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Major Professor: Michael L. Timmons
Department: Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning

The Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection offer a unique opportunity for analysis of the archival process for landscape architecture collections. The goal of this project was to analyze the format of landscape architecture archive collections and design protocol for the creation of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection. A review of best practices and experimentation has guided the appraisal and accessioning of four of Design Workshop’s Legacy Projects. The integration of a digital collection gathered from physical drawings, paper manuscripts, and computer files offers unique opportunities to establish standards and procedures for the creation of an archive at a university campus. The collaboration of professionals, archivists, and landscape architecture staff to create the archives has proven to be useful in many ways. The result is a manual composed of a review of best practices along with an account of the accessioning process undertaken in the creation of this new collection. Scholarly review
of the archives evidenced the need for an altered approach to the archiving process in order to support the creation of the digital collection and the quantity of project material. Additional measures were created to appropriately represent and preserve the unique visual components of the works.
PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Preserving Legacy: The Development of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection at Utah State University

by

Amanda J. Dunlap

Though magazines, books, and slideshows have attempted to share glimpses of landscape architecture, its fixed geographic location inherently limits who can experience it. In a move to address this dilemma, Design Workshop has partnered with Utah State University’s Merrill-Cazier Library Special Collections and the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department to capture the firm’s definitive works. The creation of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection conveys the firm’s story, sharing it with a broad and diverse audience through the use of physical archives, a digitally accessible partner, oral histories, and online learning objects to be utilized in the classroom. In a move to preserve the quality and history of this work, best practices for archive development have been reviewed and utilized in the creation of the physical and digital archives. Evaluation of the archives and best practices has enlightened the requirement for an altered approach to archive accessioning to support the digital collection and the enormity of project material. Documentation of the pilot year of archive creation has emphasized the discovery process for sorting, processing, and presentation of four apogee projects.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The profession of landscape architecture is facing a new dilemma. Since World War II, the vocation has grown exponentially. Now, with an aging population of landscape architects preparing to retire and storage rooms packed with a wealth of their past works, there is a renewed interest in the professional world and in academia to preserve their contributions to the field. Professional practice offices are encumbered with providing space for the storage of these documents. While for a time they are required to store the projects for legal reasons, once that time has lapsed, the documents become a taxing burden for the office. The documents often then present challenging legal and ethical dilemmas pitting retention against disposal. The documents typically sit in dormancy without offering their inherent benefits to the profession, academia, and the public.

The study of landscape architecture has an inherent dilemma as well. Because of the fixed location of built projects and drawings, students and professionals alike face the issue of costly and time-consuming travel to experience designed places. Often academic settings are not within traveling distance of significant concentrations of landscape architecture firms and offices; the student experience can suffer from a disconnection of professional and academic realms. Over thirty of the some seventy accredited landscape architecture programs in North America are situated in rural or non-metropolitan communities that lack significant concentrations of design professionals. While firms host a wealth of information, drawings, history, technology, and details of their
processes, it can easily remain out of reach to their co-professionals and students who lack access to their storage rooms. Archives have the potential to help bridge this gap of knowledge-sharing between academics and professionals, particularly if made accessible through means that extend access beyond the site where paper documents are stored.

Examples of previously completed work that show the process and outcomes of effective design can provide valuable assets to the learning environment for landscape architecture students. Currently, students use previous students’ work to set the bar for their own projects. These examples often lack real world application and create an artificial ceiling for students’ expectations. Professional examples of the design process and its outcomes provide students with more effective examples. Oral histories of those projects and images of the projects taken years after completion can help students link the design process to final outcomes and add rich contextual information bringing professional works of landscape architecture into the classroom.

Design Workshop exemplifies the archiving dilemma faced by numerous landscape architectural firms of the post-World War II era. Design Workshop was founded by Don Ensign and Joe Porter, undergraduate classmates at Utah State University in 1963. Founded six years later, while Ensign and Porter were professors at North Carolina State University, the firm is now world renowned for its efforts to incorporate “artistic vision, environmental sensitivity, community values and sound economics to create distinctive places that stand the test of time” (Lapides, 2011). The union of these four elements has evolved into a theory known as Legacy Design. Growing from academic origins, the goal of their theory is to unite form, composition,
and problem-solving through the overarching elements of art, environment, society, and economy (Design Workshop, 2011). Their aim was to create a connection between high purpose and form. One of the aspirations of the firm from its outset at North Carolina State was to create a “workshop” environment, emphasizing the collaborative process. Design Workshop encourages diversity and continual personal development within the parameters of *Legacy Design*. Their work ranges from small private residences to regional plans and everything in between (Design Workshop, 2007). The firm now boasts over 200 prestigious awards for their contributions to the field of landscape architecture. Founders of the firm have recognized the significance of their contributions and wish to make their process available to others, particularly students of the profession. Their academic motives of Legacy Design are now coming full circle.

Design Workshop has made efforts to have their work accessible to professionals, students, and the public through the publishing of their book *Toward Legacy*, which documents key aspects of some of their most prestigious projects. In their next effort to preserve these legacy works, the development of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection at Utah State University makes their final work as well as their process accessible in digital and physical form. This innovative collaboration captures the firm’s philosophy of creating enduring places by advancing the education of professionals, the public, and students. Instructors will be able to access the collection for use in the classroom to detail the design process and final installation of professional efforts. The documents from Design Workshop provided for Utah State University’s use offer a unique opportunity for students to learn from professional practice while preserving the
valuable information housed therein. Combining the valuable assets of oral histories, documents, and drawings into learning objects to be used in the classroom setting within the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department at Utah State University will help students to approach their projects with a new perspective, incorporating real world solutions and techniques to improve quality and understanding of work. Integrating the archives into a digital format with the availability for students and professionals alike will augment the impact these projects provide. The complete archives contain over a thousand projects held in more than five thousand tubes of drawings, the majority of which are currently housed in Design Workshop facilities. The purpose of this pilot project was to develop a methodology for determining importance, best practices for creating an inventory, retention value, catalogue methodology, preservation needs, and a system for providing access to the collection.

In a new endeavor to continue preservation efforts and secure their use, Design Workshop and Utah State University collaborated in 2010 to initiate an archive and digital collection with the goals of preserving Legacy Projects and enriching academic pursuits for the students at Utah State University. The archival collection began with four Design Workshop projects, selected as a pilot study, completed in 2012. Through careful selection of materials, vibrant visuals, and engaging audio, the four projects selected for the pilot year highlight the wealth of knowledge the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection will continue to foster. These projects span a period of time in which Design Workshop transitioned from their formative years into what they refer to as their “break-out” years, a period of rapid growth during which the values of
the firm solidified in the *Legacy Design* process. Both design approach and reprographic media show immense transitions during this time. In order to provide the most comprehensive approach to the creation of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, the pilot year focused on preserving the legacy of planning and design projects produced by Design Workshop; profiling the firm’s history and leaders; articulating the firm’s development relating to design and planning; and connecting students, scholars, and practitioners of related disciplines to the firm’s work. The pilot year sought to emphasize the establishment of collection sorting, budget development, personnel structuring, travel demands, timelines, web design, and full proposal development.

Labors during the first year included the review of archival best practices for similar collections, a test of established key processes, the development of new protocols as necessary, the establishment of learning object creation requirements, and the measurement of the feasibility of the archival process for subsequent years. A decision tree, as seen in Appendix A, illustrates this process of project integration into the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection. The pilot year helped to establish workflows, best practices, costs, and processing times for the archiving of future selected Design Workshop *Legacy Projects*. Within the first year, the archival process, digital collection, learning objects, integration into the classroom, and oral histories commenced. The successful accomplishment of these tasks has helped inspire a closeout checklist Design Workshop project managers use when undergoing end-of-project purging and archiving, effective processing of the archives at Utah State University, the creation of a finding aid
for the collection, best practices established for archiving and digitizing documents, and the installation of a Digital Collection Exhibit for the archives.

