

PROJECT	Smithsonian Institution- Revitalization of the Historic Core (RoHC)	MEETING DATE	1/17/2024
ORGANIZER	Smithsonian Institution, Carly Bond (moderator)	TIME	1:00-2:15pm
LOCATION	Virtual/Zoom		
PANELISTS	Carly Bond- Smithsonian Institution Matthew Chalifoux, EYP-Loring		
SUBJECT	Consulting Parties Meeting #18		

MEETING MINUTES

Purpose – This was Consulting Parties Meeting 18 for the Revitalization of the Historic Core (RoHC) project of the Smithsonian Institution. The meeting was held in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The agenda for this meeting was focused on Phase 2 of the Section 106 consultation. The meeting agenda was:

- **Review the status of the Section 106 Consultation Process**
- **Review the Draft Amendment to the Programmatic Agreement**
- **Schedule and next steps**

The draft Amendment to the Programmatic Agreement was released for review by the Consulting Parties on December 20, 2023. The objective of this meeting was to review the draft Amendment to the PA in anticipation of finalizing the content of the amendment and executing the document to conclude Section 106 consultation on the RoHC project.

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 following is a list of the questions and comments with a summary of the responses. Information regarding the project, including the slide presentation, is available through the project webpage: <https://ahhp.si.edu/historic-core>

Questions and Comments

The following minutes combine verbal and written questions/ comments on related topics for clarity.

Granite for Perimeter Security and Landscape Elements

1. **Q: The American Mahogany granite that you have identified as the alternate for the Prairie Brown is slightly grayer and more of a neutral element and is a good choice, even better than the Prairie Brown.**

R: Thank you.

2. **Q:** It is hard to tell from the photographs, but looking at the “texture” of the two potential alternate granites are the flecks in the American Mahogany larger or is there more reflectance in that sample? I agree that the grayer tone of the American Mahogany is better.

R: The quantity of light to dark in the American Mahogany is not different, but in this sample the size of the mica inclusions is highlighted by the sunlight in that review location.

Areaways

3. **Q:** I understand that there will be further review and input on the stucco color treatment of the areaway walls. I do prefer the gray tones. They do not compete with the color of the historic sandstone, the color is more “timeless,” and the lighter tone will reflect more light into the basement level.

R: Thank you. As we have outlined in Stipulation 17.D of the draft Amendment to the Programmatic Agreement, the Smithsonian will convene the Signatories on site during construction to review small samples of a range of gray and red tinted stuccos. A second on-site meeting will be held to review full-scale wall section mock-ups of the tinted stucco and finish treatment.

Project Documentation

4. **Q:** Will the Smithsonian be creating a Part 3 to the Historic Structures Report documenting the completed work? The documentation outlined in the additional mitigation measures may cover much of this but having this information as part of the Historic Structures Report provides a single resource of information for future designers working on the building.

R: That has not been discussed previously but it is a great suggestion.

Section 106 Review Process

5. **Q:** As you were reviewing the list of adverse effects on the building and the National Mall overall, I was thinking that in my world this would be considered an exemplary project. I understand why technically they must be defined that way.

Q: While NEPA allows for project elements to be defined as “beneficial” the Section 106 regulations do not include that option. I think it would be appropriate to include in the preamble to the Amendment of the PA that the signatories and consulting parties agree that the project is far and away beneficial to the Castle and has been planned in a way that places historic preservation at the forefront.

The project includes incredible preservation outcomes even though the assessment identifies a number of actions as adverse.

Q: I have been impressed by the deliberate and linear process that you have undertaken to get through all the very complex technical, historic, and cultural issues to develop a design that has a broad consensus of support.

R: Thank you.

NOTE: This is the last scheduled Consulting Parties Meeting for this project. Please look for e-mail updates in the future regarding the executed amendment to the Programmatic Agreement and future opportunities for further review and comment on issues as identified in the amendment.

All material that has been developed throughout the consulting process will be posted on the project webpage- <https://ahhp.si.edu/historic-core>

END OF MEETING