

## JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting Notes

**Meeting #33:** July 23, 2015

**Time:** 2-3:30 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	Toni Prawl	X
DRT Member	Bill Hart	
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Kathryn Thomas	X
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Great River Greenways	Lonny Boring	X
CAR2015	Anna Leavey	X
JEFF	Ed Dobbs	X
JEFF	Kathy Schneider	X
CRM Team	Susan Dolan	X
CRM Team	Randy Biallis	X
MVVA	James Smith	X
MVVA	Adrienne Helfich	X
NPS-DSC	Danny Darr	X

### II. Liquid Biological Assessment Facility

The DRT was shown plans for a new liquid biological assessment facility that would be composed of two sheds and bump out of the maintenance yard into the Monument grounds. The LBA facility would provide nutrients for the Monument grounds and also would be used to teach school groups and visitors about sustainable activities on Monument grounds. As a result, the design team tried to situate the facility in a location that was safe and convenient for visiting groups.

Discussion:

The discussion focused on the appearance of the storage containers/sheds, the encroachment into the Monument grounds, and the security of the Monument and visiting groups. Several ideas for relocating and minimizing the appearance of the facility were discussed. These included tucking the facility into the current mulch area, rotating and/or changing the number and size of sheds to reduce their overall footprint, and reducing the amount of pavement by sliding the sheds one direction or another. In general, bumping out into the Monument was not liked. Additionally, making more attractive and potentially permanent sheds was discussed to help with the security and long term comfort of visitors.

DRT asked that the team reconsider the proposed design, provide alternatives that avoid or minimize encroachment on the NHL, and provide a more compatible design for the proposed sheds.

## NOTES Meeting #33: July 23, 2015

### III. Grand Staircase

#### Stair Risers

The raising of Leonor K Sullivan Blvd resulted in the need to eliminate 4 steps of the Grand Staircase as previously approved. However, current surveys show that the fourth step is lower in elevation than previously thought, which presents drainage issues. The project has 3 choices: 1. leave the design as it is and understand that water may pool or freeze at the bottom of the stairs, 2. add a trench drain at the bollard line, or 3. take a fifth step to allow for correct drainage.

#### Discussion:

Due to safety and maintenance issues, leaving the plan as currently designed is undesirable. Since flooding will still occur, although on more infrequent basis, trench drains will fill with sediment and need to be cleaned out on a regular basis. Pooled water may turn to ice and cause hazards.

The DRT agreed regretfully that the option to take a fifth step was the only practicable solution.

#### Hand Rails

The acceptance of the fifth step solution to the drainage issue allowed the team to re-open the issue of handrails. Previously (see meeting notes #6 March 8, 2013) the DRT approved a handrail design that would have left the existing Grand Staircase handrail unmodified despite the filling of 4 stair risers. With the filling of a fifth riser, the handrail will become shorter and extend beyond the last stair by several feet. As a result, a proposal was made to cut the handrail 9" after the next to last balustrade, which would be just beyond the last riser. The fill would integrate with the old stair cheek wall and the new cheek wall between the stair and the street by one of two means. Option 1. The new fill could touch the new cheek wall and the old cheek wall slope into the pavement a little beyond the edge of the handrail. Option 2. The old cheek wall could be cut out from underneath the handrail and to its end on the street side and a curb installed next to the new cheek wall to provide a finished look.

#### Discussion:

The DRT noted that the handrail was originally proposed to stay intact despite the elimination of 4 stair risers, but agreed that the elimination of a fifth riser and the additional pavement height made the existing handrail look short, long, and unnecessary.

The DRT agreed with the proposal to cut the handrail 9" after the penultimate balustrade, but did not like two proposed solutions for integrating the fill into the cheek walls. Instead they prefer that the fill hit the new cheek wall without a curb and that the old sloping cheek wall be vertically cut underneath the end of the new handrail, removing the small triangular piece of sheet wall that would otherwise slope into the new pavement. They felt that this would have a cleaner, more finished looking appearance and would affect less historic fabric.

### IV. Concrete Border at Arch Legs

The concrete border that delineates the top of the stairs leading down to the Arch legs as well as the transition between the Arch leg plazas and the processional walkways is cracked and in need of replacement. Two options were presented. The first would replace the border with new concrete similar in color and texture, but include expansion joints to prevent future cracking. The second option would eliminate the border at the head of the Arch leg plaza and have it

## **NOTES Meeting #33: July 23, 2015**

seamlessly integrate into the processional walks.

Discussion:

The discussion centered on NPS policy and the Secretary's Standards, which both indicate that the first choice is to preserve historic fabric, and if it cannot be preserved, to replace it in kind. Replacement in kind was approved. The addition of expansion joints to match the concrete in color was approved.

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

September 2, 2015 @ 1 PM Central