In light of the uniqueness of this endeavor, this thesis documents the process in written form and compares it to the best practices historically utilized in landscape architecture archival development. It is anticipated that the groundwork laid in this first phase will be further refined in subsequent efforts, as Utah State University and Design Workshop continue to work collectively through projects in storage to expand the archival collection.
CHAPTER II

ARCHIVAL PRECEDENTS AND THE
PROFESSION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Efforts to collect the work of landscape architects, while not common, do have precedent in several collections. In a review of the Landscape Architecture Archives Collection recognized by the American Society of Landscape Architects, over fifty collections exist at thirteen different locations. Among the existing archives are those of such notables as Garret Eckbo, Roberto Burle Marx, and Beatrix Farrand (American Society of Landscape Architects, 2014). Perusal of the Landscape Architecture Archives Collection reveals that it includes only a narrow segment of firms, with the Rocky Mountain region having no listed archives. Also readily apparent is the very small selection of professional firms whose work is preserved in academic archives. The majority of landscape architecture collections highlight the work of an individual rather than a firm. The value of these archives is limited to the familiarity that users have with their existence and contents. Moreover, few are available for viewing in digital format, thus drastically complicating their use and effectively making them inaccessible to all but the most committed or proximate patron. Given institution restrictions on public access, an additional hurdle is presented for non-academics.

In efforts to share the importance and process of archiving landscape architecture works, Theodora Kimball, a librarian and early landscape architecture historian at Harvard University, published City Planning: A Comprehensive Analysis of the Subject Arranged for the Classification of Books, Plans, Photographs, Notes and Other Collected
Material in 1913 with James Sturgis Pray, the Chairman of the School of Landscape Architecture for twenty years at Harvard University. In 1920, Kimball produced *Landscape Architecture: A Comprehensive Classification Scheme for Books, Plans, Photographs, Notes and Other Collected Material* with Henry Vincent Hubbard, a landscape architect and colleague at Harvard University (Hohmann, 2006). Kimball’s work helped to institutionalize the best practices for the establishment of landscape architecture collections. Anthony Alofsin, an award-winning author, architect, and

*Figure 2.1. Locations of Landscape Architecture archive facilities based on information from the American Society of Landscape Architects and additional locations from the knowledge of the archiving committee.*
exhibit curator has pointed out the contributions she and other design librarians have made in helping to elevate design into a more rigorous and thoughtful pursuit. Kimball expected the efforts of library collections to be used by students in three ways: for design inspiration; assigned and collateral reading; and for research. Her efforts were based on the desire to organize existing information so others could identify and create new information.

Several universities have created archiving collections from numerous individual landscape architects and firms. Thorough collections exist at Harvard, University of California at Berkeley, University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Georgia, among others. The most pressing issues with these archives continue to be space, size, funding, and access. Limited space is available to host collections like these. Storage of the collections is generally an amalgamation of manuscript boxes, tubes, folders of photographs, slide boxes, drawers of flat files, and files of folded drawings. Optimal conditions for storage also demand dark, climate-controlled facilities. Preservation efforts may reflect the donating landscape architect’s storage methods, modified based on spatial capacity of the archive facility.

The archives at the University of California Berkeley Environmental Design Library were reorganized at the turn of the 21st century by library employees and were documented to create a best practices manual (Shepherd & Lowell, 2000). This manual is effective in providing guidelines for the development of a traditional landscape architecture archives, but does not provide some of the vital perspectives of the archival
process nor does it provide far-reaching suggestions for future utilization of the collections.

Access to collections proves to be very limited. Most collections, like those at University of California at Berkeley, are available by appointment only and require an hourly fee for usage for those not affiliated with the university. At University of Texas at Austin, appointments must be made three days in advance to provide time for rolled drawings to be flattened. Access is subsequently limited to physical presence, time, money, and familiarity with the collection’s contents.

As a result of this lack of access and facilitated by our entry into a digital age, some organizations are attempting to provide digital availability of archives. In the University of California at Berkeley’s Environmental Design Archives, the Geraldine Knight Scott Landscape Architecture Fund has funded the digitization of the Gertrude Jekyll Collection. The digital portion of this collection is minimal, offering one or up to as many as seven digital images for review per project.

Other organizations are pursuing complementary venues for preserving important landscape architecture collections. The Cultural Landscapes Foundation, founded in 1998 by Charles Birnbaum, seeks to preserve oral histories, create a record of lost landscapes, and inspire activism and awareness in saving important landscapes. The Cultural Landscapes Foundation has opened up a network of opportunities for sharing the history of landscape architecture and its preservation. Through the efforts to create archive collections and provide subsequent access, the field of landscape architecture is working not only to preserve the past, but ensure its future as well.
Traditional design archives concentrate on preserving a hard copy of the design work, office business records, correspondence, and photographs, with the occasional voice recording, and are categorized by project type or chronology. These archives typically offer a refined, sterile representation of projects lacking the impromptu, natural emotions of oral histories. Oral histories, lacking from most extant collections, offer the opportunity to add a critical dimension to the history of a project. They can enrich a project history with emotion and spontaneity typically filtered out with the written word (Grele & Terkel, 1991). Capturing experiences and reactions in the voice of those involved in a project, and having that personality describe to students the value of efforts made within a project to address a given aspect may aid in learning. Integrating the voice and related documents and drawings into an interactive learning object for the classroom will further enhance the learning experience and quality therein. While designed landscapes may not always last a lifetime, their impact can be captured as evidence of their design, process, construction, and use within archival documents.

This begins by solidifying some of the terminology that will be used, specifically for archives and digital collections. The definition for archives to be used in this research will follow that described by Frederic Miller (1990) and approved by the Society of American Archivists as “the noncurrent but still useful records of an organization or institution preserved by that organization or institution. The term ‘archives’ refers to the repository containing the records as well as to the records themselves” (p. 3). While Miller suggested that the conventional title of the archives should be called “records” or “papers,” Keley Shepherd and Waverly Lowell (2000), the head of digital programs at
Amherst College and a curator at the Environmental Design Archives of University of California at Berkeley respectively, suggested using the term “collection” instead because a collection would hold both records and papers. As this is the case with the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, the term “collection” will be used as a standard to refer to its contents.

The value of documents and drawings in the archivist’s point of view is often defined by the existing and future use of the collection items. Lowell suggested the most frequent use of archived design documents is by current owners of the landscape (Shepherd & Lowell, 2000). Other uses include research, efforts to learn drawing technique, restoration/adaptive reuse, design inspiration, examples of land use planning, environmental historian interests, future design development, comprehension of the design process, and design philosophy.
CHAPTER III
ACCESSIONING AND THE APPRAISAL PROCESS

The accessioning and appraisal of a Landscape Architecture archive relies greatly on its potential uses, the efforts the donating firm has pursued in preserving documentation, and the types of projects being considered. Based on these key aspects, future project selection criteria for Design Workshop have been developed to ensure quality projects are preserved.

Appraisal is always in some way based on what objects are being considered, why they are being considered, and their potential future use. Richard J. Cox (1996), a professor at the University of Pittsburgh in the School of Information Sciences, discussed the need to pay attention to who would use the collection in order to determine what is preserved and in what format. Miller (1990) urged the importance of creating an evaluation plan before beginning the archiving process. His documentation strategy advocated for an analytical approach to appraisal for retention purposes. Lowell discussed the factors affecting appraisal in *Architectural Records*. She recommended that “appraisal reflects the function of the records and their intended, present, and future uses” (Lowell & Nelb, 2006, p. 69). Within the appraisal process, the users and uses can be identified to help guide the archival process. In arguing for the importance of knowing future users and uses of the collection, Cox (1996) noted “merely examining architectural records as interesting in their own right is to have extremely limited aims that may in fact minimize the value of architectural records for subsequent users” (p. 146). Terry Cook (1996), Director of the Records Disposition Division at the National Archives of Canada,
extended his view of archiving beyond the efforts of appraisal theorists in which “archivists should be active, probing how society records, uses, stores, and disposes of information and, even more importantly, determining what larger functions these acts of recording were meant to serve” (p. 139). Cook argued that considering the users and uses limits the scope of the archives and weakens the effect the archives can have on future research. It is valuable to consider Cox’s (1996) view that archiving “is not an effort to determine objectives as we interact with or react to architectural records, but as a lens by which we can examine such records on the basis of broad documentary objectives formed before such examination. It is a manner in which we can determine what evidence offered by architectural records we want to preserve and even how such preservation might take place” (p. 149). Oftentimes, these decisions are made subconsciously at the landscape architecture firm, before the archives and future uses are considered.

