

## JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting Notes

**Meeting #36** December 14, 2015

**Time:** 1-1:30 CT

### I. Attendees

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Mike Ward	X
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	
DRT Member	Vern Remiger	X
DRT Member	Judith Deel	X
DRT Member	Toni Prawl	
DRT Member	Bill Hart	
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Kathryn Thomas	X
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	
Great River Greenways	Lonny Boring	
CAR2015	Anna Leavey	X
JEFF	Ed Dobbs	X
JEFF	Kathy Schneider	X
JEFF	Jenny Nixon	X
JEFF	Rhonda Schier	X
CRM Team	Susan Dolan	X
CRM Team	Randy Biallis	
CRM Team	Tim Schilling	
CRM Team	Bob Moore	X
CRM Team	Al O'Bright	
NPS-WASO	Jeffery Durbin	
NPS-Midwest Region	Don Stevens	
MVVA	James Smith	X
PCAV	Chance Baragary	X
NPS-DSC	Phil Lawrence	X

### II. New DRT Member

Tom Bradley retired on December 3. He will be replaced on the DRT by Acting Superintendent Michael Ward.

### III. Temporary Park Entrance Sign

The park's CRM advisors reviewed a contract modification for a proposed entrance sign to mark the temporary park entrance during construction. They recommended that the proposal be reviewed by the DRT because of the following concerns:

1. The portal is not compatible with the Kiley landscape.
2. Although the stated intent is that the portal be temporary, it appears to be constructed in such a way that a decision to retain it permanently could be made at a later date, without sufficient review.

## NOTES Meeting #36: December 14, 2015

3. Installation of the portal could set a precedent for installing similar large, obtrusive signage elsewhere in the landscape.
4. Ensure the portal is sized to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Jenny Nixon and Kathy Schneider explained the rationale behind the proposed sign.

1. During construction the main entrance is closed and the new entrance is difficult to locate. After following many signs throughout the city, the team wanted people to recognize clearly that when they arrive at the park.
2. They wanted the sign to imitate construction scaffolding to make it look temporary, but be eye catching.
3. It will be removed as soon as the west entrance is open.
4. Emergency vehicles were not considered in the design because the bollards in the path are not removable. This will not be an emergency route.

### Discussion

The DRT asked about the cursive font on the signs. It comes from the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary logo, but does not meet standards for accessibility and is somewhat difficult to read. After discussion, it was agreed that the font should change to be easier to read and less busy.

It was asked if a simpler sign such as sandwich boards or a gateway sign with fewer elements that was more compatible with the Cathedral could suffice. The park replied that they had looked at simpler designs with brick columns and fewer colors, but that the designs looked too permanent and not visible enough to guide people to the entrance.

The plans stated that the sign would be there for three years, but the west entrance is scheduled to open before that. It was clarified that the team wanted the sign contractor available for up to three years in case of delays, but that it could be clarified in the contract that the sign will come down as soon as the west entrance is open. In fact, when the west entrance opens, the park no longer wants people to use the temporary entrance and so will be motivated to remove it.

Each member of the DRT agreed that the sign as designed is not appropriate to the Kiley landscape and would be an adverse effect. However, the temporary nature of the sign and the clear need to guide visitors safely through the construction zone mitigates and minimizes the adverse effect in this instance. Similar signs would not be appropriate in the landscape after construction is finished.

### Decision

The DRT agreed that the sign font should change to meet accessibility requirements. If the Text needs to change due to the font change, it was suggested that "TO THE GATEWAY ARCH" may be appropriate.

## **IV. Additional Signage**

It was clarified to the group that permanent signage at the park has already been reviewed and approved via separate S106 compliance. No changes are expected to the signage plan at this

## **NOTES Meeting #36: December 14, 2015**

time. However, interior museum signage packages are currently being reviewed. The DRT clarified that they would not need to review internal signage, but may want to see any additional signage on the grounds. It was decided that the CRM Team would review the signage package and only refer it on the DRT if there were serious concerns.

### **V. Future DRT Meeting Dates**

Next meeting TBD as needed.