

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #12: November 25, 2013 8-9:00 AM Central

I. Attendance

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Tom Bradley	
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	
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	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	X

II. Interior and External Ramps at Arch Legs, Universal Design Considerations

The DRT viewed several renderings of the ramps interior to the museum and external near the Arch legs and weighed in on options that would meet ABBAS requirements while reducing impacts to the monument.

Interior

Internal to the museum, they were given options of a slope of 1:12 or 1:12.5. In both instances the ramps move into the museum central space, but to a lesser degree with the 1:12 slope. The lesser slope would also mean greater changes outside near the arch legs. The DRT preferred the 1:12 slope, although strict compliance will need to be placed on the builder to ensure that this is met since it is the maximum slope allowed under ABBAS.

External

The DRT were shown 3 ramp options outside of the museum by the arch legs.

Alternative A had railings and a single ramp along one side of the leg. This cut off the stairs around the leg from easy access, but had only minor changes to the exit plaza.

Alternative B1 made the entire exit plaza accessible by raising the grade by the arch legs by 1-3 inches and providing necessary landings across the exit plaza. Railings would be provided in the center of the plaza on each side of the arch legs with permeable points where people could leave the ramp to access the stairs or the arch leg.

Alternative B2 would include the same grading, but would provide free standing handrails on only one side of the exit plaza.

The DRT felt that none of these were really elegant solutions, but that Alternative B2 held the most potential. They would like to see how the plaza pavement treatment will be designed at the construction document (CD) level (due December 18).

III. Walks Around Berm

The DRT was provided with cross sections of the berm over the museum to show how accessible paths were designed in the landscape. Although portions of the paths are slightly sunken, a visitor should not feel as though he/she were walking through a trough.

The DRT had no comments on the design. The park will consult with their Cultural Resource Management Team before providing final comments.

IV. Entrance Plans

The DRT was shown some consolidated entrance plans. The park would like to see them consolidated even more in the CD phase so that plantings, fountains, and entrance details are all in the same plan.

V. Processional Walk Lighting

A new lighting plan for the processional walks was presented. This plan eliminates the haphazard lighting plan originally designed and implemented in the 1980s. This plan had light poles in the center of certain walkways, making park emergency response difficult. The new plan moves most lights to the edges of the walkways in a regular plan, which clears up views to the arch and emphasizes the shape of the processional walks.

The DRT endorsed the new plan.

VI. Processional Walk Joint Details

The plans call for the replacement of redwood joints in the processional walks with synthetic wood joints. This change was made because the park has found the maintenance of the redwood joints to be difficult.

The DRT agreed that the look would be the same and had no objections to the substitution.

VII. Interior Paths

Due to several considerations, the interior paths have been altered in the new design. Paths along the west edge of the park can be slightly straightened. This would allow for the reuse of over 100 bollards. Additionally the path around the southern pond was altered to run from the exterior path to the processional walk in a way more similar to the path on the north side of the park. This would increase symmetry of the two paths since the southern one would no longer encircle the pond.

The DRT generally liked the direction this design was heading in and requests to hear what the park's landscape advisors have to say about the new direction. The design team should proceed with this design and it will be reviewed again in the CD processes.

VIII. Guard Rail at Entrance

The design team presented their concept of stainless steel tri-wire guard rail to go on top of the entrance berm to keep people from walking on the glass entrance. The stainless steel would have a mat finish to prevent shininess. Although the look will change slightly depending upon the weather, it should reflect less sunlight than a full glass guardrail, which was initially proposed, and would likely be more transparent.

The DRT agreed that no guard rail would be best, but that this was an improvement over the glass guard rail and authorized the design to move forward with this feature.

IX. Eads Bridge lighting

The DRT approved the lighting concept for Eads Bridge and hoped that it would encourage developers on the other side of the bridge to do something similar.

X. Formal CRM Team Comments

1.	1:12 slope is most appropriate for interior museum ramps.
2.	Alternative B2 hold the most potential for an appropriate design for accessible ramps around the arch legs. Information on how the plaza pavement treatment will be designed should be provided in the CD package.
3.	The DRT had no comments on the design of the entrance walks. The park will consult with their Cultural Resource Management Team before providing final comments.
4.	The DRT endorsed the proposed new processional walk lighting plan.
5.	The DRT agreed that the look would be the same and had no objections to the substitution.
6.	The DRT generally liked the reduction in paving in the new proposed walkway plan. It requests to hear what the park's landscape advisors have to say about the new direction. The design team should proceed with this design and it will be reviewed again in the CD processes.
7.	The DRT agreed that no guard rail would be best, but that this was an improvement over the glass guard rail and authorized the design to move forward with this feature.

8.	The DRT approved the lighting concept for Eads Bridge and hoped that it would encourage developers on the other side of the bridge to do something similar.
END of COMMENTS	

X. Next DRT Meeting

The next DRT meeting will be scheduled for the first half of January 2014.

The DRT will review the draft construction documents for the museum/visitor center and grounds.

The DRT may also discuss the courthouse reduction in scope, the location of a proposed ranger station and the waterproofing of the museum roof.

Thank You.