



Agenda

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

THURSDAY, May 9, 2019 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1st FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD SPECIAL MEETING

THURSDAY, May 9, 2019 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- C. COMMUNICATIONS

1. **Case #H-19-026B.** 404 Montezuma Avenue. Historic Transition District. PBI Construction Consulting, agent for State of New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, owner, requests review, discussion and public input regarding the design of the Vladem Contemporary, an extension of the New Mexico Museum of Art. The proposed design includes the remodel and adaptive reuse of a 11,370 sq. ft. contributing structure and construction of a 3,140 sq. ft. addition to a height of 42'3" and associated landscape design features. (Lisa Roach, Planner Manager, lxroach@santafenm.gov, 955-6657)

D. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check https://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board for more information regarding cases on this agenda. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: April 22, 2019

TIME: 8:13 AM

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

May 9, 2019

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Call to Order		
A. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
B. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
C. Communications		
1. Case #H-19-026B 404 Montezuma	Informational/Feedback	3-41
D. Adjournment	Adjourned at 9:52 p.m.	41

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

May 9, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

A special meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair, on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 100 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

A. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Mr. Anthony Guida
Ms. Flynn G. Larson

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Mr. Herbert Lotz
Mr. Buddy Roybal

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Carol Johnson, Land Use Department Director
Mr. Carlos Gemora, Senior Planner
Ms. Lisa Roach, Planner Manager
Ms. Sally A. Paez, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department and available on the City of Santa Fe web site.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid, to approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson and Lotz voting in favor and none voting against.

C. COMMUNICATIONS

Director Johnson explained this is an informational meeting and presentation. We will share our analysis and written communications should be submitted to the State. We have general process to lay out later.

Ms. Roach asked speakers to sign up on a list at the back of the room and a list for the email comment forum.

1. **Case #H-19-026B, 404 Montezuma Avenue.** Historic Transition District. PBI Construction Consulting, agent for State of New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, owner, requests review, discussion and public input regarding the design of the Vladem Contemporary, an extension of the New Mexico Museum of Art. The proposed design includes the remodel and adaptive reuse of a 11,370 sq. ft. contributing structure and construction of a 3,140 sq. ft. addition to a height of 42'3" and associated landscape design features. (Ms. Lisa Roach, Planner Manager, lxroach@santafenm.gov, 955-6657)

CASE BACKGROUND:

404 Montezuma is a large non-residential structure listed as Contributing to the Transition Historic District and situated north of the Railyard District. Known presently as the Halpin State Archives Building, the former Charles Ilfeld Company Warehouse, is located on the west side of South Guadalupe Street, between Montezuma Avenue and Garfield Street, and just north of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Depot (c. 1880). On April 9, 2019, the HDRB designated façades 1,3 and 5 on the north elevation and façade 6 on the east elevation as primary. The property is owned by the State of New Mexico, Department of Cultural Affairs, whose representatives now come before the HDRB to present a design for the renovation, remodeling, and adaptive re-use of the building as the Vladem Contemporary, an extension of the New Mexico Museum of Art.

SUMMARY OF BUILDING HISTORY:

The Charles Ilfeld Company Warehouse was constructed by 1948, as it appears on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map from that year, and possibly as early as 1938 (HCPI #H27150) in simplified Territorial Revival Style featuring rectangular stuccoed brick masonry massing with brick coping at the parapets and repetitive punched window

openings located high on the warehouse walls. Extensive historical information about the Charles Ilfeld Company is provided in a Historic Assessment Report, prepared by architect Jonathan S. Craig and provided to City staff by the New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs.

According to the Historic Assessment Report, the warehouse structure originally consisted of a main high-bay room of approximately 11,500 square feet with an interior height of 16' to the bottom of the roof joists, over a basement of approximately the same floor area. The warehouse is aligned with the railroad tracks, as can be seen on the 1948 Sanborn map. A single story office wing of approximately 1,800 square feet abuts the northwest corner of the warehouse and is oriented to Montezuma Street. This historic addition was constructed at an unknown date prior to 1948 and remodeled after 1970. An approximately 650 square foot historic addition at the southeast corner of the building is also visible on the 1948 Sanborn map and was likely a loading entry and dock for freight deliveries by road. This "south wing" was extended further between 1948 and 1959, as is evidenced in a 1959 survey of the property done prior to the acquisition of the building by the State of New Mexico. A concrete railroad loading platform extends along the entire east façade of the original warehouse and connects with a vehicle loading dock along the north façade. This north loading dock originally featured a steel canopy supported off the building with tension rods and turnbuckles, but the area below this canopy was infilled during renovations in 1970, when the interior of the building was extensively altered.

Windows are generally 6-lite, approximately three-foot square, inward opening steel hoppers positioned high along the east, south and west sides of the main warehouse, with similar windows approximately half this height with a single row of three lites along the north façade. Although other historic windows are extant on the building, as detailed in the Historic Assessment Report, these high, punched window openings can be considered to be character-defining features of the building, along with rectangular, stuccoed brick masonry walls, brick coping at the parapets, and orientation of the building, additions and loading docks to respond to both rail and automotive transportation modalities.

The most substantial exterior change to the building was the Boarding up of the windows on the east façade and installation of a mural covering the entire east façade facing Guadalupe Street between 1980 and 1982. The NM Department of Cultural Affairs undertook an assessment of this mural in 2015, which indicated that a portion of the mural covering the central double window was beginning to delaminate from the building and subsequently fell off the building during an attempt to repair it. As a result, this is the only window visible on this façade, though the remaining windows still exist and are covered by mural panels. The historical analysis provided by the State reports that as many as four attempts have been made to restore this mural, and that its current state differs significantly from the original.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs plans to renovate and remodel the Halpin State Archives Building in order to adaptively reuse the structure as a museum of contemporary art. To achieve this, the following exterior modifications are proposed:

- 1) Demolition of historic and non-historic additions to the core historic warehouse structure. This includes the ~1,800 square foot "office wing" at the northwest corner of the original warehouse, constructed prior to 1948 and expanded after 1970; the ~650 square foot "south wing" at the southeast corner of the building, constructed prior to 1948 and expanded prior to 1959; and the post-1970 infill of the northern loading dock area beneath the historic canopy.
- 2) Restoration of the original warehouse structure, including re-glazing and repainting historic windows, the historic steel canopy and original loading dock on the north elevation, and the brick coping atop the warehouse parapets. Notably, the proposal includes restoration of the windows on the east elevation, removal of the mural that currently exists in favor of an earth-toned cementitious stuccoed surface.
- 3) Construct a 3,140 sq. ft. addition to accommodate classroom space and a mechanical/service yard at the north west corner of the historic warehouse building, in approximately the same location as the existing "office wing." At the ground level, this addition will feature integrally dyed, earth-toned, cast-in-place concrete wall massing at the north elevation, which wraps around to the west and south in the form of an 8'10" to 7'9"-high yard wall to enclose the service yard. The east façade of this proposed ground floor addition will feature large areas of glazing coupled with more exposed concrete massing, and the historic steel canopy over the original north loading dock will be finished in flat black and will extend over the entry to this new classroom wing.
- 4) Construct an approximately 300 square foot ground floor-level structure to house a café, restrooms and stairwell. The location of this proposed structure will form the southern boundary of a covered terrace off the south elevation of the existing warehouse and below the proposed second floor addition. The exterior finishes of this structure are proposed to mirror those of the new addition on the north side of the building, with exposed earth-toned concrete and glass.
- 5) Construct a 9,170 square foot second floor addition atop the historic warehouse structure and oriented to align with Montezuma Avenue and Guadalupe Street, in contrast to the historic warehouse below, which is oriented with the railroad tracks. The second floor addition is described as a 45'6" by 216'8" "bar" of building that spans the existing warehouse and new ground floor additions and reaches a total height above grade of 42'3" (38'5" from ground level finish floor). The second floor addition will expand the building to approximately 35,050 square feet.

The exterior finishes of the second floor addition include large fenestrated expanses that will be screened with a perforated metal scrim system. The framing at the glazing system will be clear anodized aluminum. The perforated metal scrim panels will have a

powder coated tan/champagne finish. At the east elevation, the second floor addition opens onto a rooftop terrace on top of the historic warehouse below. Planters will frame the perimeter of this terrace, and railings will be situated approximately 2' back from the parapets of the structure below. Materials and finishes of the railings were not specified.

- 6) Construct an approximately 65 square foot concrete loading dock and steel canopy at the southwest corner and an approximately 40 square foot trash enclosure at the southwest corner of the site.
- 7) Construct a series of outdoor gathering spaces with paved and landscaped areas to engage the Guadalupe Street and Railyard business districts. Landscape design includes hardscape terracing and native plantings, some of which extend into City-owned rights-of-way. Hardscape materials and finishes were not specified in the application.
- 8) Exterior lighting to comply with the night-sky ordinance. Designs not specified.

STAFF ANALYSIS OF CODE COMPLIANCE:

General: According to the property owner, the proposed design intends to both preserve the historic character of the core Territorial Revival style warehouse while constructing additions to the building so that it will be recognizable as a contemporary art museum. Generally speaking, the proposed design creates stark visual contrast between the old and the new in form, finishes, and scale. This approach varies from the general standards for design of state projects as articulated in Section 14-5.2(M)(3)(a), which states that such projects should be designed "with the intent of achieving harmony with existing buildings by the use of similar materials, color, proportion, and general details" and that "alterations and additions shall be in character with the style, detail and massing of the existing building." Furthermore, the General Standards indicate that "the dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction," which the design does not achieve.

Roofs: As Section 14-5.2(M)(3) requires, the roofs of the historic warehouse structure and the proposed additions are "flat with a slight slope and surrounded by a parapet." In this regard, the structure is in compliance. The historic awning over the original north loading dock does have the effect of creating cantilever, though it is suspended by tension rods and turnbuckles attached to the wall above. This historic feature should be preserved in accordance with Section 14-5.2(C) and extending and/or replicating this feature elsewhere in the design can be considered compatible with the historic character of the building.