Design firms often begin this appraisal process driven by legal considerations rather than by the value of record preservation and future use. Many states require firms to retain documents beyond a set statute of limitations, during which time the firm is legally bound by the impacts of the design. After the allotted time passes, general practices allow a firm to retain, donate, sell, or destroy the documents and drawings according to their choosing. For instance, Design Workshop’s attorneys suggested destroying the documents and records because of the legal and security issues that could arise. However, Design Workshop determined the historical importance of the material outweighed the legal considerations and resolved to retain most of the material. Despite this awareness of the potential value of their work, it is apparent that many of the early
concept sketches and schematic diagrams which help tell the story of the creative process were purged from the outset. Most likely, though, this is a result of project management rather than legal constraints. Lowell urged that “it is essential that the individuals who are responsible for managing records in design firms consult with archivists to collaboratively develop records-management programs that reflect and distinguish between long-term and permanent records following their period of active use by the firm that created them” (Lowell & Nelb, 2006, p. 70). In the case of Design Workshop, the active partnership between the firm and Utah State University will help ascertain constant communication on what is necessary on the firm’s part to preserve projects in the future. The time taken to archive and sort these documents has the potential to be of significant value in the future. Establishing archival guidelines for professionals to incorporate into their business practices will be of great benefit in coordinating the filing and archive management systems of the office. The successful accomplishment of these tasks helped create a closeout checklist for Design Workshop project managers to use when undergoing end-of-project purging and archiving, as well as effective processing of the archives at Utah State University.

Creating a landscape architecture or other design-based archive requires a collaborative effort. Because of this overwhelming need to value and sort the collection of projects according to the potential uses and users, the nature of design work is understandably foreign and makes it difficult for archivists alone to appraise a design collection. To ease the efforts and confusion, it is beneficial to have landscape architects oversee the culling process. Combining the knowledge of design experts, the donating
professionals, as well as library and landscape architecture staff is invaluable in the preservation of these records. Each party brings to the table unique insight and understanding for the task. Together, they can train advanced students to find a balance between documentation value and potential use for the proposed archival material. As a group, they can combine their expertise to select projects for the continuation of the collection.

Project selection for the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection required significant pre-acquisition planning. Meetings with DW Principal Kurt Culbertson, Chief Operating Officer Doug Parker, and Hillary Osborne, Associate in charge of records management, highlighted the need for the collection to focus both on

Figure 3.1. Artistic rendition of proposed site for Kananaskis. Image courtesy of Design Workshop Archives & Digital Collection.
apogee projects as well as progenitor projects in future selections of the archive development. Apogee projects are those which demonstrated a high point, whereas progenitor projects are those transitional projects which are valuable for their influence but may not stand alone on their own merit. Special attention would be paid to projects with award applications because these would already have the strong supporting graphics and the project’s important details. Depending on space and future interests, the archiving efforts could also consider unrealized projects. These often provide insight into the designer’s thought process, values, and design development. Lowell cited the unbuilt designs of Frank Lloyd Wright, whose exhibition tours nationally, as a prime example (Lowell & Nelb, 2006). Considering the quality and quantity of award winning projects that Design Workshop maintains, it is not likely that unbuilt projects would be chosen over built projects, unless they are integral in the evolution of the firm.

For the pilot year of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, four projects were selected. All award winning projects, these highlight the development of the firm’s Legacy Design approach over a variety of scales. Kananaskis, ASPCOL, High Desert, and Summerlin each highlight a different period of time in the firm’s forty year history, while embracing unique challenges, varying scales, numerous stakeholders, and emerging technological innovation. Kananaskis Village was a formative project for Design Workshop. Begun in 1978 with the Calgary Olympics just ten years away and a desire to boost future year-round tourism, the firm was charged with the development of a master plan for this planned resort community. Design Workshop started with a broad environmental analysis of the 51,000 acre site, creating over 40 hand-drawn analyses
including wind, views, slope, and aspect, weighted according to stakeholders’ objectives and values. The analysis helped convince project proponents to concentrate development into a single, pedestrian-centric village core hosting a plethora of accommodations, recreational opportunities, and commercial amenities, rather than creating a sprawl of development scattered throughout the pristine valley. They created revenue and viability analyses to enhance their findings. Design Workshop managed the construction process in adherence to their design, coordinating amongst the four separate developers and architects in the process. Now a destination located 20 miles east of Banff, their plan for a wilderness village has hosted numerous prominent events, including the 2003 G-8 conference of the world’s leaders. This project helped prove the firm’s goals would work on a large scale, complex project as long as they were managed through public process, design development, and construction.

A residential project, ASPCOL is a 120 acre mountain estate located in Pitkin County, Colorado. Originally part of a high altitude ranch, the residence owner wanted to maintain the existing ranch pastures and hay fields, placing the home on the hillside. This project included congruent designs for equestrian trails, stables, ranch operations, and natural gardens. Efforts to connect the viewshed of the residence’s upper story to a quiet garden space inspired the design of reflecting pools, an interior courtyard, and hillside gardens. Environmental sensitivity was embraced through the use of minimal turf, drip irrigation, native plants, and stone from local quarries. This project embraced the local and regional context and sensitively interwove the owner’s needs.
Figure 3.2. Post-construction image of ASPCOL landscape. Image courtesy of Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection.

A 1,000 acre master planned community in Albuquerque hosting a variety of residential land use densities, High Desert was the first major master planned community in New Mexico. This project embraced sustainable design principles including water conservation, arroyo preservation, native plant use, air quality protectors, and night sky protection. Approximately 30% of the site was preserved for open space and a system of trails along the arroyos. As part of the design efforts in this project, Design Workshop created A Guideline for Sustainability, which antedated the United States Green Building Council’s LEED standards by almost four years. Funded by the Albuquerque Academy,
a private school for grades 4-12, the project enabled Design Workshop to engage students and faculty in design development. This both engaged the school with interactive educational activities and bolstered support for the plan. The objectives of the project to conserve water, use native plants, enhance habitat, and provide varying residential densities have been very successful. The lack of pre-development condition records has since inspired Design Workshop to emphasize metrics and performance based design.

A 1,000 acre master planned community in Albuquerque hosting a variety of residential land use densities, High Desert was the first major master planned community in New Mexico. This project embraced sustainable design principles including water conservation, arroyo preservation, native plant use, air quality protectors, and night sky protection. Approximately 30% of the site was preserved for open space and a system of trails along the arroyos. As part of the design efforts in this project, Design Workshop created *A Guideline for Sustainability*, which antedated the United States Green Building...
Council’s LEED standards by almost four years. Funded by the Albuquerque Academy, a private school for grades 4-12, the project enabled Design Workshop to engage students and faculty in design development. This both engaged the school with interactive educational activities and bolstered support for the plan. The objectives of the project to conserve water, use native plants, enhance habitat, and provide varying residential densities have been very successful. The lack of pre-development condition records has since inspired Design Workshop to emphasize metrics and performance based design.

Summerlin, a master planned community in Las Vegas, Nevada, captures an approach utilized by Principals Don Ensign and Joe Porter that foreshadowed the firm’s growing focus on sustainable practices. The concept for Summerlin reflects their earlier work in Columbia, Maryland and the Woodlands of Houston, Texas. It employs a series of neighborhoods grouped in villages, connected by a network of roadways, trails, and open spaces. At the center of each neighborhood are a school and park, with high schools and larger parks being the focus of the villages. Design Workshop created the designs for several villages within the Summerlin development. The community has proven to be an economic success, inspiring high quality housing. Rather than the entertainment and recreational genre that many of their earlier works exhibited, Summerlin became a primary home community. Specific attention was centered on existing and potential habitat for the threatened desert tortoise. Through this design, Summerlin is considered a project of national significance as a result of its scale, its execution, and its place in the American West.
These four projects were selected for the pilot year of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection based on their impact on the profession, ingenuity, and significance. They illustrate some of the transformations that the firm’s ideology underwent during its formative years; represent a variety of project types and scales; and demonstrate the innovative design thinking of the firm. Their inclusion in the pilot year of the creation of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection provides opportunities for utilizing best practices in archive creation as well as chances to develop criteria pertinent to their unique future uses.

