beinecke due to location.

13. *Carlton Hart:* Do these options take into account the potential decommissioning of the Central Heating Plant that GSA has been discussing? How will the options change if/when this occurs?

*Response by M.Velky:* Yes. We are anticipating current GSA service transforms into similar service: Intake steam, convert to heating water and distributed in a low temperature way. We are planning for GSA decommissioning and offloading from those utilities or coverage from alternate sources. Maintain energy and sustainability goals and also provide museum flexibility

14. *Gio Esposito:* Will the proposed mechanical space be elevator accessible? Does the elevator shaft fit within the 10'9" ceiling of the proposed mechanical space or would it require additional height?

*Response by C.Cooper:* Rooftop will not be accessed from the elevator. Mechanical rooftop height will be consistent with no additional pop ups.