

PROJECT	<b>Smithsonian Institution RoHC</b>	DATE	1/13/2021
ORGANIZER	<b>Smithsonian Institution / Carly Bond (Moderator)</b>	SUBJECT	<b>Consulting Parties Meeting #1</b>
LOCATION	Virtual / Zoom		
PANELIST	Carly Bond	Smithsonian Institution	
	Hallah Abodaff	EYP-Loring	
	Kirk Mettam	Silman	
	Ann Trowbridge	Smithsonian Institution	
	Anthony Bochicchio	EYP-Loring	
	Christopher Lethbridge	Smithsonian Institution	
	Sharon Park	Smithsonian Institution	
	Brenda Sanchez	Smithsonian Institution	
	Matt Chalifoux	EYP-Loring	
ATTENDEES	John LaPiana	Ami Herrmann	
	Kelsey Bridges	Faye Harwell	
	Lynne Funk	Rachel Goslins	
	Linda St. Thomas	Grace Jaeger	
	Nord Wennerstrom	Mariann Horejsi	
	P Ann Kaupp	Nancy Bechtol	
	Jim Gregory	James Russiello	
	James Gagliardi	Jay Daghmash	
	Joe Cafferata	Hillary Lord	
	Chris Wilson	Carol Duke	
	Nancy Kenney	Patrick Ladden	
	Jessie Himmelrich	Chris Ruiz	
	Mary Tanner	Benjamin Mank	
	Janice Kaplan	Kristi Tunstall Williams	
	Thomas Luebke	Marc Rothenberg	
	Marsha Shaines	Shelley Gaskins	
	Diane Sullivan	Mark Smith	
	Elizabeth Merritt	Danielle Encela	
	Paul Chavez	Maria Delsasi	
	Rob Nieweg	Jeremy Woodoff	
	Mara Mayor	Sarah Bahr	
	Helen McMahon	Mark Bench	
	Rachel Hagerty	Deborah Palazzo	
	Andrea Righi	Katharine Stewart	

Carolyn Carr	David Maloney
Brian LeMay	Marisa Scalera
Allison Peck	Peter McDonough
David Karns	Patterson Tiller
Daniel Fox	Joy Columbus
Chris Cowles	Susan Jewett
Josh Silverman	Kirby Vining
Janell Pagats	Charles Robertson
Janice Majewski	Matthew Flis
Michael Tuttle	Krystal Waters
Lee Webb	Michael DesRochers
Matthew Traucht	Martha Sewell
Yue Li	Kevin Storm
Jessica Unger	Robert Snieckus
Nanci Edwards	Philip Moss
J Michael Galway	Michelle Spofford
Emilie Twilling	Lori Shaeffer
Jane Taylor	D Goldstien
Derrill Starling	Scott Bonney
Steve Gordon	Beverly Whitehead
Carolyn Bond	Susan Wertheim
Harold Closter	Franklin Headley
Peggy McGlone	James Wilson
Margery Gordon	Melissa Hendrix
Ed Gunts	Scott Girouard
Mina Wright	Rebecca Miller
Rich Ching	David Maxfield
Tony McCann	Patrick Ponton
Sarah Batcheler	Mary Kfoury
William E Baxter	Cynthia Field
Cene Ketcham	Steve Moore
Leith ter Meulen	F J Lindstrom
Mary Augusta Thomas	Anne Golovin
George Van Dyke	

MEETING  
COMMENTS

This was the first consulting parties meeting 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 meeting was assembled virtually and included a slide presentation, which has been posted on the RoHC project website. The presentation was divided into three sections, allowing for question-and-answer periods after each section. The following is a summary of the three Q&A sessions.

MEETING MINUTES

---

**1. Part 1 Q&A**

1. From Tom Luebke: Inquiry about the future vision for the Arts and Industries Building, what will be the programmatic use?

Response: With the conditions of the historic exterior of AIB, the panel assured that the intent is to maximize the interior space for public use and as a non-collecting venue for public exhibitions, programs and events.

2. From Tom Luebke: Points out that part of the AIB basement/Central Utility Plant (CUP) proposed program sits below the "Linden Tree" and asked for clarification on the scope in this area.

Response: Reiterated that the Quadrangle expansion per the South Mall Master Plan is not part of this project, and that this unexcavated area will be become part of the CUP and support connector

3. From Jeremy Woodoff: Inquired about elements of the long-term proposal of the Masterplan that are part of the current proposal.

Response: Restoration of the Historic Core is the focus of this project. The previously proposed underground Visitor Center will be replaced with a basement connection primarily used for back of house distribution and deliveries. The Haupt Garden will not be changed as part of this project. There are separate projects moving forward for rehabilitation of the Hirshhorn Garden and upgrades to the exterior of the Hirshhorn Museum. Other projects in the future include the Quad roof replacement within the next 5-10 years and the renovation of Freer for its 100<sup>th</sup> year anniversary.

4. From Charles Robertson: Are any of the announced new museums (Latino and Women's museum) to be housed in AIB?

Response: Congress just announced the approval to proceed with studies for the two new museums, it is premature to incorporate either in the on-going project. The revitalization of the Arts and Industries Building will move forward with the currently identified program.

5. From Matthew Flis: Follow-up question in regard to the where the new visitor's center would be housed, if not in the new underground extension/connector.

Response: A Visitor Center is planned to be located in the Castle.