For future accessioning, recognition of the various names of a single project and communicating all project numbers pertinent to a single project will help to speed up the process. During the processing of Kananaskis, it was discovered that the project had previously been referred to as Ribbon Creek and Ribbon Valley. Because of the varying names, project drawings were sent in two different shipments. Midway through the processing it was discovered that there was another large collection of drawings stored in one of the earlier names still housed in the basement storage facility in Denver. Drawing tube labels separated the three names as separate projects, although they shared many of the same base plans. The integration of the three names and their inclusive parts was necessary for completing Kananaskis as a whole project. Similar issues occurred in other pilot year projects. ASPCOL was also known as Starwood, Starwood Ranch, Starwood Main, and Mountain Retreat. High Desert was filed under many project numbers and was sometimes referred to as Albuquerque Academy or Academy Lands East. Summerlin was also known as the Howard Hughes Land Company project and contained
several different project numbers. Knowing that a single project may carry many names should help in accessioning by helping both Design Workshop and Utah State University know if they have the entirety of the project.

Future projects for the archives should be based on their potential use, the depth of project material remaining intact, variety of scope, and the proven merit of the project. While not all future uses of the archives can be determined, Utah State University and Design Workshop have outlined some intended purposes. These include learning objects modules; a digital collection which can be accessed by students, professional landscape architects, and the general public; and exhibitions, among other things. Some of the Design Workshop projects have been thoroughly culled after the finish of a project, retaining few of the original records and a limited number of the working documents. Although the projects may show merit, part of the purpose of the archives is to show process. Without representative documents to detail the process, the collection will be less effective in accomplishing the existing goals. Because of the quality of work that Design Workshop has created over the years and the limited space in the Merrill-Cazier Library’s Special Collections and Archives facility, those apogee and progenitor projects that have been categorized by the firm as legacy projects should be prioritized for accession. Award and legacy projects contain narratives, project descriptions, award entry photographs and images, and have already been reviewed by the firm and third parties as having merit. A variety of projects should be chosen to detail the breadth of work that Design Workshop has procured. Expertise of the firm ranges from large-scale community master plan development and resort planning to residential site planning and
design. The archives should highlight the extensiveness of their work and expertise. Attention to these criteria should help ensure that the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection maintains a high level of use and preserves their quality of work.

The accessioning and appraisal of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection is strongly based on intended uses, a desire to preserve project integrity, preserve the work included in their award winning projects, and enhancing preservation decisions already exhibited by the firm. Accession and appraisal of the four pilot year projects will inform the methods for subsequent project selection. Enlightened by the firm’s use of various naming methods for a single project assures a comprehensive gathering of the records in a cohesive archive. Selection of the material based on these criteria will help build a thorough collection based on the attributes Design Workshop has sought to engage in every aspect of their work.
CHAPTER IV
COLLECTION EVALUATION AND RETENTION DECISIONS

Once the decisions have been made concerning what projects to archive, the next step involves the evaluation of what to retain within each project. The condition of files encountered will often determine the manner in which they should be archived and the efforts that will be required to store them. Regardless of whether the project is large or small, stringent retention guidelines should be applied equally. While it may be easier to keep smaller collections, they too add up in space and effort. The anticipated role of the archival collection, its future value, archival costs, and application will be reflected in a hierarchical protocol for the culling of objects.

Smaller archival items such as photographs, legal files, marketing brochures, catalogues, and other records of business are typically transferred from office filing cabinets into box files for archiving. It is important to retain order as they are moved from office files to transfer boxes. These are important to retain wherein they help to define the procedures, structure, and operations of the firm or individual. The most difficult aspect of the appraisal process may prove to be within the project records. Key efforts to define retention of the projects should be based on context and content issues. Among these, Lowell listed long term potential use, stability of the image, redundancy, quantity of records, location of originals, and permanence of retention (Lowell & Nelb, 2006). This last aspect, permanence, refers to the recordkeeping requirements, in which an archive collection considers only keeping the project files for the physical life of the design’s existence or according to the obligations of law in reference to the creation,
maintenance, and nature of records; if the site is redesigned or removed, the project files are purged as well. Lowell emphasized that the most important project records to preserve are those of the design process, final construction, and photographs. Whether these files are retained for legal purposes, educational value, or construction/maintenance information, they are important to keep. The systematic efforts of the design firm at the end of a project to weed out duplicates, field sets, sepias, and other documents of lesser value helps alleviate much of the archival effort. Still, the team of archivists, landscape architects, and landscape architecture faculty should help to develop this plan for the firm. It would also help to eliminate a lot of storage space and time when trying to search through the documents later. For the archivist, if a firm is practicing these purging procedures, it is important to review their management plan to understand the story they are telling through their own efforts.

Within the Design Workshop Archives are collections of box files, tubes of drawings, computer files, tapes, disks, photographs, and slides. The collection was processed according to Special Collections and Archives procedures at the Merrill-Cazier Library. Because of the enormity of the accession, items were sorted according to value of retention. Duplicates, documents from other firms and consultant works not necessary to convey the project story were purged from the tubes. In addition, documents that are not intellectual property (including unrelated magazine articles, brochures, and product catalogs), memos from vendors, dead-end correspondence, and sensitive information that might divulge secure data or violate privacy were eliminated from the box files.
Reprographic processes have changed significantly over time, especially during the four decade span of the Design Workshop archives. Many of the reprographic processes encountered in the pilot year of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection are no longer used because of their instability and the cost-effectiveness of more modern print methods. Diazo, ozalid, and sepia prints are some of the reprographic media which proved issues with stability and preservation. Many of the print media are notably unstable, and show signs of degradation. Diazo and ozalid prints use chemical processes to create a positive print on opaque media. The subsequent linework is black, blue, or brown. These are used most often when making revisions and proofs because they preserve the original document, are cost effective, and the linework is maintained similar to the original document. Sepia prints are usually positive prints on translucent paper which allow intermediate “originals” to be altered without harming the original. These are often referred to as the “poor man’s” mylar or acetate copy. With time, sepia prints fade, yellow, become brittle, and off-gas sulfurous compounds. Markers used on some paper mediums allow images to bleed, obscuring original intentions or transferring to adjacent papers. Of the duplication processes used, Lowell suggested that blueprints are the most stable prints of the 1900s (Lowell & Nelb, 2006). In review of the Design Workshop collection, the most stable documents have proven to be the film, acetate, and Mylar documents. Reverse image prints and paper negatives are unstable. They are not used by archival institutions for replications, and thus less desirable for retention when other options exist. Beyond the ability of a medium to hold up over time, the initial condition of the records is also important. Because of the printing methods used to create
design documents, they are very susceptible to humidity, light, and other environmental conditions. Their existing condition and stability upon receipt by the archivist will help to determine archival efforts necessary for preservation and retention.

In discussing image formats, slides and photographs can involve access and use issues. Many slides were taken by professional photographers hired by Design Workshop. Those would be stamped or labeled with the photographer’s name in order to provide credit. For those images taken by a member of the project team, no label will be

Figure 4.1. Michael Timmons, Bradford Cole, Kurt Culbertson, and Amanda Dunlap reviewing Kananaskis drawings.
included, and the images are acceptable to use, because Design Workshop tends to have their photographers sign off on the copyright. Additionally, employee work paid through salary becomes the property of the company. Some of the photographs and slides journal mundane topics such as the moving of rocks. In cases of this sort, representative images could be selected if the archive facility felt the space requirement became an issue. Most important were the images which captured the original site and the site after installation. These could prove to be valuable for any restoration efforts in the future. For those images which duplicate original drawings, the images should be saved especially when the originals are not available. The forty hand-drawn analyses in Kananaskis were an example of this, as the originals were no longer with the collection but photographs in the collection showed their purpose and content.

Several weeks into the appraisal process for Kananaskis, Design Workshop Principal Kurt Culbertson visited the Utah State University campus to review progress of the project. During the visit, retention efforts were reviewed and solidified between the University and Design Workshop staff. One of the biggest questions was what to focus on for preservation and what should be removed from the collection. While future projects would require intense culling because of limited space availability in the library, it was originally determined that Kananaskis would be retained as a nearly complete collection. After delving into the project, it was discovered that nearly half of the drawing tubes were filled with duplicates printed on transparencies for printing. Those transparencies posed issues with preservation because they contained large amounts of tape and gummy residue. The majority of those transparencies were removed from the
collection, with the exception of a few to demonstrate reprographic material. Their duplicates on stable mediums were preserved. Numerous duplicates in unstable formats would be removed from the collection because of their more stable counterparts. Kananaskis was preserved in its entirety after the removal of duplicates and transparencies. *Figure 4.2* shows the final percentage breakdown of full-scale drawings which were purged and retained from Kananaskis, High Desert, and ASPCOL.