Walls and Windows: The combined door and window area of the historic portions of the building does not exceed 40% of the total area of these façades; however, the extensive fenestration on the proposed additions, both at the ground level and at the second level

does not meet this stipulation of the code. Most of the windows will be screened from public view by a perforated metal scrim, minimizing their reflectivity; however, the level of fenestration exceeds that which is normally allowable by code. Furthermore, there are several instances of windows positioned within 3 feet of a corner on the proposed additions, and the large windows do not appear to be either recessed or in proportion to the fenestration pattern in the applicable streetscape.

Finishes: The proposed design at the ground floor level does make an attempt to simulate earthen massing with thick, earth-toned cast-in-place concrete walls on the additions and with earth-toned stucco on the historic warehouse, achieving the general intent of the standards outlined in Section M. However, exposed concrete is not an allowable material for exterior walls in historic districts, and the fenestration and perforated aluminum scrim of the large upper level addition are wholly non-conforming with finishes prescribed by City code.

Colors: The colors proposed by the property owner for stucco, concrete, and aluminum finishes are in compliance with the requirements of the code that publicly visible façades "simulate a light earth or dark earth color."

Height: The proposed height of the building is 42'3" from grade (38'5" from ground level finish floor), where the maximum allowable height is 42'9."

Historic Status Implications: Section 14-5.2(M)(3)(b) states that state projects "that involve contributing, significant or landmark structures shall be undertaken in such a manner as to preserve the status of the structure." The standards for preserving historic status of contributing and significant structures are set forth in Section 14-5.2(C) and (D). These sections specify the following, which may be considered relevant to this proposal:

- 1) Additions shall feature similar materials, architectural treatments, styles and details as the existing historic structure. In this case, the proposed additions vary dramatically in style, materials, and treatments. This does have the effect of distinguishing the new from the old; however, the proposed design does not align with the spirit or the letter of the code in this regard.
- 2) Additions are not permitted to primary façades. In this case, a substantial addition is proposed to primary façades on the north elevation.
- 3) Additions must be set back 10 feet from a primary façade. In this case, the second floor addition sits atop and proud of the primary façades on the north elevation, and one primary façade will be demolished entirely.
- 4) Additions are not allowed to exceed 50% of the square footage of the existing historic footprint of the building or to exceed 50% of the existing dimension of a primary façade. In terms of building footprint, the historic footprint is being reduced by approximately 3,000 square feet. Roughly 3,500 square feet of proposed additions will expand the ground floor footprint, and over 9,000 square feet will be added in a second

floor. The total non-historic square footage will ultimately exceed that of the historic square footage of the building as a result of the proposed additions.

5) Second story additions are permitted to contributing structures. However, the code requires that second story additions be set to the rear or side of the historic structure and shall not exceed 12 feet in height over the historic rooftop. This proposal is clearly not in compliance with this stipulation.

Taking into consideration the above deviations from the City's regulations for contributing structures, the HDRB may wish to discuss whether the proposed alterations to 404 Montezuma put the structure's contributing historic status at risk.

STAFF SUMMARY COMMENTS:

Staff presents case background and analysis of the project as to its compliance with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts and Section 14-5.2 (M)(3) Design Standards for State Capital Outlay Projects. Staff defers to the Board to discuss the project, to provide input to project representatives, and to solicit public comment on the project.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked Ms. Roach to read the definition of Contributing Structure and Ms. Roach read it.

Chair Rios asked her if she felt the proposed building will cause the existing building to lose its status.

Ms. Roach believed its contributing status could definitely be compromised.

Chair Rios noted it is in the Historic Transition District.

Ms. Roach said it is right on the edge of the transition district.

Chair Rios asked why the applicants did not have to apply for an exception.

Ms. Roach said the applicant is not submitting it for approval. She said the Section D and M apply to this project.

Chair Rios asked Ms. Paez if the Board has jurisdiction with this State property or what the jurisdiction of the Board is.

Ms. Paez said it does fall under the 3.22.6 State Statute for capital outlay projects, amended in the most recent legislature but not until July 1. It speaks to an agreement that it would generally be compatible with the Code.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Peter Brill, PBI, 2004 Galisteo, representing the applicant, was sworn.

He said, "Thanks for scheduling this special meeting. On behalf of DCA, we are very pleased to make the presentation tonight, especially with this location. This project has had a long and winding road. Not only has the design evolved; even the legal status in the last 45 days. He commended the Staff for the spirit of cooperation, which is exemplary. While we will hear many different opinions, I hope we can disagree without being disagreeable."

Mr. Andrew Lyons, 2044 Galisteo, was sworn. He said he was here to present the proposed design for adaptive reuse of Halpin Building for the New Mexico Museum of Art wishing to expand to include contemporary art. But the Museum at the edge of the Plaza is full and designed for historic art.

The focus of Vladem is contemporary art and events brought to Santa Fe. This building is a perfect location for it.

Mr. Lyons shared the presentation outline, the history of the building and then proposed design, and then engagement in the HDRB process. Then they would give concluding comments on the project to correspond with the project team. They would ask for a break after that for examination of model and exhibits.

We hope it will provide feedback we can use in any revisions to the design.

Historic: The building when it was completed is included in your packet with photos and maps. A copy is on back table for the public.

We only provide discussion of this as it pertains to the City Ordinance, as contributing to the Historic Transition District and what is necessary to keep the building contributing. Those faces were shown on a slide. The Halpin Building was a warehouse to a coal company, Burlington Company and then to the State. In the 1920's, it was a simple warehouse with no loading docks. It was very close to the railroad tracks and appears to have stucco and brick coping.

When Mr. Ilfeld bought it for proximity, they demolished and rebuilt a warehouse in 1936 and was owned by the Ilfeld Company until the 1950's and was used briefly by what is now Jean Cocteau Theater.

It was sold to the State for archives and named after the administrator Charles Halpin. It is currently used by DCA for storage.

There are 11,500 sq. ft. on the ground floor. It is not square to the lot but oriented to the rail line that ran along Guadalupe Street. A lean-to on the south was used for

loading.

The East side was built with a loading area and on the north for cash and carry customers. An addition was built in 1948. Some changes occurred after purchase. Notable was an addition near the north of the west façade for restrooms, enclosure of loading dock, interior stairs close to the northeast corner and a ramp to access the north side. The exterior change was a large mural in 1980 and high windows were covered over. The panels are poorly affixed, and one panel already fell off. We tried to rehabilitate the mural but could not. The color is decaying. They also did a reroofing project and the brick coping.

The Halpin Building is in the transition district, described in 14-5.2 (G) and it borders the Downtown, Guadalupe and Don Gaspar districts. It was a transition among those districts.

In this case, the Railyard District is directly south and west. We look for buildings in that area as massive, monolithic, and in earth tones. Railyard requirements include size, mass with walls that are massive or appear massive. This design meets those standards of the code and we discuss the modern materials, but they are transitional between historic and railyard.

The height is 38' 6" above the finished floor and 42' 6" on site. The maximum height here is 42' 9". The tallest building is the Garfield Building at Garfield and Guadalupe at 52' 0" to the top of the mansard roof. The elevation of the proposed second floor is even with eaves of the Garfield building, and we hope those are appreciated.

He showed the height of the addition in reference to the University Building, which is 18' above the existing warehouse building.

The process and actions have taken time to reach agreement. The presentation at this time, because of changes in state and city governments, is a complete design but is brought here for input, both positive and negative. The focus should be on the design and not on funding or position of the New Mexico SHPO and we will politely decline to answer any such questions. It is not subject to the City zoning requirements.

The architects take their responsibility not lightly. They spoke to the role of the museum building on the Plaza. Vladem embodies a dialectic between past, present and future. We are charged to design, respectful of historic location and of our time and effort. We started with this collage created by the Community College (shown).

Prior to evolution of the design, they worked on spatial designs and, as indicated on the slide, the requirements exceeded the existing space on the lot. They needed to honor the massing of the warehouse while providing amenities around the building. They also studied massing options for a second floor.

The design solution evolved our common intent as a sheltering intent by springing over it with the universal hand gesture of hands cupped for flame against the wind. They worked to protect significant historic elements by allowing the mass to be legible and distinct from the addition.

They showed how the circulation patterns in and around the building are perceived as necessary and, as it sits on a loading dock base, they extended the corners to connect with outdoor spaces and a part of the structure to connect Alameda with Guadalupe and open a pedestrian walkway from south to north (left in the diagram). The north and east corners become activated civic places.

They are emphasizing connecting with the New Mexico School for the Arts approaching from Montezuma and want life to be perceptible and relating to the storefronts of the neighborhood. The proposed addition aligns with Montezuma.

Cary Marvin said in the early site analysis, if chromatic, how the sun relates. We take advantage of natural lighting and solar, rain, etc. It was important to celebrate the views of high desert life.

A unique quality that draws so many artists are the windows on the upper level and being careful about wayfinding in the Santa Fe context.

As a museum for contemporary art, it needs to bridge and let the massing facilitate this vernacular of historic Santa Fe. Original stucco mass was restored, and this shows brick coping of the existing structure. Central shows earth stucco and concrete around the site. The other shows the scrim panels.

The second floor shows filtered light that you can see. The scrim panel design came from folded panels and opens to the views to the mountains. They also create beautiful shade patterns like on a tree. It resulted in a 25% reduction on mechanical costs with commonly available material and compatible in the local context.

You can see the second story spanning over the lot with a concrete wall and massing that will be replaced. The north end is the education wing, visible to Guadalupe. The slide shows restoration of the existing building, canopy, and windows along Guadalupe. It does not show the mural and DCA is studying options related to the mural.

Ms. Deidre Harris pointed out on the east elevation, this historic character rests on high windows, brick coping and loading dock. It steps back and allows historic to show. The design encourages traffic to and from the Railyard and shows the contract to the historic warehouse with a ratio average of 33%.

On the north elevation, the primary warehouse is kept and under the loading dock demolished for a new primary entry way underneath. The existing door openings are preserved. The concrete mass corresponds to the height of office space being replaced.

