

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting Notes

Meeting #26: December 16, 2014
Location: Old Courthouse Conference Room
Time: 10-2 CT

I. Attendees

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: CRM Team	Kathryn Thomas	X
Advisor: CRM Team	Tim Schilling	X
Advisor: CRM Team	Bob Moore	X
Advisor: CRM Team	Dawn Bringleston	
Advisor: CRM Team	Marla McEnaney	
Advisor: CRM Team	Al O'Bright	
Advisor: NPS	Don Stevens	
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	X
Great River Greenways	Susan Trautman	X
CAR2015	Anna Leavy	
JEFF	Kathy Schneider	X
Advisory Council	Christopher Wilson	X
Advisory Council	Katry Harris	
FHWA	Raegan Ball	X
MODoT	Mike Meinkoth	X
Osage Nation	Andrea Hunter	
Osage Nation	Barker Fariss	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	
MODoT	Karen Daniels	X
MODoT	Gayle Unruh	X
MODoT	Nicole Hood	X
MODoT	Greg Horn	X
MODoT	Jim Middleton	X
FHWA	Dawn Perkins	X
FHWA	Edgardo Cordero	
Advisor: NPS	Don Stevens	X
Advisor: CAR2015	Don Klima	X
JEFF	Frank Mares	X
NPS	Christopher Lewis	X
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X

II. Park-Over-The-Highway MO DoT Discussion

The park has objected to concrete walls built by MODoT on the new slab that will house the Park-Over-The-Highway and have asked that the effect of these walls be analyzed. The park feels that these may constitute an adverse effect on the Monument and the Old Courthouse by obstructing views

Karen Daniels began the meeting with a presentation outlining the MODoT analysis of effects of the walls on the new bridge over the highway, the canopies over the pedestrian bridges, and the walls along the highway edge. These structures did not undergo formal S106 consultation via FHWA due to confusion over the responsible agency for this review. MODoT concluded that these structures did not have an adverse effect on the Monument, the Old Cathedral, or the Old Courthouse.

The DRT, NPS and CAR2015 advisors, MODoT and FHWA spent approximately an hour discussing the issue and clarifying facts.

- The team was asked to explain the safety issue and the alternatives looked at for meeting safety goals.

FHWA has a minimum 6' requirement for walls over highways. Because the landscaping was designed as a hill, the wall had to hold in the landscaping and reach a minimum of 6' above the ground level. It is slightly taller than the minimum 6' height to accommodate a curve that meets the barrier along the highway edge. A fence designed to prevent a 4" sphere from fitting through the openings could have been added to the top of the retention wall instead of creating the safety wall out of concrete, however a concrete wall was chosen.

- CAR 2015 added that the concrete wall was chosen to help mitigate sound and to provide a better experience and approach to the Monument.
- The DRT asked if any other views into the Monument were considered. The park considers all the views into the park as important since people approach the Monument from many different locations and not just via Luther Ely Smith Square. They felt the view from other entrances was not inviting because of the solid concrete wall.

The team considered the view between the Old Courthouse and Arch because that was emphasized as being of central importance in all of the DRT meetings and specifically defined as character-defining by NPS planning documents. They also looked at views to the Old Cathedral. Other views were not defined as character defining and were not analyzed.

- Are there any costs developed for cutting down the height of the wall?

Preliminary costs are between \$500,000 and \$600,000 to cut the wall down to a lower height and add 5' of fencing.

- A question was asked about the appropriateness of reopening S106 consultation since FHWA already has a No Adverse Effect determination for their work.

FHWA did not include these elements in their original SHPO submission. They subsequently made an agreement with the SHPO that they would submit these elements as a supplemental submission. The SHPO agreed that the failure to submit was not intentional, but was caused by confusion over what was or was not covered by FHWA versus the PA. FHWA and SHPO agreed that determining the effect of these elements was the first step in resolving the issue.

Next Steps: FHWA will finalize the draft effect finding presented at the DRT meeting and email it to the parties attending the DRT meeting for review and comment. That email will start the 30-day review of the finding. All comments should be submitted back to Karen at MODoT.