A few reasons for the decision to retain Kananaskis as a nearly complete collection included the role that Design Workshop played in the project, the variety of reprographic mediums exhibited, the design process, the size and significance of the project, and the lack of supporting records. Design Workshop led the Kananaskis project as a type of project leader or coordinator, organizing financial projection teams, architects, investors, the local government, and, of course, the landscape. Selection criteria for the archives were consequently established based on the goal to preserve most of the Kananaskis project. The drawings to purge were duplicates on the same print medium, prints when the original existed, documents from other firms not relevant in telling the project story.

*Figure 4.2.* Comparison of drawings retained (in blue) versus purged (in red) from each project after receipt at USU.
other items which were not intellectual property (like transmittals), memos and
catalogues from vendors, and dead-end correspondence. Items specifically retained
included ink drawings on Mylar (because of their stability), building elevations and
ground floor plans for each building, copy prints with notes preferred over clean copy
prints (because these show process and intent), design standards, submittals to the city
with critiques, significant letters, slides and pictures that may be used in the future for
restoration efforts, and the original contracts. The contracts would show what the firm
initially set out to accomplish in the project. Culbertson expressed his desires for Utah
State University’s focus in the archives to capture the essence of each project, providing a
descriptive understanding of the problems; linking key elements of site analysis; tracing
the design from market studies and the clients’ ideas; client interactions and impacts on
the design; and financial influences which altered the plan.

In the subsequent weeks, the drawings were sorted according to retention value
and placed in four piles: retain; purge; scan and retain; and scan and purge. Retention
was determined according to the guidelines decided in the meetings with Kurt
Culbertson. Documents to be scanned fell into three categories: (1) those drawings which
were showing signs of aging, fading, fragility, image bleeding, or showing other forms of
degradation were prepared for scanning to capture their current state; (2) the final
illustrative plans, drawings which detailed the design process, and images which showed
the integration of technologically advanced computer generated images with hand
rendering techniques were also included in the scanning (this group was considered to
contain documents most likely to be utilized in the creation of learning objects); and (3)
those documents which were scanned prior to being purged. Fragile, heavily damaged, with bleeding line work and hosting information easily gained from a digital duplicate, these documents offered very limited reasons for retention. For example, identification of drawings to be scanned for Summerlin was dictated more by the permanency of the images than the other projects. Many of the color rendered site illustrative plans are drawn on sepia prints. The paper is showing intense signs of aging and deterioration; the ink is lifting off of the paper and smearing in spots. Because of the intense signs of decline, these will hold a priority in the scanning process to capture their current condition in digital form before further degradation occurs. Those drawings which were put into the purge pile were removed from the rest of the sorting process and boxed for removal. It was agreed by Design Workshop, the Merrill-Cazier Library’s Special Collections and Archives, and the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department that the purged items would be stamped as discarded, and made available for display in the University’s landscape architecture studios. The display of discarded items can help to inspire students, add visual interest to the studios, and serve as a constant reminder of the valuable asset the full collection provides to the department.

During the collection evaluation, a formidable challenge for archivists of the Kananaskis project involved the working space. Several drawings were larger than 4’x5’, making them difficult to roll out in tight quarters. The Fife Room of the Special Collections and Archives Division of the library was converted to an ephemeral workshop for unrolling, measuring, describing, and cataloging the documents. With limited space and the need for the room to be used by other parties, the drawings had to
be rerolled daily and stored after use. The height of the tables was another problem for workers—they were a normal table height, but the workers were almost always standing, causing them to bend over to reach the drawings for hours at a time. This slowed the process quite a bit, suggesting the need for an alternative location. Criteria for the new location included a large space with several tall tables, limited access, dim lighting, cool temperatures, and within close proximity to the library. Temporary use of the LAEP graduate studio for the summer semester afforded ample secured space in a quiet setting. When classes started for the school year again, a spare office that was being used as storage space for the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department suited the bill. It held four tables with adequate lighting and plenty of space to hold all of the drawing tubes for a single project. This area solved the problem of having to roll up all of the drawings after each use, whether the task was completed or not. Drawings could be unrolled and weighted down, allowing them to lose some of the deep-set curls they had inherited after years of being bound in the tubes. The documents, once flat, were much easier to manipulate during sorting, labeling, and description. Lead-filled sacks were used as weights to hold the documents down. They were small, manageable objects that would not damage the drawings. The environmental conditions and familiarity with processing helped to further streamline the sorting of High Desert, ASPCOL, and Summerlin.

An important aspect in archiving the Summerlin project was the level of filtering required. While the previous projects had been thoroughly culled before Utah State University's involvement, Summerlin held many more sketches and records intact. The
Summerlin project is comprised of numerous high quality original drawings and other information. This added to the quality, depth, and time necessary to process. More than 130 tubes hold the collection, each densely packed with drawings. This is far more than all of the other three projects combined. Because of the extent of this project, review of the selection criteria for retention is important. The enormity of the drawing collection requires stringent efforts to remove unnecessary content. Shepherd and Lowell (2000) suggest creating a hierarchy of the original drawings preceding secondary drawings, or those that are duplications. Whatever the organization, consistency is preferable throughout the collection. For the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, duplicates were all removed. Sepias with highlighting and no keys to define their use were purged when other matching drawings on more sound mediums existed. Only the most complete construction document print packages (90% or 100% are preferable) were retained when multiple copies were found. Print packages were preferred over the sepia packages as well, due to the fragility of sepias, problems with off-gassing, and the clouding of the paper as it ages, impeding the legibility of the image. Even though the amount of drawings to process required intense effort, the original order of the drawings was much more functional than some of the previous projects. This helped greatly speed up the processing of Summerlin.

In addition to the selection criteria already discussed, a few office organization tools altered the retention condition of some drawings. Tape adhesive generally exhibits a shorter lifespan than the documents it attaches. This creates a conservation issue. If the drawing is valuable enough, then measures can be taken to remove the tape. This process
is expensive and time consuming. Many of the drawings in all four projects had tape whose adhesive had melted out from under the binding. It often attached numerous drawings together inadvertently and was challenging to remove without damaging the images. Complete removal of gummy residue is impossible and efforts are very time consuming. When the document is vital to keep, the tape is often left on to try to block the adhesive from sticking to additional objects, but when there is another copy of the drawing, the one with tape is removed from the collection. Staples and metal paperclips are removed to protect documents and drawings from tearing. When the staple or paperclip is used to connect a group of documents in the box files, a plastic paperclip can be used to bind the group. For drawings, the naming system replaces the staple to indicate their connection. This will be discussed further in the next chapter. Often, sticky notes were attached to the drawings, but because their archival stability is not yet established, they were removed from the documents. The information the note contained is recorded in the finding aid’s narrative and description. These foreign elements which are not an integral part of the collection can have detrimental effects on document condition and subsequent retention decisions.

Collection evaluation and retention decisions were based heavily on the condition in which the records arrived at Utah State University. Stability of the mediums greatly influenced digital preservation criteria. Retention was heavily weighted toward preserving originals. Specific efforts were made to ensure the viability of the documents and the information housed therein. Final retention criteria were influenced by facility
storage space, value of the documents, condition, and pertinence in relating the importance of the project.
CHAPTER V
ARRANGEMENT AND DESCRIPTION

The accurate arrangement and description of the records are imperative to their use and function. Logical arrangement of the archives will aid in their integration for research and classroom use. Descriptions help highlight important traits within the archives, making a search through their contents easy to the layman and inviting to the researcher. Through effective arrangement and description, the archives should experience frequent use.

