

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #22: August 15, 2014 9 AM-10 PM 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	
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Ann Honious	X
DRT Member	Mark Miles	
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	
JEFF	Kathryn Thomas	X
JEFF	Janet Wilding	X
NPS	Susan Dolan	
NPS	Tim Schilling	
CAR2015	Anna Leavey	X
MVVA	James Smith	X
MVVA	Adrienne Heflich	X
Trivers	Chris Ching	
Trivers	Amy Huff	X
Cooper Robertson	Tom Wittrock	

II. Flagpole location

MVVA presented several ideas for locating the flagpole prominent spot after the park asked that it be moved from the planned location near the West Entrance. Options include centering the flagpole in Luther Ely Smith Square, centering it at the head of the square in an historic location (i.e. the location it was in when the Arch was completed), or framing the Arch either at the head of Luther Ely Smith Square or toward the new west entrance with two flagpoles.

Discussion

The park did not think that two flagpoles were necessary or desirable, unless design considerations made it so. They preferred the central location, although either central location may be acceptable, perhaps with some easy tweaks to the proposal. MVVA stated that they could alter the design of the flagpole at the head of the park without much trouble, but not in the center of the park. The center of the park provided complications due to ADA accessibility and the need to design new pathways.

CAR2015 preferred the framing options to keep the view shed between the Arch and the Old Courthouse clear and asked that the team not consider changes that would require major reworking to existing designs.

The SHPO office wanted there to be symmetry, so either the framing option or the central option may be acceptable, but one pole off to the side would not be.

There is no evidence that the flagpole location was part of the original Monument design and no information as to why it was removed. Therefore, it is considered to be a non-contributing element in the landscape. It will likely be an acceptable impact, because a 35-foot pole with a correspondingly small flag is proposed, rather than a giant flag. SHPO would like to see a mockup of what the flag would look like in the central location at the head of the park from the museum looking back toward the Old Courthouse.

DRT Comments

The DRT agreed that MVVA would supply the required mock up and that the team could comment via email on the impact of the flag(s) on the Monument.

III. Old Courthouse

The park requested additional information about the power door operators and other penetrations into historic fabric that would be needed as a result of the temporary visitor center. This information was highlighted on the plans and Trivers discussed the proposed power door operator, which could be either hand or foot operated.

Discussion

The DRT had limited time to discuss this issue, but felt that the long door operators were inappropriate for the building. Trivers stated that the park CRM Team had had the same comments and requested that the smaller hand push buttons be used.

Other changes the DRT felt could be dealt with by having the design team work with the park, especially since any changes could be reversed should they not be appropriate. However, the DRT would like to see the final plans for reference.

DRT Comments

The DRT agreed that the smaller automatic door openers should be installed and that the park could make decisions about the implementation of the temporary plan, although they want to see the construction documents for the temporary visitor center to compare with the permanent plans when they arrive.

IV. Emergency Antenna

The DRT received a package with a mock-up of a potential location for an emergency antenna, which will be moved from the top of the parking garage to one of the Monument's service entrances.

DRT Comments

The DRT agreed that the new location was acceptable.

VIII. Next DRT Meeting

To be determined.