

Meeting Minutes

FROM: EHT Traceries
SUBJECT: Smithsonian South Mall Campus Master Plan
 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting #7
DATE: October 26, 2016

The following minutes represent comments received during the October Section 106 consulting parties meeting for the Smithsonian South Mall Campus Master Plan.

Consulting Parties

Name	Organization
Brian Lusher	ACHP
David Maloney	DC HPO
Andrew Lewis	DC HPO
Kim Williams	DC HPO
Thomas Luebke	CFA
Pat Tiller	Committee of 100
Kate Perry	Committee of 100
Richard Longstreth	Committee of 100
Rob Nieweg	NTHP
Will Cook	NTHP
Robert Snieckus	USDA
Leslie Burks	USDA
Jonathan Rogers	DDOT
Joyce Saginaw*	Dept. of Justice
Peggy McGlone	<i>Washington Post</i>
Ellen Malasky*	Guild of Professional Tour Guides, DC
Cynthia Field	
Richard Wagner	
David Maxfield	
Stephanie Eiches	

Lead/Cooperating Agencies & Project Team

Sharon Park	SI
Ann Trowbridge	SI
Christopher Lethbridge	SI
Michelle Spofford	SI
Carly Bond	SI
Mike Carrancho	SI
Nancy Bechtol	SI
Debra Nauta-Rodriguez	SI
Bill Donnelly	SI
Barbara Faust	SI
Linda St. Thomas	SI
Diane Sullivan	NCPC
Matthew Flis	NCPC
Kathryn Smith	NPS
Catherine Dewey*	NPS
Susan Spain*	NPS
Aran Coakley	BIG
Daria Pahhota	BIG
Laura Hughes	EHT Traceries
Bill Marzella	EHT Traceries
Daria Gasparini	Robinson
Liz Estes	Stantec
Kirk Mettam	Silman

**Participated via live webcast*

Presentation and Discussion

1. Mike Carrancho, Deputy Director for Engineering and Design Division, acting as the meeting facilitator, opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. He provided an overview of the meeting topic, the Determinations of Eligibility (DOEs) for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (HMSG) and Quadrangle (Quad) buildings, noted that future meetings would address the Master Plan alternatives. He clarified the role of the facilitator and outlined the general meeting structure and protocol for providing comments.
2. Sharon Park (SP) provided an overview of the meeting agenda, Master Plan goals, and Section 106 process.
 - a. SP provided several updates since the April 2016 meeting, including: response to written comments; the naming of a new director of the Arts and Industries Building; and DOEs for the HMSG and Quad.
 - b. She provided a summary of the findings of the DOEs, the qualifications of the firms that prepared them, and the test of “exceptional importance” that applies to resources less than 50 years of age.
 - c. She noted that the Committee of 100 on the Federal City recently filed a D.C. Landmark Application for the Quadrangle building, with findings that conflicted with the findings of the Quadrangle DOE.
 - d. She also noted that SI had prepared a fact sheet with a summary of findings from the Quad and HMSG DOEs, which was made available to consulting parties at the meeting.

DOE Process and HMSG DOE

1. SP introduced Bill Marzella (BM), Lead Historic Preservation Planner at EHT Tracerics, to present the DOE process and the findings of the HMSG DOE.
2. BM presented a brief overview of the DOE process in the District of Columbia, including the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and the impacts on the decision-making process for federal undertakings that involve historic properties.
3. BM also presented the findings of the HMSG DOE, which was determined to be eligible for National Register listing under Criteria A and C and to meet Criteria Consideration G as an exceptional example of Modernist architecture by recognized master architect Gordon Bunshaft.
4. BM welcomed comments and questions.
5. Robert Nieweg, National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), asked for additional clarification regarding Criterion C, specifically if the plaza walls and sculpture garden were as significant as the museum building drum and plaza fountain.
 - a. BM confirmed that these elements—although not as visually iconic as the drum and fountain—contributed equally to the property’s significance.
 - b. SP added that the findings of the HMSG DOE were informing SI as it develops the Master Plan, including the development of a fifth alternative that integrates these comments and reflects the significance of the walls.
6. Cynthia Field asked if SI was similarly considering alternative treatments for the sculpture garden.
 - a. SP confirmed that they were.

Quadrangle DOE

1. SP introduced Daria Gasparini (DG), Principal at Robinson & Associates, to present the findings of the Quad DOE.
2. DG presented the findings of the Quad DOE, which was determined to be not eligible for National Register listing, as it failed to meeting any National Register Criteria or Criteria Consideration G for exceptional importance. She provided a detailed discussion of these findings and the content of the DOE.
3. Andrew Lewis of the D.C. Historic Preservation Office (DC HPO) thanked SI for undertaking a DOE for the Quadrangle and noted that DC HPO had provided informal comments on the DOE in September.

He noted that the lack of a context for Postmodern architecture makes evaluation difficult. Given the level of interest in the Quadrangle treatment, he appreciated SI making an extra effort to evaluate its significance. Mr. Lewis added that the Committee of 100 had filed a landmark application for the Quad, which DC HPO was in the process of reviewing and was expected to be filed soon. He stated that DC HPO did not want to preclude the comments of the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB), noting that SI and the consulting parties could participate in that public discussion when a hearing has been finalized.