6. From Daniel Fox: Requested to review original masterplan program versus current developed options.

Response: The first section included slides comparing the scope of the South Mall Campus Master Plan and the proposed RoHC project.

7. From Franklin Headly: Inquired about existing stored steam engine as part of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary exhibition to be used in 2026  
Response: The collection for the anniversary exhibit is planned, but there is no current permanent collection planned for AIB.
8. From Jeremy Woodoff: If the main purpose the Central Utility Plant (CUP) is to improve efficiency, wouldn't it be more efficient and less disruptive to improve the larger existing systems that currently serve these buildings.  
Response: The existing systems, which have been installed over time, are inefficient and do not properly serve either the SIB or the AIB. As a centralized utility plant, the CUP will offer the most efficient option for providing services to the SIB and AIB and eventually to all of the buildings in the South Mall Campus. The CUP also allows for the relocating of equipment outside the footprint of the historic buildings, allowing more of the historic spaces to be reclaimed and made available for more appropriate uses.
9. From George van Dyke: Inquires about website of the RoHC.  
Response: The project website address is included in the slides at the end of the presentation.  
<https://www.sifacilities.si.edu/historic-core>
10. From Mary Kfoury: Asked to identify the authors of the Historic Structure Reports for the SIB and AIB which are being referred to during the presentation.  
Response: SmithGroup for SIB, EwingCole for AIB

## 2. Part 2 Q&A

1. From Mary Kfoury: Inquired if the renovations designed by architect Adolph Cluss (19<sup>th</sup> century) are part of the period of significance in the modification of SIB  
Response: Yes. The period of significance of the SIB is 1847 to 1910.
2. From George van Dyke: How will IT infrastructure within the SIB be addressed.  
Response: Integration of all the new and upgraded systems will be done with great care, providing the necessary infrastructure to support the facilities while being sensitive to the historic spaces.
3. From Mary Kfoury: What is the proposed use and configuration for the present "library"?  
Response: The "library" is the only double-height space that remains of the Upper Great Hall in the SIB. The A/E team is reviewing the functional and programmatic drivers. The objective is to reclaim the Upper Great Hall as convening space and if possible to maximize the use of double height space.
4. From Mary Kfoury: Structural question: Will this project complete the unfinished seismic and blast work necessary for AIB? What is the conceptual approach?

Response: The previously completed work on the exterior envelope of the AIB achieves most of the necessary seismic and blast design requirements. The design team is reevaluating the building for compliance with current requirements and will incorporate any additional requirements in the interior renovation.

5. From Cynthia Field: What happens to the existing columns, including the bases not visible? Can they remain undisturbed?

Response: This is a question regarding the brick piers and vaulting in the basement of the SIB. The design calls for lowering the floor of the basement to make it more useable as functional space, possibly for public uses. The approach is to insert new elements that do not mimic the existing brick, but carry to footprint of the pier down, clearly delineating new material / structure. The existing footings, below the existing slab, will be removed as part of the underpinning.

6. From Thomas Luebke: Is the restoration of the original floor level in the West Hall anticipated?

Response: The floor in the West Wing, or the Commons, was raised in the 1870s to provide headroom for a laboratory space in the basement. The proposed design will lower the floor back to its original level. The basement floor will also be lowered, allowing the basement to be used for public or Smithsonian staff uses.

7. From Frankly Headly: How do these modifications change the overall purpose of the Castle? And what is that purpose broadly speaking by the way?

Response: The objective of the project is to return the Castle to more public functions, but it will still remain the administrative center of the Smithsonian.

### **3. Part 3 Q&A**

1. From Jeremy Woodoff: Asked if it's necessary to provide sprinklers in the buildings.

Response: The buildings are currently equipped with sprinklers. Upgraded systems will be included in the revitalization to comply with the life-safety codes but also to provide protection for the historic buildings.

2. From Tom Luebke: Seismic intervention, base isolation in the Castle, basement will be lowered, are to be put in. Older presentations on the South Mall Master Plan had extensive cross-bracing intervention.

Response: A primary advantage of base isolation, it minimizes intervention in the upper levels of the building and achieves the necessary reinforcement out of view. There is a synergy on this project with the proposed lowering of the castle basement floor, the base isolation work can be incorporated into the overall work on the basement and foundations. The AIB has gone through a structural upgrade which included seismic upgrades. Our scope is to

review to today's code and bring it to SI attention for further action.

3. From Patrick Ponton: How would the addition of the below grade level affect the historic floors and the original utility trenches in the AIB?

Response: We have to excavate to perform work. The existing floors are in disrepair, but the intent is to salvage as much as possible of the existing marble floors for reinstallation. The goal is to retain the historic fabric and repurpose elements when appropriate.

4. From Franklin Headly: Are there any images to show the visual impact on the garden next to Hirshhorn? It seems to demolish part of that wall will in fact destroy the aesthetics of that modernist garden room.

Response: The team is aware of the sensitivity of the gardens around the entire site, including the Ripley Garden to the east of the AIB. Incorporating any site elements, such as cooling towers, to the area between the AIB and the Hirshhorn will be done in a manner that addresses the existing landscape features.

5. From Mary Kfoury: Will the structural design address the completion of seismic reinforcement on the AIB?

Response: We believe all the seismic reinforcement issues have been addressed with the completed exterior upgrades. This project will include a review of that work and bring forward any discrepancies that may come to light since codes change over time. The goal is to comply with the current code.

**END OF MEETING**