



**CONSULTING PARTIES MEETING**  
 For Development of an MOA for  
**Building 1 Renovation, Wings 4, 5 & the Spine**  
 June 27, 2018 @ 1 pm  
 Bldg 81 - 1A116  
 325 Broadway  
 Boulder, CO

**Meeting Participants**

|    |                      |     |                 |  |
|----|----------------------|-----|-----------------|--|
| 1  | AECom                | Mr. | Gordon Tucker   | <a href="mailto:gordon.tucker@aecom.com">gordon.tucker@aecom.com</a>           |
| 2  | City of Boulder      | Mr. | Marcy Cameron   | <a href="mailto:Cameronm@bouldercolorado.gov">Cameronm@bouldercolorado.gov</a> |
| 3  | Historic Boulder     | Ms. | Carol Taylor    | <a href="mailto:historicboulderinc@gmail.com">historicboulderinc@gmail.com</a> |
| 4  | NIST                 | Ms. | Emily Parkhurst | <a href="mailto:emily.parkhurst@nist.gov">emily.parkhurst@nist.gov</a>         |
| 5  | NIST                 | Mr. | Joseph Mahlberg | <a href="mailto:joseph.mahlberg@nist.gov">joseph.mahlberg@nist.gov</a>         |
| 6  | NIST                 | Mr. | Nat Keller      | <a href="mailto:NKeller@doc.gov">NKeller@doc.gov</a> <i>via VTC</i>            |
| 7  | NIST                 | Mr. | Wayne Pierce    | <a href="mailto:wayne.pierce@nist.gov">wayne.pierce@nist.gov</a> <i>via</i>    |
| 8  | NIST                 | Ms. | Jennifer NIST   | <a href="mailto:jennifer.nist@nist.gov">jennifer.nist@nist.gov</a> <i>VTC</i>  |
| 9  | SHPO<br>studiptroppe | Mr. | Joseph Saldibar | <a href="mailto:joseph.saldibar@state.co.us">joseph.saldibar@state.co.us</a>   |
| 10 | Collective           | Ms. | Anne Pharamond  | <a href="mailto:apha@studiotrope.com">apha@studiotrope.com</a>                 |
| 11 | NIST                 | Mr. | Phillip Neuberg | <a href="mailto:phillip.neuberg@nist.gov">phillip.neuberg@nist.gov</a>         |
| 12 | AECom                | Ms. | Kirsten Johnson | <a href="mailto:kisten.johnson@aecom.com">kisten.johnson@aecom.com</a>         |
| 13 | NIST                 | Mr. | Jim Burrus      | <a href="mailto:james.burrus@nist.gov">james.burrus@nist.gov</a>               |

## MEETING NOTES

---

**I. Introductions**

All participants introduced themselves and their organizations as well as their connection with the Building 1 Renovation Project

**II. Background/ Program Objectives/ Proposed Design**

A. Background and Program Objectives – Phillip Neuberg, FAIA-- NIST FPO

1. Mr. Neuberg explained that NIST surveyed and evaluated Building 1 in coordination with the Colorado SHPO and jointly they determined its eligibility for listing in the National Register in 2016.
2. At the same time, NIST was completing Phase 1 (Wings 3 & 6) of a multi-year, multi-million dollar Building 1 Renovation project.
3. NIST had, however, failed to consult with the Colorado SHPO and because the resultant design, (of the renovated wings 3 & 6) does not comport with the Secretary of the interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Structures, Phase 1 was determined an Adverse Effect.
4. As a result, NIST worked with the Advisory Council and the SHPO to host a meeting of potential consulting parties on 8/31/2017. Participants at that meeting suggested that NIST mitigate the Adverse Effect by developing an Historic Structures Report (HSR) and series of Preservation Zone Maps that could then serve to guide all subsequent phases of Building 1
5. NIST developed an MOA that stipulated the production of such documents and commenced the survey, documentation and writing of the HSR by hiring a team of cultural resource specialists all meeting the SOI Qualifications for historic preservation projects. Subsequent to today's meeting, the HSR has been completed and may be viewed at :  
<https://www.nist.gov/ofpm/boulder-building-one-moa>
6. Finally, Mr. Neuberg explained that the development of the HSR in conjunction with the development of the schematic design earlier this year allowed for a sensitive design that incorporates much of the guidance from the SOI Standards. Nonetheless, a strict application of the SOI Standards has rendered a determination of Adverse Effect. Avoidance of the planned Wings 4, 5 and the Spine (Phase 2) is not an option and the team has concluded that the current design is the best to meet NIST's scientific mission. Thus today's meeting is to look at mitigation measures which NIST can then consider as it goes forward.