Existing grading is 16% and average of 24% overall.

The south elevation shows the mass of the warehouse is kept and set back. The building maintains a 6-foot setback from the street. The average glazing is 22%.

The west elevation is dominated by the warehouse - an original part at the northwest corner would be removed. Canales and downspouts would be restored. It faces the rail tracks where the percent of glazing is 5%.

Mr. Marvin showed the raised terrace at street level and events of variety and waiting for the bus or Railrunner. There is a large cover over the south and assists passengers and gives a view of the elevation.

Mr. Devanger showed a view from the north for the inner life of the building. In design, we are cognizant of tradition and modern. This is focused on arts in a city designed for arts.

Mr. Lyons thanked the Board for taking the time to hear the team's presentation. Over the next 60 days, the State will be collecting input and we will leave this slide for viewing. And ask for a break.

The Board recessed at 6:23 until 6:32 p.m. to allow viewing.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Katz said how much the Board appreciated the representatives from DCA *presenting to the Board and their willingness to work with the City.*

He noted that he was the City Attorney when the whole process was developed, and the process has worked very well. The first few times were before the state statute, and the process was done willingly with the County on the courthouse, the State on the parking garage and the school district. There was creative excitement as well as physical changes made in each of the projects. It was clear to him that the City is only interested in a consultation, cooperative, collegial process and there is no intention to do a legal process. But we do have a big job and as pointed out by staff and the public from the design of the proposed addition on a contributing building that violates almost all the code criteria. That will have to be worked out.

As noted in the presentation, this is a contemporary arts building and makes it *antithetical to the prime criteria in the historic district that it harmonize with the district and streetscape.* It is clear this does not do that. It is clear that the city will have to compromise and bend all the rules that this does not meet; the form the shape the size the height. Those are probably all necessary for your operational functionality for the programmatic needs of the museum and the museum should have that. The State law

says that.

However, some aspects of the design are more stylistic than needed for functionality that he hoped to discuss those. They clash with the neighborhood and historic area and historic preservation is important to the City and the State.

Member Larson wanted to comment on the process and how they reached this point, both through historic research and consideration of the building, particularly the mural. She wanted clarification on that aspect because she found it an important historic exception and wanted to reach a better understanding on that.

Chair Rios, referencing the mural, asked, when the Board designated façade #6 on the east elevation containing the mural, as part of the primary façade.

Ms. Roach replied the mural does not meet the definition of historic feature for *material and therefore would not be included as part of the primary façade.*

Chair Rios asked a representative to come forward. She asked Mr. Brill on façades 1, 3 and 5 on the north elevation and 6 on the east, all designated as primary, what changes would occur.

Mr. Brill addressed the mural. The state has appropriated \$52,000 for creation of a new mural and DCA is in final negotiation with the surviving artist to paint a new mural.

Chair Rios asked if that was interior or exterior.

Mr. Brill thought that was on the interior.

Mr. Devanger explained he did not have the designation of the façades in front of him. Generally on the east, the façade will be restored along Guadalupe Street and on the north, the portion with the awning will be restored and the storage shed underneath will be demolished.

The façade adjacent with Montezuma will be demolished and replaced with new building and as indicated during the presentation, they are considering matching the historic heights. He showed the Board what that would look like on the north elevation. The top of the concrete matches the existing line of office in the original warehouse and with the removal of the office addition, they would free up the original warehouse, so it stands proud and has a presence.

Chair Rios asked about the existing square footage and the proposed square footage of the new building.

Marvin explained there are a couple of levels and the main warehouse box has just over 11,000 square feet on the lower level and just over 11,000 on the main level, both of which they will keep and adding another 13,000 square feet.

Chair Rios indicated during the break architect on the Board had explained to her what is post. She asked that Member Guida explain to the others.

Member Guida said because he is not the architect, he did not think he could officially explain, but what the Board understood from the presentation is that this is not a typical wall-dominated project. The upper volume of the proposal is two sets of walls with the inner set solid and glazed, and then the scrim is about 3' out as a continuous surface except for the awning portion. They are seeing a monolithic shroud with a set of walls and windows inside of that.

The DCA Architect agreed.

Member Guida stated he was excited by the project and found the design very thoughtful and appropriate for the context, particularly in a transitional district to the Railyard.

He thought this was a way of addressing the contributing status of the original building. It might not be the accepted way in Santa Fe. For him a lot of the excitement comes from the appearance of the project as well as how it challenges our existing design standards. There is an interesting discussion to be had on how the interpretation takes place and the project is provocative in that regard, for the community to think about what is appropriate and where there may be limitations in design standards that might be based more on a residential mindset.

A thought regarding the earlier comment that they would not get into process, one of his challenges is how they got here. They have discussed 14-5.2 purpose and procedures for state capital outlay projects. For him the missing step was the first meeting with the City; the predesign meeting before a design takes place. The discussion with the State and the City on what they would like to see on the site, which did not happen. He wondered if they would be in the same place if the meeting had happened.

Chair Rios asked the architects if any of them had reached out to the preservation community.

An architect replied the very first meetings were with a representative from the HDRB and members of the Historic Preservation Community. They met several times with Randy Bell and Pen LaFarge and other members of their organization.

Member Biedscheid stated she appreciated all the DCA has offered to City of Santa Fe to enhance the cultural aspects that are important to the City's identity.

The department and the State has a presence in several historic districts and she wondered in the interests of informing the community, if the project representatives might articulate what they view as the effect of the project on the historic characteristics of the streetscape and of Santa Fe in general of an addition of a contemporary

museum. She asked their view of nods to the history important with respect of the warehouse and railyard aspects and what they consider concessions or compromises they made in the project design.

Mr. Devanger replied as the project evolved, they have worked to ensure the way the building is experienced from the street level, they started out with ideas of rammed earth. But concrete seemed to be contemporary but it's load bearing vernacular nature with earth tones was important to them. The building evolved in terms of concessions around the way the building is experienced from the pedestrian perspective.

He thought other members of the team could better answer process.

Member Guida asked if there was anyone who could talk about the procedural situation.

Mr. Brill said he would try. He asked if there was a specific question.

Member Guida explained in the rules for state capital outlay projects a procedure is in place and on item B, after design and before soliciting the proposal for design build, the state is to submit the plans before the HDRB for review and comment. They are doing that now, but the part that they are missing is A, the part that states, *"before commencing with design the State and HDRB shall consult as to the appropriate design standards and how those design standards would impact cost and operations ..."*

That meeting did not take place.

Mr. Brill stated there had been a different administration at the City and the State. He was not a witness and could only speak to what he has heard and read.

His team is under the impression they did have the initial meetings with the prior administration and worked with the community and with staff. They have nothing that says that occurred, but they can assert they did happen; many meetings, even dozens of meetings with different entities, several times at least, with the City.

They are in an awkward place and they recognize that the people and the philosophy of the project and how to work together has evolved. They are focused on moving forward and they understand that this type of project is probably the last one that will fit this mold and going forward would be a different system.

In good faith they are coming to the Board and receiving the input and believe strongly that this is a public comment, but not a project of for an up or down vote.

Member Guida replied he understands where they are today and accepted that. He asked, given the details were fuzzy, if Staff had anything to add.

Ms. Johnson stated this happened during a complete turnover of staff at both the city

and state level. She and Ms. Roach stepped into this at the same moment as Mr. Brill and his team did and the specific chronology and documentation of the number of meetings prior to their arrival they cannot find or replicate.

She thought it better to focus on the fact that they are here now and might be the time to invite the community to comment.

Public Comment

Chair Rios asked people to speak concisely when commenting.

Ms. Roach indicated she had a list and could call 5 people at a time.

Stuart Ashman, Jamie Clements, Bruce Larson, Scott Hall, and Steve Harris were asked to come forward.

Mr. Ashman indicated he is the former Secretary of DCA under Bill Richardson and now running the Folk Art Market. The department oversees the historic preservation division for the state, and he is somewhat versed on preservation standards and practices.

He was the one who secured the building for the museum with the idea of having a contemporary art museum in the Railyard. Originally, they had planned an extension on Shelby Street but abandoned the idea when this opportunity came. This seemed more appropriate, given the development in the Railyard and Guadalupe Street districts.

The intention was to bring the museum up to date. The Montezuma Street has changed dramatically in the last 30 years. Across the street was a complex of stores and many may remember that being a yard for Brown Pipe and Supply and an industrial area. Coca-Cola bottling was across the street, which became Paseo Pottery and is now Double Take. Next door was a car shop that became the Zia Diner.

He explained that his point was the history of the area has been evolving and adaptations made as the community's needs arose. Architects Devanger Contractor and Deirdre Harris both New Mexico artists, in contrast to other buildings, created a team for the be re-adaptation of the Halpin Building with *much public input and attention* and reverence to the original building.

The plan is to add a contemporary architectural element emphasizing the function of the museum while at the same time honoring the original structure and adapting it for its new use. Historic preservation best practices require that additions to historic structures clearly define what is historic and what is new. Done to ensure the historic is honored and not confused with the addition. The design adheres to best practice in the most thoughtful way.

Finally, he wanted to say the project will enhance the Guadalupe Railyard District

and bring a new opportunity to the City to exhibit and collect contemporary art produced in New Mexico - something lacking for many years.

He acknowledged Bob and Ellen Vladem who were present, for their generosity and the Museum and New Mexico Foundation for their efforts to raise the money and the Department of Cultural Affairs for their support.

He urged the Board to consider the importance of the contribution to the Santa Fe community from an artistic, economic and quality-of-life perspective. Given the Site Santa Fe, two blocks away and New Mexico School for the Arts down the street, the Vladem contemporary will be the anchor and an important enhancement to this arts corridor.

Jaime Clements explained he is the president of the Museum of the New Mexico Foundation that is raising private funds for the Vladem Contemporary. They are nearing \$11m in cash and pledges on a campaign goal of \$12 million. a capital campaign is one of the best barometers of community support for a cultural project such as this. To date nearly 600 people have donated which is remarkably high for the size of Santa Fe and indicative of the broad base of support for this project and for this design.