The arrangement of the records should reflect the original order of the documents. This is why it is important to carefully transfer files. If there is a no clear order the archivist must impose a system of order on the records. The imposed order should reflect best practices, be based on their likely creation, and facilitate future use. The determination of whether to cultivate the original order or impose a new order over the documents will largely be based on the condition in which they are received. Moving, boxing, use at the firm, and shipping the files all may have altered their organization. When possible, it would be valuable to consult the donor’s records-management system. This proved invaluable with Design Workshop as archivists referred often to the firm’s filing system for the box files. This arrangement, or the assessment of original order, should be determined during content analysis, before processing begins. If order is imposed, it should attempt to reflect the way the records would have been created and used. Organization should reflect past use rather than future use to preserve the original logic of the creator. The drawings from Design Workshop showed less order than the
records in the box files. Understanding the processing at the firm’s level helped enlighten the archive efforts. Working drawings are kept in flat files in the studios at Design Workshop. These are pulled and replaced in no particular order during their use. When a project reaches completion, the drawings are culled and rolled by the project manager. Specific organization of the drawings was more the exception than the rule. Many duplicate drawings were kept in efforts to save printing costs later on rather than for the inherent merit of the drawings. Recognition of the firm’s protocol helped to direct the drawing order based on past use and design evolution.

Institutions should maintain a consistent system of arranging collections and records. Adjusting the system according to volume and typology becomes burdensome and confusing. Generally organization of records begins with the identification of existing series and subseries. Miller (1990) defined series as “a body of file units or documents arranged in accordance with a unified filing system or maintained as a unit by the organization or individual that created them because of some other relationship arising out of their creation, function, receipt, physical form, or use” (p. 7). Series titles should be flexible enough to accommodate needs. Miller has suggested only four series titles, which entail personal papers, professional papers, officer records, and project records. Shepherd and Lowell expanded on Miller’s suggestion with the additional series to include faculty papers; major projects; art and artifacts; additional donations; and unique series holding those collections which do not organize themselves in any of the existing series. This last series should be malleable, but the initial titles should remain fairly consistent, regardless of contents. If original order for the collection exists, though,
the series and subseries should be used more flexibly as they apply. In considering the organization of series and subseries, Shepherd and Lowell (2000) recommended considering how the architect would have arranged and used the archives. Regardless of whether the original order is maintained or a new order is imposed, series descriptions will be the key to transferring information to the researcher about what the order is and how it can be used. Portions of the collection such as photographs, magazine articles, and presentation boards which may be retained by the firm for on-going marketing purposes, can be connected digitally/intellectually to the archival files. Nelb advised “project files are the fundamental unit for arrangement and description of design and construction records” (Lowell & Nelb, 2006, p. 95). The original order of the project files is often ordered alphabetically by project name or numerically by project number, based on the project’s start year and a consecutive number. Most commonly, if an order must be assigned it is alphabetical according to project name.

Textual records, photographs, and drawings, are generally included within the project records. Beyond this, presentation drawings, CDs, disks, models, and videos can also be included. The format in which these objects and documents arrive should be respected. If files come in boxes and drawings come in tubes, their separation can and should be protected as a part of the efforts to observe the original order. Shepherd and Lowell (2000) suggested that separating documents and records according to their specific storage needs is more important. Intellectual links to their original organization with a finding guide maintains the correlation. Separation within this collection can occur when folded drawings are found in the project box files. They should be removed
for humidification, allowed to flatten, and stored separately. This is similar to the practice of removing photographs in a manuscript collection as well. Photographs are usually housed separately because of specific storage needs but linked to the original collection with the finding guide. It should thus be determined in the record management plans of the institution how to manage these, whether they should be placed with the contents of the tubes or separated into their own area.

The organization of the tubes according to the tube names was analyzed for congruency. While the tubes were titled, their contents often did not match the label. Based on the local practice of the archive appraisal, processors determined whether it was better to maintain the integrity of the tubes, the original organization that is generally preferred in archival work, or create a new system. In situations where a mixture of drawings had been grouped in a single tube or where identical drawings had been placed in different tubes, it was decided to reorganize the drawing, and place a reference number to the original tube on each document.

Filing categories determined to be appropriate for Kananaskis were site inventory and analysis; studies and schematics; master plans; illustrative plans; graphic process; timelines; grading and topography; construction details and specifications; day lodge; parcel a; parcel b; parcel c; Fortress Junction Service Centre; maintenance building; staff housing; illustrations; document packages; and Banff Downtown Enhancement. The clusters were labeled one (1) through eighteen (18). Within the clusters, each drawing received a number as well. Thus, the labeling system evolved into which the project number (Kananaskis was 1), cluster number (Studies and Schematics were 3), and
drawing number were listed on the back corner of each drawing and recorded on the spreadsheet. Appendices B, C, and D contain a copy of the final spreadsheets. A letter was sometimes attached at the end of the code when a drawing was part of an inseparable package or two drawings were secured together. The number system becomes an code which titles each drawing by listing project number, cluster number, drawing number, and a letter which would indicate if it was part of a set, all in descending order. The drawing labeled 1.3.31.A. is one part of a study or schematic described as a concept drawing of the village core including hardscape and grading. Tube numbers for their archival housing in the final coding system were not encouraged, because their location may change with time. Thus, the code 1.3.31.A. does not reference the tube number, only the cluster number because of the possibility of their housing changing. A unique cluster that was created for the Kananaskis project was entitled graphic process. This cluster includes documents and drawings that show some of the unique reprographic media no longer prominently used by design firms. The printing processes and techniques that have since been lost were specifically retained as examples in this project.

The arrangement and description of High Desert went a lot smoother after the lessons learned from Kananaskis. The initial review of the tubes showed that some were organized according to tube names, but some of the descriptive labels did not tell what was really contained in the tube. One tube in particular held only a note reading “Transferred to Santa Fe for CF archive.” The original contents of that tube have not been determined, but drawings matching the tube name were not found during processing. Because of the only partial order of the drawings, it was decided that as
much of the order would be preserved as possible, but cluster divisions for parcels or tracts like in Kananaskis would be followed to finish the organization. The final cluster titles are as follows: High Desert Trailhead; Parcel 2; Parcel 3; Site Analysis and Inventory; High Desert Office; Planting Plans; Parcel 7 (Apartments); Parks at High Desert; Century Theaters; Streetscapes; Topography and Grading; Studies & Schematics; High Desert Master Plan; Illustrations & Imagery; Parcel 15; Parcel 16 (The Trailhead); Master Development Schedule; Consultant Works; and Engineering/Utility Packages.

The last two clusters were not drawing clusters that are planned for constant retention in each project, but they best address Design Workshop’s role in this project. They are placed at the end of the series, in case future needs warrant their removal. Some of the planting plans did not seem to match any of the parcel plans, and were not labeled, making it difficult to ascertain where they should be organized. They received their own unique cluster.

ASPCOL is a collection of construction documents and master plans with only slight variations. Most are not original drawings. The drawings that would be considered part of the design process are minimal. The quantity of drawings that came from the ASPCOL project was very few in number. Kananaskis and High Desert had required months to process, whereas ASPCOL took a couple days. It is a small collection, which indicated that intense culling had occurred before it was donated to the University. The only items removed from the project were a couple duplicates, which were purged to follow protocol. The original order of this project was maintained because it was understandable and already followed the organization assigned to the other Design
Workshop projects. The clusters were titled after the tubes they arrived in: Topography & Grading; Master Plan; Planting & Irrigation Plans; Equestrian Center; Tennis Court; and Pond. The drawings were almost all dated, allowing call numbers for the finding aid to follow chronologic order. The arrangement of each of these projects is then supplemented by the descriptions created for the finding guide.