III. Design Review Presentation Follow Up Discussion

The Friday prior to the DRT meeting, a presentation on the full design program for the Monument was held for park and DRT members in order to determine if any final design issues may have been overlooked that need attention. During the DRT meeting, the members asked questions and were provided clarifications on issues that they wanted to bring forward.

1. There was a question about the ramps on the east slopes and the fact that they had been simplified from the SDs. This is true. The curves were simplified so that they did not back track on themselves and the entrance to the southern and northern most ramps were moved from the path to the overlook in order to provide the same overlook experience for everyone. It was noted that the ramps were not symmetrical, but since the Arch is not in the center of the site, neither are the sloped areas. No further information or changes were requested.
2. A question was asked if there would be fill placed against Ead's bridge in the North Gateway. The answer to this is no. No further information or changes were requested.
3. The seating areas along the western edge were questioned, however, the DRT agreed that these had been explicitly reviewed and approved previously. No further information or changes were requested.
4. The DRT asked how the parking garage demolition would occur. A demolition plan will be included in the division 1 submittals for the North Gateway. The DRT would like to review the plan and also have it submitted to the Osage Nation and Tim Schilling. The plan will be reviewed to ensure that demolition will not pose significant threats to Eads Bridge or known buried archeological resources. The plan is also needed to help Tim Schilling, SHPO and the Osage Nation determine how best to implement the monitoring plan during this work.
5. The park requested that MVVA provide additional renderings of Luther Ely Smith Square and landscaping.
6. The park requested that they take another look at the bench design internally and report back if any changes were needed.

On 12/24/14 the following email was received from Ann Honious:

The bench design that Bob Moore and Kathryn Thomas questioned at the DRT meeting is fine as approved. After reviewing the drawings in more detail, they have no CRM concerns.

IV. Landscaping Issues

The park identified landscaping issues in the final construction plans that may need to be further addressed. They are working with CAR2015 and the design team to better define the issues and find solutions that meet project needs. The DRT will be informed of progress.

V. Compliance Process for Modification

Margo Brooks presented a draft process for dealing with modifications to existing plans. This process would provide the CRM team with notes from weekly project meetings, requests for proposals and draft modifications so that questions about how the proposals may affect historic fabric and properties can be brought to light and worked through as early in the process as possible. The CRM Team will be asked to contact Kathryn Thomas with any questions and both Kathryn Thomas and Margo Brooks will serve as a backup and alert CRM Team members and project managers of any potential questions or concerns. The park will experiment with this process and refine it before bringing it forward for formal approval.

The DRT approved of the concept and felt that they would not need to get involved with most modifications, but if there were something of great concern to the CRM team, that the DRT should be asked to weigh in.

VI. Potential Cumulative Effects for Future Review

Laclede's Landing Parking The City of St. Louis advertised for proposals to build parking in Laclede's Landing. Proposals were reviewed, but CAR2015 does not know of any additional movement on this potential project or if it were determined to be feasible. NPS sent a letter to the City to advise them of interest in the project should it move forward.

Kiener Plaza: The Kiener Plaza project has no federal funds or permits and is not expected to affect historic properties. The park will check with Betsy Bradley at the City to assure that no City Block Grant Funds will be used for this project. If not, no S106 review will be required.

Great River Greenways Floodwall Connection: GRG and the park are working together toward a solution to a potential unanticipated effect from a floodwall connection to the park retaining walls. The SHPO will be included in the deliberation.

VII. Additional Topics

The DRT would like an index of meeting note topics to aid in reviewing past decisions. Margo Brooks will develop an indexing system.

VIII. Future DRT Meeting Dates

January 27 9-11 Central

Preliminary Agenda:

1. Landscaping Issues & Proposed Solution
2. Old Courthouse Basis of Design Report
3. Parking Garage Demolition Plan
4. POTENTIAL TOPIC: Old Courthouse Exterior Ramp Handrail
5. POTENTIAL TOPIC: Park-Over-The-Highway

Future DRT Meeting dates will be announced. Margo Brooks will send a poll to DRT members to determine availability.