In addition, as part of the campaign Kelly O'Donnell was commissioned to prepare an impact study. Her analysis shows that in the first decade \$192 million in new economic activity will be generated and \$100m in new wages and \$12m in new tax revenue. The project is vitally important on many levels and will keep the New Mexico Museum of Art relevant in today's art world and support art and culture brand they cherish and rely on.

Mr. Bruce Larson at 3229 Calle Celestials, stated he has been a trustee of the Museum of New Mexico Foundation for many years and a member of the Board of Regents for the Museum of New Mexico.

He has been a part of the project as a member of the Building Committee since inception and has seen the evolution and the changes. The Vladem is in the Historic Transition District. The dictionary definition of transition is passage from one position, stage, state or subject, to another. The design fits that definition as it maintains many parts of the Halpin Building and incorporates new elements that expand utility of the building. The new element links the museum to the Railyard district by a bridge. The transition zone is redefined by a building which in itself is a transition.

Mr. Larson offered his congratulations to the team for design that is truly functional and meets the definition of the transition zone. The Vladem will be an important addition to the culture of Santa Fe as well as the state. Also, Santa Fe will be the recipient of GRT based on the project costs only around \$700,000, which is an immediate benefit.

Mr. Scott Hall at 317 Paseo, thanked the Board for their service. He currently chairs

the Board of Trustees for Museum of New Mexico Foundation. His primary purpose in addressing the Board is to add to their understanding of the depth of support in the community for the design. It has been a year-long story of affirmation and reaffirmation. They are a large, nonprofit volunteer organization with members and 8,000 households with 18,000 members statewide.

The feedback they have received on the design is affirmative. In addition they have a have a capital campaign nearing \$11 million in pledges and contributions and 600 families have put skin in the game. In the most recent session of the legislature and the Governor have approved capital outlay predicated on the design in the amount of \$410m for one year with more to follow.

He hoped the Board could take that into their consideration and deliberation.

Mr. Steve Harris stated he started coming here in the 1970s and the last 17 years has owned a home in Santa Fe. He was attracted by the landscape and the architecture and much more and is thankful for people who work hard to protect the City's traditions, cultures and architecture. He feels that no city could stop evolving and growing and every city needs to layer on its own history of each succeeding generation. To do less is to risk losing sustainability and relevance.

That is why he strongly supports the contemporary art museum adding to the incredible museums that draw the residents, students and art enthusiasts from around the world to Santa Fe.

The design for the Vladem Contemporary will provide a modern transition between historic district and the Railyard by breathing new life into a building in need of resuscitation. He thought the attributes of a former Halpin building, while the new design makes it more at home with its contemporary art gallery neighbors in the railyard and the upcoming New Mexico School of the Arts.

Trends come and go but people tend to stay interested in what they grew up seeing and learning about. Santa Fe critically needs to find ways to keep young people here and engaged and they need to attract younger, more diverse visitors, investors, workers and families. He feels the Vladem will resonate with the *younger demographic*.

They need to respect and embrace the past by responsibly reaching out to the future. He believed the design for the Vladem does that.

Ms. Sandy Zane indicated she has the property called Form and Concept diagonally across, formerly Zane Bennet Contemporary Art. They are also in the historic transition area and also went through a major reconstruction of that building from 12 retail businesses to one business. She has also had experience on Canyon Road, in the historic district.

She is impressed with what the Museum Foundation has done to encourage public

input, commentary and ideas in the process. Aesthetic is a sensitive thing, like finding the one person you will live with the rest of your life. While difficult, this team of architects has done a fantastic job of balancing historic against the function that is shown by the appearance of this building.

She reaffirmed this will definitely help increase tourism, the state as a real art destination. She reminded them Santa Fe is called *The City Different* and that corner is a meeting place for many kinds of construction; her two-story building, the Garfield building with three stories and commercial and they need to be creative and do their best to make this happen.

Emmet Martínez at 110 Via Leyba said he was raised in Santa Fe and his family has been here about 300 years. He said he is nobody he has no money and he has no influence - is a barrio dog. Murals are art and murals represent the best of Mexican Azteca influence.

They talk about compromise. Okay let's compromise but look at that. That is not the Railyard Depot; that is not even Jacques Cousteau; that is a tin box. They should remember there are people in Santa Fe who live here and work here but there are not a lot of people in Santa Fe who love it. So, don't Californicate New Mexico.

Mr. Pen La Farge at 647 Old Santa Fe Trail stated he is president of the Old Santa Fe Association and their reaction to the proposed Museum is decidedly mixed. While we are open to good, new architecture, there are problems with this design that cannot be overcome or ignored. The design of the museum succeeds in that it announces itself as a house for contemporary art. That is, in that way, what the State wanted and is appropriate. However the design for the new part of the building is out of compliance.

The State has insisted on advertising the museum to raise funds, as being in the Railyard Arts District. That is incorrect, there is no Railyard Arts District. The proposed Museum is in the Historic Transition District and therefore should be in compliance with regulations of the district in its look, its feel and in its aesthetic. Beyond that, the proposed Museum is at odds with the streetscape and the look of every building that surrounds it. As it is, the *Vladem* is a blazing sore thumb at the building, although the building would look excellent elsewhere.

Members of my Association have met with the State and the fine arts museum to discuss the design, but the discussion ended after a short time and has not been resumed. Thus, they left us with nothing to do but to oppose the design as it is.

The Association understands that State Senator Wirth's strengthening of the statute that governs how state buildings are built and historic districts, exempts the *Vladem*. That is, however, not a good excuse for a building that does great harm to the neighborhood and the historic district and to Santa Fe. The State should understand that the look and aesthetic of Santa Fe since first defined in 1912 is what has made northern New Mexico the desired location and beloved destination that it is.

Santa Fe's integrity and authenticity are vital to us as citizens, residents and to our living and by such uncaring damage to our integrity as the Vladern building proposes that the capital of the State that which makes it unique, valued and beloved.

The Association asks that the Board and the State work to mitigate the eccentricity of the building, the harm it would certainly do, and to come to a reasonable architectural compromise that everyone can value and appreciate as a positive addition to the style of our city.

Mr. La Farge stated on a personal note this is the only museum he knew in the State system that is named for a person. If the museum must be named, he believed it should be named for the generous family whose gift of art made it possible, the Phillips.

Mr. John Dick at 112 Camino Escondido indicated he is an architect that practices in Santa Fe for 28 years not associated with the designers. The rich historical fabric of Santa Fe is significant, and the city is significant and robust enough to allow for a rare variance from the norm. He doubted that the Scottish Rite Temple, Loretto Chapel, the Basilica could be approved within today's historical code requirements. Yet he thought most agree the building as a richness to the city would not otherwise have.

In Paris where structures like the Eiffel Tower and the glass pyramid at the Louvre, which personally he did not find appropriate, were initially abhorred. Public-interest overtime has now made them canonized. Architecture can be iconic by the newness of form and expression and at the same time gesturing to its historical context.

Mr. Dick thought this design has been able to navigate the line between contextual and contemporary resulting in a richer and more engaging built environment. Extremism can be just as damaging when concerning mimicry as with exhibitionism. If a building tries too hard to fit in it may become nothing more than a copy of its surroundings. Rote historical mimicry could be problematic for the legibility of the city as building and bygone styles begin to create a city of replicas instead of relevant genuine structures.

This design poses genuine possibilities of successful integration and navigates the built context in ways that enhance rather than detracts. This project shows awareness of the historical stratification occurring in all cities with a rich fabric, where people can discern a vigorous ongoing debate that will certainly continue here in Santa Fe and significant historical cities everywhere.

Mr. Bill Siegel stated for transparency, he works very happily with Devanger and his team in 2006 on his prior gallery in the Railyard. He provided his background visiting Santa Fe in 1982 for business moving to Santa Fe and 1990. He has owned several galleries in town and would like to make points about projects that have nothing to do with legal issues.

For him Santa Fe is an art town and when he mentions Santa Fe during his travels,

people's strongest impressions are that this is a world-class center for the arts. To him that means in reference to this project there are people young and old in Santa Fe who are trying to create art. Art, if anything, is an individual's expression of what they see feel and how those feelings relate to something in the present. It is something that is current.

This project is a quintessential expression of that definition of art and is taking in this case, an old building and transforming it into a contemporary statement of what is currently happening in the world.

He remembered in 1990 when the Eldorado Hotel was fought over bitterly for many reasons. He believed the same was true when the railyard was initially proposed more than 20 years ago, both of those sites and others have proven to be great assets to Santa Fe.

He believes they should honor the past without being held slave to it. The primary characteristic of what makes art transformative is it often takes what came before and enhances it by making it contemporary. It makes the old new and relevant to the time in which it is created and requires that old rules might have to change to accommodate a new world vision.

If Santa Fe is going to continue to prosper as a world-class center for the arts and then the buildings must be as relevant to the architecture of today as the art that will be shown inside the structures.

Ms. Beverly Spears at 1334 Pacheco Street stated she is an architect practicing and Santa Fe over 40 years. She was the chair of the Business Capital District Design Review Committee. (BCD DRC) which addressed the Railyard many years ago.

She wanted to make a few points. In the area where the project is proposed, Guadalupe Street north of Montezuma is an intact streetscape with buildings that hold together well.

But that is not true south of Montezuma, the space is not clearly defined, streetscapes incohesive and building style are random. This building will be south of Montezuma and the area is not that fragile an area in Santa Fe. She thought the building would not disturb a cohesive area and in fact fit right in with randomness.

Another aspect is that the contemporary museum is a public building and she agrees with Mr. Dick that it is appropriate to stand out and be a landmark and not just blend in and should be an exception. She wished it was even more dramatic.

Her third point is regarding the height of the building. Santa Fe's history going back 100 years is a Spanish Colonial City and the paradigm seen in Cuzco and Oaxaca, etc. is an important paradigm and is what should be given primary attention. A low height is part of the letter this building at 42 feet, and because it is not in the downtown area or

the old Spanish Colonial area, is acceptable particularly when looking at the surrounding fabric.