- a. SP thanked Mr. Lewis for the statement and committed to participating in the local designation process when requested by DC HPO.
4. As co-author of the Quad landmark application, Richard Longstreth (RL), Committee of 100, made several comments. He noted that the demolition of the Quad would represent a great loss, noting its qualifiers as an underground facility, its integration of design and context, the intrinsic excellence of its design, the reputation of its architect, its representation of the expansion of SI programs, and its connection to SI Secretary S. Dillon Ripley.
 - a. RL expressed his opinion that the Quad DOE was lacking in previously unknown information. He concluded that the Committee of 100's regard for the building and concern for its treatment was shared by other parties.
 - b. DG later clarified that it was not the purpose of DOE evaluations to develop new historic contexts, but rather to reference and evaluate properties within existing contexts.
 - c. SP added that SI understands the value of the various elements of the Haupt Garden, which would be returned when the Quad roof is replaced. SP also added that the Committee of 100 application does not adequately evaluate the Quad per National Register Criteria. SI was asked to keep the Quad DOE as a draft by DC HPO, but that they (SI) were confident in the findings of the DOE, which would ultimately be evaluated by the Keeper of the National Register.
 - d. RL disagreed that the National Register program was not intended to pursue new avenues of research. He stated that the threshold for exceptional importance was determined at the local level. He concluded that such resources, once gone, are gone forever.
5. Thomas Luebke, Commission of Fine Arts (CFA), stated that there was a question of authorship surrounding the building and landscape design, noting that the written information and presentations mentioned several contributors. He also commented that the Haupt Garden might represent the most emblematic example of Postmodern landscape design in Washington, D.C.
 - a. DG responded that there is a common misconception that Lester Collins was responsible for the landscape design. Collins was consulted regarding plant materials, whereas Sasaki Associates acted as the landscape architect of record and principal landscape designer.
 - b. BM added that, through the South Mall Cultural Landscape process, he interviewed Stuart Dawson, the Sasaki project manager for the Quad project. Dawson ascribed much authorship to Jean Paul Carlhian, with whom they collaborated closely.
 - c. BM also described landscape architect Daniel Kiley's involvement with the development of the Victorian Garden, predecessor to the Haupt Garden.
6. Cynthia Field seconded RL's point that, sometimes, new research and evaluation must be made in the absence of established contexts, noting the value of the existing oral histories on the Quad development. She advised SI not to repeat the similar demolition of the Army Medical Museum, demolished in the 1960s to allow for the construction of the HMSG.
 - a. DG responded that, as a part of the Quad DOE, they surveyed literature on Postmodern architecture in D.C. that might rise to the level of exceptional importance, noting several examples.
 - b. Mr. Luebke clarified that his earlier comment was about Postmodern landscapes.
7. Robert Nieweg asked for clarification for how the Quad is a contributing element to the National Mall Historic District, but not individually.
 - a. DG described the differences: the Quad only contributes to the historic district under Criterion A.
 - b. Kathryn Smith, National Historic Landmarks Coordinator, National Park Service, confirmed that all buildings in the historic district to the modern day are nationally significant under Criterion A as a collection of museums.

- c. All parties recognized that there was an error in the draft DOE that lists the Quad as contributing to the Mall historic district under Criteria Consideration G, which would be corrected in the final draft.
 - d. SP committed SI to its participation in the HPRB process.
- 8. David Maloney, DC HPO, noted that organizations in D.C. often file landmark applications without the knowledge of the property owner or DC HPO. These non-profit organizations have an important role in the historic preservation movement in D.C. He noted that, because SI is not a federal agency, perhaps they should undergo the local HRPB process. He encouraged SI to practice more inclusiveness in the planning of its facilities in the future.
 - a. SP responded that SI would have appreciated more time and information to familiarize themselves with the parallel nomination.
- 9. Kathryn Smith, NPS, asked for clarification from DC HPO about the process for reconciling the two nomination processes.
 - a. Mr. Maloney responded by asking SI to keep the DOE open until DC HPO has a chance to bring the application before HPRB, which would allow for the receipt of public comments. In this case, DC HPO cannot comment on the federal process until the local (HRPB) process can be completed. He added that D.C. preservation law does not have a 50-year guideline for the evaluation of resources.

Conclusion and Next Steps

- 1. SP introduced the matrix of historic resources for the Section 106 process, for historic properties that fall within the Master Plan project area and the Area of Potentials Effects. BM reviewed this list and noted that its completion will allow SI to finalize alternatives and their respective effects.
- 2. SP outlined the schedule for the process moving forward, including the development of a fifth alternative that would address consulting party comments.
- 3. SP requested comments on the Quad DOE by **November 9**, in addition to comments from the contents of this meeting. She noted that a video of the webcast would be provided as a record of the meeting.
- 4. SP welcomed any closing comments or questions.
 - a. Robert Nieweg asked for clarification regarding the evaluation of alternatives, and if four alternatives would be carried forward for evaluations.
 - b. SP confirmed that the four alternatives presented previously (A-D) would be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), in addition to a fifth alternative (E), which would likely be a preferred alternative. Ann Trowbridge seconded this approach, adding that some alternatives may be dismissed from consideration during the EIS analysis. Matt Flis, NCPC, confirmed that SI intended to carry forward several alternatives for analysis.
 - c. Brian Lusher, Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP), thanked SI and DC HPO for their participation and comments. He added that, in the event of a disagreement on the findings of the Quad DOE, either SI or ACHP could request a formal determination from the Keeper of the National Register.

Conclusion and Next Steps

- 1. SP closed the consulting party meeting and thanked the attendees.

Minutes prepared by Bill Marzella, EHT Traceries, November 1, 2016.