The International Council on Archives (1999) has determined that “the purpose of archival description is to identify and explain the context and content of archival materials in order to promote its accessibility” (p. 7). Nelb wrote that “description is the method by which the archivist conveys information about the records to those who need them” (Lowell & Nelb, 2006, p. 98). The availability and utility of archives is determined by the descriptions assigned by the archivist, because if they are not effective, understanding is lost. The quality and depth of descriptions reflect the institution’s intent for the use of the collection. Shepherd and Lowell (2000) proposed the creation of miniature scope notes which help identify the contents of the collection series can prove to be the most effective finding aid. These are provided within the finding aid for the DWADC. Whether the collection contains detailed lists of contents or stop at the series level, the narrative will ensure use of the archives. Shepherd and Lowell (2000) suggested the content of the descriptive paragraphs will “typically contain information relating to the types of records (unless this information is obvious from the subseries list), the subjects or activities documented in the series, and any strengths or weaknesses in the records. Names of significant correspondents, clients, collaborators, or projects may also be pointed out here” (p. 10).
Scope and content notes are a narrative description which help guide the user through the collection. With the dependence on digital media and internet access to the digital collection, it is important to include series and often subseries descriptions to help increase navigability. While scope and content notes are important, they should be fairly brief. Details including size, title, and medium of the drawings are not necessary to record. Nelb noted “an item-level description model is appropriate for managing holdings of unique single items, but is poor archival practice for large design collections” (Lowell & Nelb, 2006, p. 100). In a review of the Environmental Design Archives’ process at University of California at Berkley, many of their archives contained detailed item-level lists while others lacked any description at all. The efforts to conduct a thorough analysis of some of the drawings to a level more in keeping with a collection of fine art had apparently caused the neglect of other collections. They found that it would be more effective with the quantity of archives they were dealing with to lessen the depth and increase the breadth of their archival descriptions. By limiting their arrangement and description to the series level, archivists were able to manage the quantity of collections. They suggest, above all, creating a set of standards to enhance the consistency throughout the collection with a common set of terminology and arrangement. This consistency benefits both the archivist and the future researcher. One of the difficulties the Environmental Design Archives at the University of California at Berkeley faced in their collections is the unique mixture of both tube drawings and box files within an architectural or landscape project. They suggest creating both a folder list and a project index. Shepherd and Lowell (2000) explained that “the folder list follows the standard
format, listing the folders within the context of series and subseries and including the box and folder numbers, folder title, and dates of the records. It is used to describe the records that are not project-related, such as personal and professional papers, faculty records, and some office records” (p. 11). They continued, “The project index is an alphabetical list of projects, with additional descriptive data and pointers to any existing textual records, photographs, and drawings relating to that project.” The combination of the two systems helps orient the researcher and ease use of the collections.

The files that contain the design proposals, client correspondence, and office meeting minutes help to create context for the project. Even when the drawings used to document the design process have been discarded, these textual records help to illustrate the timeline and efforts that went into the project. While some of the textual records are not necessary to retain, many assist in understanding the depth and breadth of design efforts. The box files also help to define the role the firm played in the project. Above all, Lowell suggested “knowledge of the history of design and the built environment will enhance the appraisal process” (Lowell & Nelb, 2006, p. 83).

Kananaskis highlights the need for communication between the storage facility and the firm. Before time is spent processing, preparing, and storing a project, there should be a detailed discussion of project importance. The initial process of collection evaluation included a cursory perusal of the drawings in an attempt to gain an overview perspective of acquisition contents. Reading through the contract, bid proposal, and final submission documents helped to determine what to keep and guided suggestions for learning object material. The narrative descriptions provided in the book Toward Legacy
along with their own project detail and narrative capture of each project shed light on Design Workshop’s efforts, including their role in the project, the underlying motivations of the efforts shown, and the chronology of the project. Knowledge of project significance will help in arranging and describing the projects.

Through careful coordination with the firm and examination of existing project narratives, the arrangement and description of the projects is fairly straightforward. Original order should be maintained whenever possible. When order is imposed on the project, it should be sensitive to the way the firm would have used the records and lend itself to future use. Organization within the pilot year maintained original order when it was feasible to do so, grouping series and subseries accordingly. The organization helps to highlight the steps of the design process. Descriptions should highlight the important aspects of the project; providing a clear, concise description will reduce confusion and enhance the utility of the finding guide. Thoughtful arrangement and description will aid in the usability and help to encourage frequent use of the archive content.
CHAPTER VI

MANAGEMENT AND STORAGE OF ITEMS

In a review of long-term maintenance standard best practices, temperature, humidity, mold, pollutants, and light can have some of the most detrimental impacts on archival records. Archival storage entails strict climate management, including temperature, humidity, and lighting. Existing physical space to be dedicated to the collection, financial resources for the storage format (whether flattened in drawers, framed for display, or rolled in tubes), and potential for future additions to the collection all influence retention plans. The control of climatic effects can augment the life of the archives.

A few storage facility standards will also help preserve drawings before they are given to an institution for archiving. High temperature and high humidity can quickly deteriorate records. Light can be very damaging because it can both fade images and darken the medium they are on. Ultraviolet light is detrimental and should always be avoided to ensure a viable lifespan for the records. When drawings are stored in tubes, they should be stored in low light areas with no natural light. When drawings are stored in tubes, those tubes should be laid on their side rather than on end to maintain the integrity of the paper. Following standard practice for humidity and temperature within storage facilities is very important. Keeping the temperature of the facility at the very warmest at 75° F, but preferably 65° F, slows deterioration of the drawings (Lowell & Nelb, 2006). Relative humidity should be kept below 45%, with new standards recommending 35%. This helps protect the drawings from mold and rapid degradation.
The Utah State University’s archive facility remains at 63°F and has a humidity level of less than 35%.

In storage efforts, flat storage drawers are preferred, but cost, space, condition, and quality of the drawings are often the determining factor. If drawings are less valuable, more durable, or if cost and space become an issue, they can be rolled around an acid-free tube, tied with flat cotton “tape,” and stored in tubes with caps to keep out the dust. The mediums in the Design Workshop drawings are stored without rolling them around a tube, as they prove to be sturdy without the additional support. Within the storage element of the archives, equilibrium must be struck between balancing the budget and conservation (Lowell & Nelb, 2006). In creating more digital objects and storing fewer originals as a way to afford archiving these types of collections, this is one of the problems to overcome with the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection.

After labeling all of the Kananaskis drawings, they were rolled into bundles of manageable size, which often were about twenty drawings per roll. The rolls were wrapped with archival quality Mylar to protect corners and edges during storage and retrieval. The Mylar rolls were labeled with a project number, cluster number, and drawing numbers before storage in archival tubes. The inside of the archival tube was labeled according to what rolls were housed therein, and a corresponding label was placed on the outside of the tube top as well. The other projects are stored in the same manner. The box files, photographs, slides, and other items were transferred to archival folders and stored in archival boxes. Through attentive control of environment and
storage factors, the life of these drawings, documents, photographs, and slides are preserved.
CHAPTER VII
CREATING A DIGITAL COLLECTION

The creation of a digital collection to work in partnership with a traditional archive presents a variety of challenges. Enabling easy access to a digital collection requires reformatting of physical documents, acquiring access to facilities which can create a digital copy of a physical document, acclimating to constantly update digital file programs, obtaining substantial digital storage, and providing the depth of information to make the collection useful. Daunting as this may be, the value of a digital collection is immeasurable. A thorough digital collection can enable a much larger user group to have access to the collection. The creation of the digital portion of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection helps in the development of learning objects, preservation of key documents, and extended lifespan of the materials.

Reformatting a traditional archive increases accessibility, preserves records from deterioration, and protects originals from overuse. Reformatting is generally used in efforts to preserve drawings or records when the original document shows signs of deterioration. It can also be preferred when a drawing is in high use to preserve the original and allow the surrogate to receive the wear and tear. Digital scanning, electrostatic copies, microfilm, and photography are the four means to reformat physical drawings suggested by Tawny Nelb, a private archival consultant and member of the Society of American Archivists (Lowell & Nelb, 2006). Small drawings can be scanned with a flatbed scanner but for larger documents, photographs or large format scanners have to be utilized. Protection of the drawing when using any of these methods is vitally
important. For large format roll-through scanners, Nelb suggests using a clear, two-sided carrier. Miller (1990) specified using 6 mil clear polyester to protect the drawing. In this method, one sheet of the polyester is folded in half and creased along one edge. The drawing is placed within the polyester envelope and the folded edge is fed through the scanner first. This keeps the document flat, protecting damaged edges from additional wear, and shields sensitive media such as graphite from rubbing on mechanical parts. About an inch of overlap on every side helps to hold down rolled edges and protects the drawing during the scanning process. With the Design Workshop drawings, this method obscured colors and created overexposed light streaks in the digital copy. Placement of a blank sheet of bond paper behind drawings on trace and other semi-transparent mediums during scanning helps increase the contrast and quality of the scan. Images needing to be photographed are placed on a vacuum board to hold down rolled corners during capture. While digital images will all require upgrades with time, they do open the use of the archives to a much larger audience than the delicate and often unwieldy originals would permit.