Mr. Larry Matthews at 616 Canyon Road said he owns a gallery on Canyon Road and as a business owner/citizen he appreciates the city's concern for its distinctive architecture and varied architectural styles and the role that plays in life of the city.

The Vldem Contemporary Museum is a very necessary and important addition to the ongoing reputation of Santa Fe as one of the world's leading art destinations. Its curatorial direction of contemporary art adds a necessary art historical compliment to Museum of Fine Art and Site Santa Fe. The thoughtful design maintains a recognition of the areas past and of architecture today and our place in history.

The building and Museum will continue to forge Santa Fe's place in art history and act as economic driver for the City. The design itself is an important symbol of the art that would be exhibited within its walls. He is very much in favor of adopting the design as proposed.

Ms. Mary Jo Halpin stated her father was Joseph Halpin the building was named after and she came to save the mural. Her father commissioned the mural before he retired and if he was here, he would be saying things much louder than she to save the mural. He loved that mural, as her family still does and the community loves the mural, regardless of whether they are present to say that or not.

Ms. Halpin said the family is happy, but something is happening with the building because it has sat empty for so long and was used for storage. They are not happy that the name of the building is gone but that is okay. Her family was kept in the loop on almost everything happening, but since this is a museum of art, they would like to see some way to keep the mural on the side of the building.

Chair Rios asked to confirm that Ms. Halpin was in favor of the design proposed.

Ms. Halpin stated she did not say that. Her family thought the design was beautiful but is massive and is not for that corner or this building.

Mr. Chip Chippeaux thanked the Board for letting him make a comment in favor of the Vldem museum. He works at the Century Bank and has been in business in Santa Fe for 35 years and has been involved with numerous nonprofits including The Santa Fe Arts Commission, Tierra Contenta Corporation among others. He brings a business perspective to the discussion as well as a concern for the historical, cultural and social significance of the city.

He thought the design offered a great transition between the historic district and the Railyard and a wonderful addition to the contemporary galleries in the area and Site Santa Fe. The architectural and economic renewal of the area is outstanding and should be publicly acclaimed and the proposed Museum will be a wonderful addition

culturally, architecturally and economically and is tastefully considered and in architecturally in step with the changes in the area.

Ms. Lindsey Holt stated she would love to talk about art and architecture, but she is obligated to bring to their attention something more mundane. She is an artist in northern New Mexico for about 40 years. One thing she enjoyed in the early 1990s when Sam Pick was mayor, was to suggest to the editor of New Mexican doing a series about the Railyard. That was before Catellus Development Company had proposed developing the area.

The editorial series was very successful, and Ms. Beverly Spears was one of my guest writers. About 8 to 10 people in the arts community professionally and well-known also wrote guest editorials with suggestions, visions, of the Railyard.

From that seminal moment, much of that has come to pass but she is here to remind them there is an elephant in the room. She would propose a visionary solution that incorporates possibly a solution to the fabled mural problem.

She indicated the elephant in the room is parking. They built a courthouse in the last few years and the bond issue for the construction project promised public parking. When the building was finished, they were told there were security issues and they were not welcome to park there.

Challenging issues exist in the Railyard in the Guadalupe Transitional District every Saturday when going to the farmers market and a gallery. The posture of the City is aggressive with parking, there is revenue involved. She thought it is obligatory upon the City Council to find more space for parking for the future.

Her suggestion is to consider sacrificing some of the open space in the park and do a bond to build a parking facility. Also, the technology exists, and they could digitally scan the mural and reproduce that within the proposed parking structure. At the least they could find someplace in a park nearby to relocate the mural with new materials. She personally would volunteer to head the committee if the Board is interested.

Mr. Raymond Herrera, a lifelong resident of Santa Fe said he has been involved with preservation for over 40 years. He was a founding member of Museum of Spanish Colonial Art, the Museo Cultural and other aspects of growth in Santa Fe.

He acknowledged the architects who did a great job, but they are from Albuquerque and he thought they were confusing Santa Fe's Railyard to the one in Albuquerque. This museum would fit perfectly in Albuquerque.

Also the preservation of the mural is important to their community. It is part of the culture and he has heard money has been appropriated to do something with the artwork. He asked if possible, for them to just redo the mural on the same site on the new building under the windows.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato at PO Box 1601 stated she is a historian and have worked in historic preservation for over 40 years. She thought it interesting that Mr. Brill talked about his design but everyone else associated with the Museum Foundation talked about economics.

She said they mentioned they are honoring the history but, in her opinion, they are obscuring the building. The structure is contributing structure and totally overwhelmed by the addition. Also on the north side one primary façade is being destroyed and is pretty much straight up two-story.

Ms. Beninato agreed with others it is a handsome design and would fit well somewhere else, but not in Santa Fe. She agreed with Pen LaFarge about that. Santa Fe has already lost Sanbusco, a contributing if not significant building, and the status was lost because of the Santa Fe School of Art and Design.

The second story does not give the impression of mass and the screening of the windows reflects that at all. This a contributing building that is historic and everyone came to the Board agreeing it was historic, but they have a need. They want the Board to ignore the historic design requirements because their need is better, greater, than the requirements.

She does appreciate there is a lot of open space and open to walk through and even though the west was not designated contributing that it is being restored to look like the warehouse. She also appreciates the east side and other things done, but the destruction of one side.

Ms. Beninato approached the model noted that if the second story could be moved it would be less overwhelming; the basement could be pushed to make an area underground with lighting going down. That would be contemporary and innovative and creative and do away with some of the second-story massing.

Mr. Kurt Sommer stated over the last 20 years looking at what has happened at the Railyard and the architecture, they would notice it is not contemporary, it is unique. The other end of the street on Guadalupe, Site Santa Fe has a unique design and this building would be a perfect complement for the streetscape. It would enhance the Railyard feel they are hoping to achieve and is perfect for a contemporary museum.

They need to look at the rules for historic preservation to find a way to bend them for innovation and design in areas that are transitional such as the Railyard and this site.

One block up the street, the County Courthouse is not a typical Santa Fe structure and they would not have built that if it had to conform to the city historic preservation. They would not have been able to build the University building today because it is overwhelming big building and larger than this in height. It would not fit in downtown Santa Fe but fits where it is and is a perfect complement of the development of the Railyard. He encouraged the Board to find support for the building.

Mr. Philip Goodwin indicated he was here in support and owned property on Guadalupe Street. He was also here with the Guadalupe merchants who talked about wanting to see more energy on the street. He thought this building looks like it would bring energy to the street and would be a great book end with Site Santa Fe on one side and the end of Guadalupe Street and is right on the transition line. He thought it would be a beautiful building.

Mr. Rich Moriarity at 113 Calle Royale was opposed to the current design. However, he assumed the museum will be built and he will enjoy going to it, but this design creates an issue beyond the parameters of the building. Obviously, the Board would talk about many of the issues that need to be resolved and part of that should be the *view from the Railyard that will be obscured*; the Sangre de Cristos will be obscured.

The slide presentation showed the top of the building taken from farther back, but walking north along the Farmer's Market building, the Sangres would only show a bit on top of the building. Those views are historic themselves in fact the history is long before Santa Fe.

Mr. Moriarity said an excellent suggestion was to take the second story and moving things down and possibly spreading the building out. That would eliminate the view shed problem. This is not in the Railyard District it is in the historic transition district and the Board has a role to play.

He asked the Board as part of their role, to consider the effect of this building, that is box-like could be changed to be more contemporary in a stepped fashion. That could possibly create more interest than a rectangular box. The views matter and all of senses affect how we think.

Mr. Moriarity suggested for residents and visitors to Santa Fe that the ability to see the mountains unobscured has been preserved in the past. He asked that it be preserved in the future.

Mr. Randall Bell at 314 Garcia Street acknowledged Mr. Moriarity for making a very good point. Behind the building there is the iconic Santa Fe Railway Depot where people coming into Santa Fe by train are dropped off. At this point, standing at the depot, you would see the mountains, but with this building people will see a giant wall of scrim and glass. That is a loss.

Regarding process, a gentleman tried to determine to what degree the City had participated early on prior to design. The DCA and the museum have an obligation to come to the City and the stakeholders like the preservation community, prior to the design. He found it hard to believe despite a change of staff, that there were no files regarding the meetings. He believed the DCA and the museum did not honor the obligation.

For the preservation committee, he would only speak for himself as a member that

he and Pen Lafarge as OSFA, were invited to a meeting last summer but that was not in pre-design stage. The building presented tonight was when they had seen then. He thought under the State statute, it would have been appropriate and necessary for both the City and the preservation committee to be contacted in the pre-design stage.

Also worth noting is that this historic district site was chosen unfortunately and sets up a desire for the project and its scale knowing that it would be nonconforming to the ordinance in numerous ways, materials, scale, etc.

As he sees it this began as a juggernaut in which he is happy to see a contemporary art museum coming to Santa Fe as well as the financial benefits and supporting art, that is great. But Santa Fe's economy was established on the integrity of its historic fabric. From the beginning it has been said this building is in the Railyard, but it is not. It is in an historic preservation district and they are being asked to ignore that and to throw out ordinance and policies.

Two days ago he walked from Guadalupe Church and along the sidewalk is a nice progression and scale of buildings, mostly historic. The building opposite this at Montezuma and Guadalupe built in the early 90s, fits in and past the Halpin building is the historic train station. Then there is Tomasitas which is a historic structure, and beyond that the historic Gross-Kelly warehouse and the aligned buildings behind it. So from the Church to the galleries there is continuity of streetscape that will be seriously violated by this building in scale and materials.

He thought it unfortunate that the city and residents are put in a position where they either have to cave or take throw out the ordinance to let them do what they want. The Zia diner that came up for signage, there was great scrutiny.

Mr. Bell said he knew the Board was not making a decision, but the more they could weigh in and consult with the proponents, he would hope they would do that.

He added that he agreed that the building is a nice design for someplace else.

