

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #11: November 5, 2013 8-9:00 AM Central

I. Attendance

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Tom Bradley	X
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	X
DRT Member	Vern Remiger	X
DRT Member	Judith Deel	X
DRT Member	Bill Hart	X
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Ann Honious	X
DRT Member	Mark Miles	X
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	X
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	
Facilitator	Greg Cody	X

II. Renderings and Further Details Needed

- Renderings of new accessible ramps at the Arch legs, both interior and exterior.
- North/south sections of the berm and west entrance.
- Renderings and unified drawings of the west entrance and plaza.
- Drawings for moving light poles.

III. Formal CRM Team Comments

1	Berm height and shape looks good, but prior to approval further renderings/details needed for north/south sections.
2	Further renderings/details needed for west side perimeter and recent changes showing security barriers, paths and plantings.
3	Overall, the CLR indicates that Kiley envisioned dense plantings of a relatively spare plant palette. On page 5-22, the CLR states that the plant palette should be limited to approximately 16 species. The proposed planting plan uses 20 species, some with multiple varieties. This is not a "spare" palette. CRM Team recommends peeling away at least a few of these species. Talk to the grounds crew to determine if plants proposed actually grow relatively well on the site. Jim experimented with different species and, in one way, this was a negative because trees accrued on the site and obliterated the concept of clustered plantings that framed views of the Arch and the ponds.
4	Most flexibility for planting is in the northern end of the park and at LES Square. A more simplified planting that captures the spatial qualities envisioned by Kiley in what the GMP termed the "Original Landscape" zone, with a more liberal interpretation of rehabilitation in these two adjacent areas, would be consistent with the GMP and the CLR.
5	The planting configuration as presently proposed doesn't reflect original design intent. If the park is losing existing trees, NPS is obligated to at least attempt to capture the three dimensional qualities where the cypress circles are enveloped by dense, simplified plantings, with open views from the west, across the ponds and toward the arch. The CLR directs this, and it would go a long way to envisioning Kiley. Beth Meyer brought these points up very early in the conceptual design stages, and she was correct. For reference, see the 1964 Kiley planting plan, Figure 4.26 (P 4-30), and page 5-14 in the CLR.

6	<p>The team discussing resolution of the Emerald Ash Borer issue explored using a mix of London Planetree cultivars within the uniform plantings along the processional walks. This concept is not expressed in the current proposed planting plan in enough detail. Please confirm the numbers of multiples, which ones, number of each and identified locations. For further information please contact Marla McEnaney, Midwest Region Historical Landscape Architect or Susan Dolan, Manager-NPS Park Cultural Landscapes Program .</p>
7	<p>Midwest Archeological Center (MWAC) believes that the most recent plans for the Arch Grounds would likely have no adverse effect on potential archeological resources. MWAC also believes the west entrance project would likely have no adverse effect on potential undiscovered archeological resources. MWAC is, however, concerned about the intense public scrutiny these high profile projects will be under and thus recommends archeological monitoring during construction, both to demonstrate due diligence and simply to be sure that no inadvertent adverse effects on significant resources occur during the process. In particular, large-scale, deep excavations like those that would be needed for the west entrance and the removal of the parking garage should be monitored by a Secretary of the Interior-qualified archeologist. MWAC has personnel who could undertake such work or the park may wish to use a qualified outside contractor. Although MWAC believes there is a low potential for encountering National Register of Historic Places-eligible archeological sites or human remains, the CAR2015 project should consider the possibility that they could be encountered and provisions should be made for the possibility that necessary archeological work could subject the construction schedule to unforeseen delays. The details and specifications of the monitoring plan and how discovery contingencies would be dealt with should be worked out as far in advance of contracting as possible and this discussion should be done in consultation with the signatories of the CAR2015 programmatic agreement and follow the protocols outlined in that document.</p> <p>The cost per day for archeological monitoring is \$874.35. This includes a Secretary of the Interior-qualified archeologist and an assistant. In addition to monitoring, there would a minimum of about two weeks pre-preparation and post-field write up. This would cost about \$3,800. If any archeological materials were encountered, then the amount of time for post-field work would go up. Also, monitoring of concurrent projects would require more people so costs would increase. These costs are for planning purposes and MWAC can provide a more accurate estimate when the specifications of the individual projects are more concrete. Please advise if more information is needed.</p> <p><u>DRT Response</u></p> <p>DRT understands the concern and agrees to look into how to accomplish the proposed archeological monitoring in the most efficient manner.</p>
<p>END of COMMENTS</p>	

IV. No comments on official DRT S106 Meeting Final Notes (10/23/1013).

V. Next DRT Meeting

The next DRT meeting will be Monday, November 25 at 8:00 am Central. Topics for discussion include:

- (1) Review of additional renderings/further details to be provided for new accessible ramps at the Arch legs, both interior and exterior; north/south sections of the berm, west entrance, and plaza.
- (2) Review of drawings to be provided for moving light poles.
- (3) Review of renderings for stainless steel tri-wire guardrail (forwarded by email to DRT 11/5/2013).

(4) Review of renderings for illumination of Eads Bridge for Safety & Place (forwarded by email to DRT on 10/31/2013).

(5) Ranger headquarters to be located in maintenance area (schematic design and design development to be forthcoming).

(6) Waterproofing museum roof (proposed to be a categorical exclusion for NEPA and a streamlined activity for Section 106).

Thank You.