**B. Proposed Design** – Anne Pharamond, AIA –studiotroppe Design Collective

1. Ms. Pharamond, served as the project architect working closely with the scientists, OFPM staff and the Federal Preservation Officer to balance needs.
2. Ms. Pharamond described their data collection process. Through a series of slides, she presented the design program, as it evolved and how the SOI standards were applied and interpreted as the design evolved.
3. The design looks to maintain and preserve much of the original character defining features and to also find opportunities for activating outdoor spaces that were previously ignored or avoided.

4. Mr. Saldibar of the SHPO voiced his concern that the entry additions proposed for the east and west ends of Wings 3 and 4 were not necessary to meet scientific program, these same elements being a significant reason for the adverse effect determination.
5. The design team and OFPM staff accepted SHPO's concern but stated that existing blank walls inhibit access and that the additions are critical to creating new welcoming points of entry, without which activation of the new wings and adjoining courtyards would be thwarted.

### **III. Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Content**

1. Discussion ensued, and many interesting ideas were shared among the participants who all expressed a sense of appreciation that NIST, a valued member of the Boulder Community since the middle of the last century, is seeking their input.
2. It was emphasized that the establishment of the campus, and by extension the construction of Building 1 remains a seminal event in the history of Boulder and that it signaled a change for Boulder in becoming a city that was looking outward rather than inward.
3. To the City of Boulder, the Building is viewed as a Mid-Century icon. It prompts questions about mid-century Modern in Boulder. Where did the scientists who worked here live? What was the influence of NIST on Modern design in Boulder?
4. While it is understood that the primary point of entry for Building 1 is no longer directly off Broadway at the "headhouse" or front of the building, it was recommended that NIST maintain the front entry and courtyard, even if it is, in fact, a secondary entry.
5. It was suggested that the Headhouse lobby house some type of public exhibit, especially since the auditorium is an area the public and/or invited visitors are prone to frequent. Furthermore, with the planned move of the physical security and badging office to this general area, it might not be difficult to provide requisite security to segregate the public from entering more secure parts of the building (Wings 1-6 and the Spine).
6. Specific ideas that came out of the meeting included:
  - a. Changing Gallery space included in the design for the renovated spine might feature Exhibits on Boulder, Building 1 and its significance.
  - b. The front Lobby might also house changing exhibits developed by NIST or others to educate the staff and the public.
  - c. An annual Lecture Series (on or off campus) that partners with the City and Historic Boulder (and perhaps the university) brings speakers to look at aspects of Mid-Century Modern life in Boulder -all designed to enhance public awareness.

- d. Opportunities to partner with Historic Boulder for tours of the campus and or Building One.
- e. More information about the history of the Boulder campus on the NIST public website since most viewers will not be able to visit the campus nor lobby for viewing the exhibits.
- f. An exhibit or display that features the significance of Eisenhower's visit to Boulder and NIST for the dedication

#### **IV. Next Steps**

- 1. Mr. Neuberg promised to review all these matters with NIST leadership and develop a draft Memorandum of Agreement for review and comment later this year.
- 2. The meeting ended at 2:30 pm

*These notes represent the author's interpretation of the meeting. If there are any additions, omissions, edits or corrections, please notify the author at once.*