Mr. Richard Czoski at 332 Reid Street indicated as Executive Director of the Railyard Community Corporation he was speaking in favor of the project on behalf of himself and his Board of Directors. They have been involved in the Santa Fe Railyard for nearly 20 years and weighed in on all of the development as well as efforts to protect historic buildings that have been designated in the Railyard.

The overall philosophy is that historic buildings are more important when there are contemporary buildings next to them that make the historic buildings stand out. The Depot, Gross Kelly are historic and do not look like a copy of something else. That is in the Railyard Master Plan and the overall philosophy.

The Corporation feels the corner has been vastly underutilized and has been a no-man's zone with nothing going on. The corner could be the northern entry to the

Railyard, especially for people coming from the Plaza. They are fortunate to have Site Santa Fe as the contemporary anchor on the south end and think this new building would be the anchor to the north end.

He added this corner relates more to the Railyard than to the historic buildings down the street as Ms. Spears pointed out. The architecture is entirely consistent with the new architecture in the Railyard itself. The railyard is meant to look different and is made to not look like the rest of Santa Fe on purpose. They believe this building relates more to the architecture of the Railyard than the more historic buildings.

In closing he stated they could not give an unqualified endorsement because they have concerns with location of the waste facility in the back. They would like more input on how Garfield Street will be extended between Guadalupe and the Depot and would like more discussions about the loading dock design.

However, they heartily endorse the building and feel they should encourage bold interesting architecture on the corner without compromising the historic buildings to the north.

Ms. Sandra Brice said she is the director of events at the Santa Fe Railyard Corporation and a resident in the historic Eastside. She felt the building a perfect metaphor for transition between the neighborhoods of the Railyard and the Guadalupe District, but also between the late 19th and early 21st century. There has been discussion about whether the museum should be more complementary. To her the building seemed the function not only of a contemporary art museum but also the transitional space is to challenge, and it supersedes being complementary. That is what makes it exciting.

Although the museum is not an official part of the Railyard it will become a welcoming gateway by its function and will be an exciting invitation into the new Santa Fe.

Mr. Rick Martínez at 725 Mesilla Road voiced disappointment. The sign in front of the building says, "A country that forgets its past has no future". He thought they were starting off very bad and he hoped it wouldn't become a city that forgets its past has no future. It is sad that to see that this is not mentioned as part of the building, because it should be, because it was part of the building to begin with. He thought the state should keep that and find a place for it or keep it right in the front. It looks like it would be the perfect spot just to keep it there.

Also in talking about murals, the murals and Santa Fe-they are losing all of them. they are losing Alvord's mural and the mural in front and it will be inside. Murals should not be inside; they are meant to be outside. They should figure out ways to put murals in other places, but not just get rid of them. They are losing the murals around town and nobody cares, but he cares.

Also there is a plaque on the building that is for the Halpin building. He asked what

would happen to that if that plaque could be placed around that building too. They need that to recognize that it is a part of that history.

There are a lot of things they need to recognize what that building was and years ago that was part of the railroad. If they keep forgetting all of that it is sad. He doesn't mind the building itself but forgetting everything they have in the city and throwing it away does not make sense to him. They should ask the architects to figure out where that sign can go so, they can have a city that does not forget its past, and we will have a good future. That is what they need. The murals of the city mean a lot to those who grew up here and if they could find ways ... not just hide them inside the buildings.

Mr. Tim Maxwell provided his background as a Museum of New Mexico employee for 30 years and DCA Division Director for over 10 years. He served on the HDRB at one time and knew how difficult this could be. He agrees with the foundation supporters and those who said the museum would bring benefits to Santa Fe. He is not enamored with the design of the building and he would not list his likes and dislikes. That is something that should be shared in public forums and that is where this has fallen down.

He has to express his disappointment in the museum of New Mexico for not being more forceful about public involvement in this. Mr. Brill said we are all in this together at the beginning of the meeting, but it does not seem that way. He did not recall many public meetings and he regretted he did hear about the collage creation and he was out of town when there was a viewing of the model.

He thought tonight they can't do anything to reverse much of this. With more public meetings he would've mentioned this example. Just to say one more thing, when a new archaeology center was being constructed on Caja del Rio Road, his office was moved to the Halpin building and it is horrible. It needs something and is surprised that no one proposed it be torn down. But he is glad they did not.

When the archaeology center was being built and they were moved, the archaeology center was built a donation from BLM of 20 acres with an additional 19 acres optional. Part of the discussion at the time was that it would be a perfect area for off-site museum storage. One reason for this museum is storage issues. He thought in the change of administration someone has forgotten about that. If there had been public meetings, he would have certainly brought that up. They could reduce the footprint of what they need if they had built the outside storage facilities.

That is why he feels the process failed in some ways. It is probably too late to reverse this process now, and he wishes they had been all together earlier.

Mr. Patrick Harris at 1002 Osage Circle provided his background as a Cantor at Cristo Rey Church who lives in Santa Fe with his wife of 37 years and raised his children here. He is the sole surviving member of the three people that gilded the Spitz

clock in front of the museum and an instructor in art history for which she has received awards.

Buildings in any city have a conversation and they are looking at a problem or a solution depending on which side you are on similar to the problem/solution recently unveiled in Amsterdam with their Museum of Modern Art. The museum was over 200 years old and they attached a new modern structure to it. That has become a landmark in Amsterdam, which is also an historic city.

By bringing something new into the center alongside what is recognizably old, might be an imperfect solution, but works. Santa Fe buildings have a conversation and most of that, they are lucky has an architectural style. Part of that style refers to the past and how we respect it and as people and generations to come we also need to be concerned about her future.

He loved the louvered cladding on the second story, that is not in variance with that neighborhood. That cladding creates a conversation with a building that will be a distant relative - SITE Santa Fe. Every building has a conversation with husband these two buildings will talk to each other and this building will talk to people.

Modern and contemporary artists are not pariahs or at odds with the sensibility of the community. They are put of it. They need to recognize that, and he is very in favor of this because this also recognizes the country fusion artists have made to the city of Santa Fe. He really hopes to see this building go up.

Ms. Barbara Fix at 610 Alicia commented that things change, and change is constant. The past is speaking to them through what people who are no longer here have said; their visions such as John Gaw Meem, Von Horvath and others. Those people said you can't hold on to everything, but you should hold on to what is precious and needed for our souls.

The mural is interesting, but it is not historic and because it is not it is contemporary, making the odd situation where a contemporary museum is going to destroy contemporary art to put contemporary art in the museum. The loss of the mural will strike at the heart of those not here. Those who are here are very involved in politics and the City. It was wonderful to hear from Ms. Halpin about her dad.

She gave staff excerpts from the book Street Murals which picks this particular mural as being important internationally. That is something that should be honored. The reality is we talk about economic development of art; Meow Wolf is maybe an example. But Meow Wolf is not the first collective of crazy artists in Santa Fe. In the 1980's there was the caravan of dreams and Felipe de la Vaca, etc. People involved collectively in the spirit of the time.

The book mentions the plaque on the mural that stated that the mural is intended to bridge the gap between art and people. It is true the Board does not have jurisdiction

over the mural, but the Board and the city have a say in what the State does and is basis of a beginning conversation.

A lot has been said about process and how it is not been followed. The general knowledge is that this is a done deal, but maybe not. It is not too late to have the conversation that alternatives could happen that could accomplish the purpose for the contemporary Art Museum. It does not have to be an intrusion and unnecessary change.

Ms. Fix said she believes that the creativity inherent in Santa Fe is an answer. She noted that Mr. Czoski said they have always stood for historic preservation and she offers the example of the Baca Street Railyard. The corporation wanted to tear down the ugly building and the adobe and you have people that come to look at what they can make out of it. That is where the city has to call on creativity. The conversation needs to go on.

Ms. Gayla Bechtol projected a map overhead that she discovered on the Santa Fe website that shows historic district boundaries and national register nominated in Santa Fe in 1973 based on what they thought based on 1912. She pointed out the Railyard is included with the Gross Kelly warehouse building.

In the 1980s the Railyard was taken out of the historic district to redevelop. She showed archival photographs of the Halpin Building and the addition and the historic district as might have looked in 1973, Jean Cocteau and Sanbusco.

She wanted to bring this to the Board's attention because this is an historic district even though the City decided not to keep the Railyard as historic.

She stated she was part of the railyard planning process starting in 1995 and as it evolved one of the most important guiding principles was the view corridor created by the tracks. Many people involved in the planning, remembered the Railyard as an open space and seeing circus animals.

She thought they created something wonderful. She was distressed by a letter she learned about that the State was trying to avoid scrutiny of the project. She read from a letter to David Rasch: *"Dear Mr. Rasch, this letter is to inform you that the Halpin building is being constructed with private sector funding raised by the Museum of New Mexico Foundation. The Department of Cultural Affairs does not intend to use any state funding on any portion of the project that will impact the exterior of the building. If state funds become necessary, the funds will be limited to the interior of the building. Thank you for your interest in the project and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions"*.

She is disheartened and the point was to avoid the scrutiny. When she found out the building would be 42' tall she imagined what would happen from the public spaces, particularly the easement held as a conservation easement. Part of the values from that

easement is open space and the 6000 citizens of Santa Fe wanted to keep that as open space. This view stands on the tracks, and it can be moved, and she would like to point out moving one way or the other the unfortunate geography they face is that the tracks turn at the last minute. If the tracks kept going straight the public spaces of the railyard would not be as impacted but it turns out it blocks a great deal of the view.

Suby Bowden, who could not be here, created the document. She is a brilliant beloved architect many of you know. She recommends an alternate proposal that would require more use of the city's land but could preserve more of the view. That would make 6000 people happy that helped to design the railyard and love the railyard.

They are excited about the museum and she thanks them for their efforts. She is distressed however that from day one, the public scrutiny was meant to be avoided. Having been a part of a public process that created an award-winning public space, i.e. they Railyard along with many other collaborators, she is disheartened.

Ms. Elizabeth West at 318 Sena said she walks by the space is very often having worked at the public library. She was uncomfortable saying she is in favor or opposed; she guessed she has to choose she is opposed, but there are parts she likes.

She thought it exciting to have a museum, and it could be made out of canvas tents and people would like it. The museum is going to happen one way or the other; and it was great that the Vladems helped with the kickoff. She wished they would let it be named for the Halpin's but that was another approach.

She said people will love it. She liked the idea of the flow. Starting with the positive, she likes to be switch instead of building a box on top of a warehouse they switched that. She was at the collage gathering and talked with many architects and then she attended the OSFA meeting. She talked with Mr. Contractor about repetition. She said she does not think he heard her - or did not put it into effect.

When they were looking at the model, she noticed a lot of repetition that tends to be stultifying. She recalls telling the architect that her father taught her about repetition and cited a story about a long stairway where all the newel posts appeared the same.

She said the eye does not notice exactly; the brain does not take it all in but one's ethos is affected. How you live with Art is strong and she brings that up because Devender and she talked about the scrim / shroud as the top covering and that it could be inexpensively altered. She found the massing too extreme and too repetitive. The contemporary statement is too heavy and too boxy and is overwhelming.

Breaking that up by the height of the building or the shroud, would be more effective and more friendly. She agreed with Ms. Spears to a point, that standing out is good but standing out more would be to make it more varied. That is an easy way to solve the problem and not too expensive. The NM School of Arts is creating a lot of conversation and has been forced to be more variegated, which would end up making it successful.

The southeast view at night shows more variety. In a series of photographs she saw one where what you could see behind the shroud is more varied. She suggested to the team to come up with something like that.

Regarding the different elevations, the Eastern elevation is cold because of the repetition and massing. The south and north elevation is too tall, and she would wish for a way to make that okay by varying something underneath. The devil windows with two walls is a waste of space. She likes the West elevation and the north elevation with the high windows retained also. She likes the mural but is resigned to adapting to their ideas but wants it to be honored in some way; she is willing to consider a mural on the inside as a compromise.

She said Mr. Brill started by saying, "let us agree to disagree" but she would rather say let us try to have some kind of consensus. She thanked them for listening and said they now have 60 days; and the offer of coffee holds. Avoid repetition.

Mr. Charles Rusiker noted that in listening to those who spoke tonight if each had a brush it would be a beautiful contemporary piece of art. His interest in the project is many fold. His family lived in the area of Alto Street and Guadalupe from late 1600's so he represents his ancestors. He thought too many people have become complacent and have not been not involved. His received wealth of information and thanked them for the opportunity to speak. He hoped those who have generations in Santa Fe would become more involved in voice.

He added that his hope was the Board could work to make this project more acceptable. It is indeed contemporary art facility as is SITE Santa Fe. He is proud that the Vladem and the Foundation have been major contributors. His family on the Native American side was assisted by the Museum Foundation and used their name for the title of a dance circle at the Folk Art Museum as well as giving credit to the person who made this happen for them. He thought the Vladem family should be acknowledged in the name of the museum.

On the murals, the President of the school Board Steve Carrillo mentioned he was from LA where they tear all kinds of things down. They should be happy they are not tearing Alvord School down.

The mural that depicts the Chile Line also has a strong meaning because "Uncle Charlie" from Ohkay Owingeh and he talked about riding the Chile Line to Indian School. Charles Ilfeld had the building and Jose Lucero used to delivery for Ilfeld with a horse and buggy and he would point out as they passed through Chimayo La Puebla Pojoaque where various people live. They need to figure a way to honor that past. the Alvord school mural is also contemporary and would not bother him to see it inside.

They need to embrace the contemporary side of art history. He feels confident that there is a way to compromise. He and his wife are participants in the community Museum system and might be the first ones at the door. Let's make this a good

process.

Mr. John Eddy at 227 East Palace, Suite D acknowledged his appreciation for the historic review Board because of their expertise. He looked forward to them having the opportunity to talk about project.

He is on the Board of OSFA and is not speaking for them but had attended a meeting offered by a designer. The meeting was congenial but any of the admonitions were overlooked but he sees none of that feedback in this design. His biggest concern is the scale, massing and height that engulfs the contributing building. It is a clever and interesting design but that is the effect. They are speaking for the record they know, because they know the thumbs up and thumbs down happened already at the Legislature.

When talking about conversations buildings have with community members, the mural was allowed to degrade to a state where it is unrestorable. That is regrettable in that the conversation the building had with the community for 10 years or so was "you people down there on the street don't matter. We will let this go so it is easier for us to make the argument that we can do what we want with this building when the time comes". That is the shame of the DCA.

Regarding design, Staff outlined where the building is not compliant to code very clearly. He thought the Board would do a good job of listening to Staff, but their hands are tied to a degree. Height, scale and massing are problems and the biggest problem with the building is the upper floor and scrim because of the reflective value would be a distraction on the streetscape. The scrims obscure the inner soul of the building and it offers no inclination of what might be going on inside other than it is modern. He would like to see the scrim pushed back and step backs on the second story to minimize the boxlike appearance and the upper roof could be left overhanging the upper story. That would help to break up the massing and overwhelming blocking.

He echoes a lot of the sentiments and expertise brought to the meeting and he appreciated their patience.

Mr. David Rasch stated he had to admit he started this process in the state. In 2017 he was approached to look at building a structure on top of a contributing historic building in the historic district. He was the historic preservation planner from 2003 to 2018 and he knew the ordinance well and was there when state code 14-5.2M was passed that clearly states with a state property in the historic district there is a process. He believed they followed it.

They called and told him they were not spending any state money on the project. He thanked them for mentioning the letter to him from the Secretary of DCA. He was worried that had been lost. That letter clearly said that no public funding would be spent on the exterior of this building. It was not his interpretation of code, is referring to a water former staff and the former preservation planner, the former land-use director,

former city attorney, and former Mayor. They were all involved, and the decision of the city attorney's office was if public funding is not being spent on the exterior, you do not have jurisdiction. That was Kelly Brennan's advice to him, and he relayed that to the State. The newspaper said today, Rasch is the one that did this, but this was not his decision. He was the messenger.

He thought the City has a different opinion about the code interpretation now, but he would not go into hearsay. As the City preservation planner for 15 years, people loved to hate him and is why he does not work at the City anymore.

The State continued to work with him after he gave them the city attorney's opinion and he saw the building design before the scrim was applied. He now recognizes under this ground, the design he had been shown. On that day in 2017, he wrote an email to the State Historic Preservation Officer and said this is an epic failure of historic preservation. And that was before the scrim was applied. He believes they did follow the process, but he was advised to shut down the process at the direction of the City Attorney.

He needed to correct the record on that this evening, not only because he was their Historic Preservation Planner for 15 years but was also the President of the Friends of Architecture Santa Fe. He developed on that Board a successful downtown architectural walking tour and became the Santa Fe style expert and did a popular PowerPoint project on Santa Fe style and presented at the history Museum to the public and at that lecture he challenged the State.

He has a solution and he had three images he showed. The first was SITE Santa Fe, which he thought this metal projection is a slap in the face of Santa Fe. It looks like the jaws of the shark or a bear trap. It is an angry building that Santa Fe does not need in the historic district. This building is in the Railyard and the railyard district standards clearly state gritty, industrial, warehouse, metal sided and meets that. as a matter of fact in his email to SHPO caused his email to be forwarded to the former Deputy Director of DCA and caused a meeting between him, the architects and the deputy director.

At that time the State said they understand that the Museum of Fine Arts is a gem and is the best example of Spanish Pueblo revival in Santa Fe. This was a contemporary building when it was constructed to house the Museum of Fine Arts, art collection. It is recent Santa Fe style; it is not built of adobe and is not mud-plastered or have an earth roof. It is built of brick, stucco and cement, asphalt roof, which is very different.

Looking at another State building in the historic district he found as a classic example of Territorial Revival. He said it is a beautiful building, more beautiful than the one they are discussing. But his solution is, he has tried to get across to the community that any tradition that stagnates, dies and Santa Fe style is one of them. We must innovate that. While Fine Arts is the best example of Spanish Pueblo Revival in the 20th

century, he would challenge the State to do the best example of Territorial in the 21st Century. He calls that Neo Territorial. There are four tenets he thought the design could easily follow and still harmonize with the historic districts.

He defined Neo Territorial while looking at the photo. 1) Blocking massing with flat roofs and solid corners. The only problem with the current design is the area with non-solid corners. 2) Walls sharp-edged, not rounded. Modern materials, crisp corners. 3) Edges and openings are delineated by other materials; traditionally brick coping and wood surrounds. He would also love brushed aluminum surrounds, but something around all edges and openings is necessary. 4) Symmetry or formalism in façade compositions. This building has symmetry in each façade but is not repetitive.

Mr. Rasch said for the record, he is defining Neo Territorial style.

Chair Rios asked regarding the Museum of New Mexico Fine Arts, she was told the building is adobe building.

Mr. Rasch replied there is a very good photograph showing construction and it is a Rapp and Rapp building built of brick. He said this is the point of the building. Even though built of contemporary 20th century materials, it harmonizes to mud / adobe buildings by looking like it was eroded by mud, water and wind. It was purposefully made to look old.

Ms. Mary Schruben stated she had many comments that are not appropriate for the meeting because they are to talk about the exterior design. She will submit them to State and hope they will be shared with the city and the Board. They include the energy footprint, stormwater, parking, signage, and the precedent that will be set by the building for the area and the City, the garbage house in back and overall sustainability.

She wanted to express her concern tonight about the glass wall and the art housed within. She requested the designers to research other museums that started with glass walls that had to be retrofitted because of severe damage to the artwork from the sun. Her examples are the Denver Art Museum, the Piano Building at the Kimball in Ft. Worth and the Houston Contemporary Art, about one-third empty now because it cannot be used as exhibit space.

In pursuit in best practices for contemporary art display and curation she would ask designers to consider modifications to the glass box overall as a concept. Santa Fe is at 7000 feet altitude and in a high desert climate and getting hotter every year, in winter and summer. East and West light is particularly damaging to artwork and here the largest façades are east and west facing.

She suggested perhaps a redesign of the glass box concept to complement the transition zone and the railyard district and surrounding buildings to provide a more suitable environment for art, the artist and the people viewing it.

Mr. Sean Evans is a principal of OAS Architects in Santa Fe. he knew what the Board faced as he sat on the preservation Board in Philadelphia. He suggested it is time to rewrite the rules. The national preservation standards originate from consideration of monuments, but this warehouse is no monument. In this town we treat everything old as though it were highly significant, while enforcing well-intentioned but ultimately ineffectual design standards for the new that reward the less common denominator, resulting in ersatz and meaningless character.

There are times to be conservative, but this is not one. This is a time to celebrate the carrying forward of the past into the future without denying the present. this is what a Contemporary Art Museum should embody. He thought there was an excellent example in front of them.

Their local preservation rules originate in appropriation and a perfect example is the example that Mr. Rasch showed a few minutes ago. These preservation rules have resulted in extreme gentrification. They need a deep meaningful communitywide discussion of culture that results in the commitment to the preservation of intangible heritage and cessation and trivialization of built heritage.

His children do not see a future in Santa Fe because there is so little here that speaks to the future. They prevent it from materializing. An effort to preserve Santa Fe is only ensuring its demise. The future in the past are not mutually exclusive and we can have, and we must have both. It is time to rewrite the rules.

Ms. Valerie Brooker at 1616 Young Street respectfully disagreed about rewriting the rules. She feels historic preservation has always played an important role in Santa Fe and she thinks staff for documenting the reason the structure does not confirm. As a librarian she would also like to express her distress with the lack of documentation regarding number and content of previous meetings.

She appreciates how difficult it is to design a building, she has architects in her family. But as a private citizen when she looks at the building, she feels overwhelmed. She thought the building is not a complement to the Halpin building which was small and modest. She thought the mass overwhelms it.

Ms. Georgia Maryol, the founder of Tomasitas and the next-door neighbors to the Museum. It has been interesting hearing everyone and she is not going to make suggestions. there are always changes in the community but being the next door neighborhood to this museum, she knows they have to deal with this from the point of view that if she were to build a business in Santa Fe she would have to supply a certain amount of parking spaces for every square foot in the building. Whereas the state of New Mexico, is a different situation.

She thought it would be nice for the plans to include some suggestions or signage or on their web site to direct their visitors to enter from Manhattan Street and use the public parking facility there, which is very difficult for visitors to find. That is really

important. She is looking forward to this and knows she has to deal with it, but she would appreciate it if they would take that into consideration. She will be supportive and any positive art happening in the community is great whether they like the design not, it is an art community.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Chair Rios thanked all 39 people who spoke for their varied comments. She was glad that Santa Fe has an involved community.

Chair Rios asked Mr. Brill to respond to the issues raised such as her question; are they willing to make changes. Also, issues were raised on the view shed; if the building could be lower.

Mr. Brill responded that he did not know how to answer the first question: can they change the building. they would in good faith receive their comments and review each of them and meet internally. They would then receive direction from the State and respond with care and thoroughness, and if there are changes that could be made and that is the direction, they would make them.

Chair Rios asked if they are willing to make changes, if that meant they would lower the building to improve the view shed.

Mr. Brill replied was not sure that was on the table, but they would take it under advisement.

Chair Rios noted they addressed the issue of the mural and they were willing to put a mural inside.

Mr. Brill replied that was the direction they are heading. There is funding available and there is a conversation and then MOU with the artist to create a new mural.

Chair Rios asked about the wording outside the building about a country that forgets it past. Mr. Brill assured her it was an excellent comment that they would figure out to respond to.

Chair Rios asked if there was anything further Mr. Brill wanted to say.

Mr. Brill replied they have deep gratitude for the Board working with them and for gathering the public for comment and they have a lot of respect for the process.

Member Lotz stated he was really impressed with follow-up comments and they were thoughtful and sincere. He took all of the comments to heart, as an architect, whether positive or negative. He was impressed with the substantive nature and the

public's eagerness to do what is right and important for the community. He thanked them for their commitment to the city and to the project and thanked everyone who spoke tonight. It was very helpful.

Mr. Devanger agreed. He said the team has tried to be extremely thoughtful and would continue to do that. He pointed out related to the comment on the view shed, that the building does not go past the eaves of the building on the corner of Garfield, the old University building. It is not as monumental as depicted.

Chair Rios asked regarding parking, if they have to meet the City requirements.

Mr. Brill replied no, that is not correct and is a state property they do not have to comply with parking.

Chair Rios asked if they would have any parking on the site.

Mr. Brill replied the answer was no. There would be truck access and a loading dock but there will be no parking. The current spaces will be used for the building.

Chair Rios said a plus was that she did not hear anyone say they did not want the building. And the team's willingness to work with the community is another plus and it may be a win-win situation at the end of the process.

Chair Rios asked to hear from Board members.

Member Larson thanked everyone for taking time to come and offer their input. She also thanked the designer for submitting a thorough array of images. Her thought process was first, where the funding would come from and her understanding was the Board would not be informed of that. Now that she understands funding is from private donations for the exterior, her concern is addressed pertaining to historic and prehistoric contact rule. Properties in New Mexico require compliance for historic buildings through the National Historic Preservation Act in Section 106.

She is disheartened to see that although the State provided a vague but somewhat informative report on the history of the building, there is a lot that has not been accounted for. A lot has been ignored, especially in regard to, the mural as far as paint restoration and paint analysis. She addressed that in the previous meeting about the façades. It is possible to restore a mural in 2019 to accurate colors.

She appreciated the comments on the mural and understands where they are at this point. However, it is an important significance to the community and art that made a statement that reflected not only the WPA murals of the 1930s, but back to the beginning of occupation of New Mexico. She would hope the State would reconsider that and take into account not only the history of New Mexico but the history of Santa Fe and not just the landscape, but the cultural landscape and who they are as a community.

They need the building to have a life again. The design is beautiful but does not do a transition and a Territorial style building. She would like to see alternatives for the design, but she appreciates their consideration. She hopes to hear the results of the discussion between the state and the design team going forward.

Member Guida expressed how encouraged he was by everyone who showed up and especially the number of people accepting of something that is a box that is a little outside the box. That participation and willingness to show up is important in light of the process irregularity and it was good to get some background. It is also worth considering if the process had been followed to the letter what that might have yielded. He questioned if this proposal would have made it through that type of discussion with Board.

He noted the project is pretty daring and as several people pointed out, suggestion of breaking or challenging of the rules that caused a lot of good conversation and might cause more.

A lot was said about the bookend of Site Santa Fe and this project and the Railyard. It is more interesting to think about the bookends historically of the New Mexico Museum of Art in establishing Santa Fe Style and that focus that came out of that building and this as a related institution and the challenging of those rules. If the original museum transformed Santa Fe, it would be interesting to think about how conversations that fall out of this discussion might influence other projects.

The Board has had discussions about how they sometimes force architects in Santa Fe to step back and defer to history and blend in and disappear. There are other ways to do projects that conform with accepted historic preservation standards that may not conform with Santa Fe standards.

He thought as a project it has a chance to crack the whole thing wide open. The Board could discuss the specifics of the project but as a whole he really liked the project.

Mr. Brill thanked them for their comments and said he knew it was a difficult conversation to have with the community. They are in the midst of it and the future is an incomplete equation. They are open and would not go home and would stay with them and work through this.

Member Biedscheid started by stating the project obviously does not meet the code but they understand it is not required to. She thought Board's role was to provide a forum for the public to provide input to project representatives and each other. She is struck by how thoughtful and smart entertaining this community is.

A few things resonated with her in the public comments, one they do need a discussion about culture and how they integrate the past with the future. that

permeates conversations around economics, tourism quality-of-life and this was the start of an interesting conversation.

Another thing someone said was this the function of a contemporary art museum is to challenge us and this conversation fits perfectly with the stated goal of contemporary art. She liked the idea that Santa Fe could be robust enough to accept this new design and one thought-provoking suggestion that came out of the comments is possibly moving toward a Neo-Territorial style. Maybe it is time for a new style that incorporates some contemporary elements.

Things she likes about the project is the orientation of the building being different from the original orientation and that there is no demolition of the building. She found admirable that they incorporated retaining the brick coping and the repetitive punched windows that are indicative of the 1930s warehouse.

She thought it would be appreciated if they could find a way to incorporate the mural and the signs, the small elements that may be a significant gesture to the community who values those and plays a role in their feelings around the building.

Member Katz echoed about the challenge the contemporary art museum would bring and the idea of the need for conversations about what the historic districts are, and stand for, and require.

He is a lawyer and the rules are more important to him and he is been frustrated at how this completely ignores the rules of the historic district. He is impressed and appreciates the comments and found it wonderful to get the different views that were very thoughtful. A couple of comments resonated with him. One was Beverly Spears that the blocks between the church and on the north side of Montezuma are tight and low areas and changes on the other side.

He also thought Richard Czoski's view that it this relates more to the Railyard and that the proposed bookends with Site Santa Fe made perfect sense to him. Also the statement of Kurt Sommers regarding the rules and that they may need to bend them - he thought he had said the same thing earlier that day.

There is one simple answer - it should not be in the transition district. To pretend that it is makes a mockery of the rules and the laws. Certainly the rules in the district boundaries could be changed, this is the Railyard it is not the historic district.

He loved that it is not browned and round and is different and it has been a great success. He treasures that, but to pretend this is in the historic transition district and the building is being historically preserved in some way makes a mockery of it. That is his view.

Chair Rios thanked everyone for coming out and for expressing their views.

Board Discussion and Conclusions

Chair Rios said the Halpin building definitely needs to be revitalized and in working with the group they need to find the best solution. She said the present building - is it too high, does it overwhelm the Halpin building, and what can be done to improve it, needs to be addressed.


D. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 pm.

Approved by:

Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.