A flatbed scanner was used in the Digital Initiatives Department of the Library for smaller documents up to 11” by 17”. The Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department has a roll-through large format scanner for larger documents up to 36” wide. Still, many of the drawings for Kananaskis were too large even for the roll-through scanner. For these larger documents, a Hasselblad overhead digital camera owned by the Library was utilized. Drawings would be mounted and photographed, requiring very high selection standards because of the cost and tediousness of the task.
Many of the drawings, because of the selection criteria, were also incredibly delicate. A roll-through scanner could damage the drawings if they were sent through unprotected. A document sandwich idea was proposed in which the drawings would be placed between two sheets of a clear material and sent through the scanner, protecting the document from tears and jamming. Acetate holds the documents well, but reflects the light from the scanner and created large blue streaks in the scanned image. Mylar and matte acetate were too opaque and discolored the scans. Reformatting images using digital scanning, electrostatic copies, microfilm, and photography provides access to physical drawings and records. Beyond these digital surrogates, the born-digital records also host a plethora of valuable information that needs to be preserved. Creating a digital surrogate is another form of appraisal. Because of the expense involved in managing digital material one must weigh consideration of cost versus access in selecting digital objects.

A digital collection entails more than just scans and photographs. The adoption of computer-aided design (CAD), computerized geographic information systems (GIS), and other “born-digital” technologies as standard office practice add to both the depth and challenge of digital archive collections. The amount of digital records, the instability of storage media, and the shortening lifespan of programs and computers which can interpret the information create a real stumbling block for digital archives. Recording and storage technologies are constantly changing, and the longevity of digital formats is still unknown. New operating systems will not process the old data, and old systems which helped to create the data are increasingly difficult to find. Converting 3.5” and
5.25” floppy disks, tape drives, and proprietary media such as Iomega disks to a viable archival medium is challenging (Mitchell, 1996). More ominously, Dale Flecker (2003), Associate Director for Planning and Systems at Harvard University Library, noted the grave issues facing digital archive collections currently in his discussion that “changes in technology will ensure that over relatively short periods of time, both the media and the technical format of old digital materials will become unusable. Keeping digital resources usable by future generations requires conscious effort and continual investment” (p. 10).

There are two generally accepted methods of preserving born-digital objects. Migration is the system in which a document from an old format is moved to a new format as standards evolve and new formats are created. This would include the upgrading of an Adobe Portable Document Format (pdf) file from the Version 1.0 to Version 10.0, released in 1993 and 2010, respectively. This allows the document or file to be constantly accessible to the general user. While this sounds simple, it is time consuming and reliant upon the software available for transfer. A single Adobe Reader would not be able to read both a Version 1.0 file and one created in Version 10.0. The file would have to be upgraded, or migrated, as the software became available. Some programs provide for reading past versions, but limit the depth. Version 10.0 can only read pdf files from Version 5.0 or newer. Program formats are constantly changing, and while text files are not too difficult to bring into newer formats, design files are another story. Computer generated geometric models contain intense formulas and information that can often only be read by its creating software. Emulation, the second method, attempts to write old software onto new computers. This effort has been pursued by people like Jeff
Rothenberg of RAND and companies like IBM for over 60 years. This is a very well-established method in computer science and engineering, but it is not perfect either. It shows systematic flaws and can run into problems with storage. As Clifford Lynch (2004) noted, “digital preservation is not accomplished through a single ‘right’ strategy, but is ultimately a set of carefully considered choices in support of specific objectives” (p. 617). The chosen process for archiving digital media should be determined by potential uses, feasibility of storage, and the ability of the archivist to migrate or emulate file data as necessary.

Conversion is not the only cause of problems in digital archive efforts. Firms should be encouraged to create digital filing structures that can be followed and understood by the archive. A lack of consistent filing at the firm can lead to very slow processing at the institution. The tendency of offices to retain everything or create files which lack a specific labeling system causes confusion for the archivist and are very time consuming to review. File names often do not follow a recognizable pattern. It is a challenging proposition for archivists to deal with the immense amount of digital records being created and donated to archival collections. While memory and digital space may seem endless, there are significant costs for storage space and access issues for digital media at the institutional level.

Both storage space and storage devices can be costly and troublesome. As is seen with compact discs and the floppy disks that preceded them, digital storage media once considered stable and long-lasting, are proving unstable and short-lived. External hard drives, the preferred method by many to manage their own digital records have
demonstrated short-comings. When a hard drive is not operated frequently enough, it can lose its ability to store information and simply seize up. Efforts are desperately needed to create efficient methods for dealing with digital media in archives. This current issue threatens the permanency of the designs which have been created in the past few decades (Mitchell, 1996).

While creating and storing digital archives may seem to be a daunting endeavor, there are reasons to pursue their creation. Effective redundancy of important documents, both in paper and digital format, provides some insurance against loss or destruction (Flecker, 2003). The creation of digital surrogates has created a new safeguard in document preservation, and has immeasurably opened up access to otherwise seemingly inaccessible physical documents. The difference between digital surrogates and born-digital material is that digital surrogates generally are scanned or photographed with archiving in mind. The methods used to create the digital copy and the format used to preserve it generally follow a systematic approach that is supported by library staff and facilities. Because of the well-developed best practices of format and resolution, digital replications of physical documents are much easier to archive from the outset.

For the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, one of the concerns with the creation of the digital collection was the temporary nature of digital media. The images could be migrated periodically as software upgrades occur in order for them to be continually readable. Existing digital media could be converted from program files like AutoCAD into unalterable, readable pdf or TIFF files. This was reviewed by Design
Workshop. They concluded that for some of the E files the content was not worth the cost of migration.

Along with the reformatting of the large scale drawings and born digital design files, the box files and records are also incorporated into the digital collection. Staff in the Digital Initiatives Department scans all of the box file contents for access through the Utah State University Digital Library. A few drawings were scanned initially to determine best practices for the available facilities. The drawings were scanned at 300 dpi and 400 dpi to see how large the digital files would be and to test the image quality they would provide. The 300 dpi scans showed plenty of detail because of the size of the originals. TIFF is an archival format for digital images, and although it creates much larger file sizes, it preserves the highest quality image. TIFFs also ensure future migration of the data. It was an obvious choice for the archives. From the TIFF files, JPEGs could be created later for online access. Digital images were labeled according to the label assigned to their paper original. Also, the scanned images would be temporarily stored on a large portable hard drive, which offers its own problems. There was a need to find a central storage system. While the collection of digital files is small the library is able to provide sufficient memory space on the existing servers. As the number and size of digital files grows, there will be a need to purchase more digital media storage space as it surpasses the capacity on the Merrill-Cazier Library’s current system.
In meetings with Design Workshop and Utah State University libraries, it was proposed that an electronic interface be used as the most viable dissemination of information about the inner workings of the firm. This would include design business practices that are not thoroughly addressed by the project files, media blurbs, and a capture of the big ideas as they evolved across individual and multiple projects. This would enable project organization to remain intact while highlighting connections. It was also proposed that pictures of key Design Workshop staff involved in each project could be captured along with a sample of their hand.

Figure 7.1. Joe Porter during the recording of an oral history.
lettering, a unique record of their own work and influence. The addition of this information would help tie the digital collection together as a cohesive whole.

One of the features of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection is the oral history portion of the digital collection. Preparation for the oral history portion of the archives included the review of project narratives and interview questions. Some things that were important to Culbertson to address included key features of the site that shaped the plan; program development; the big idea which married the site and program together; unusual tales or client characteristics (motives or desires) which altered the plan; critical economic or financial objectives which shaped the plan; forces of change within the plan; the existence and influence of other affiliates on the project (this would include documenting the connection with any key people or firms of significance); any project lineage that involves this project; and overall successes (what worked, what did not, and what can be learned from the efforts). A valuable model for the development of the oral histories is The Cultural Landscapes Foundation. Creating a connection with the Foundation will prove to both help inform Utah State University’s own process, but could also connect the two groups and increase web traffic between them. Oral histories will help highlight the importance of project methodology to casual users of the archives as well as help dictate learning objects for the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department.

The digital portion of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection provides access to a large audience and preserves many different design formats. Digital scanning and photography will help to protect documents currently in poor condition and
shield important records from too much handling. Migration and emulation efforts will help ensure continued access to the archives. Extending access to the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection through the web will help encourage use, enhance learning opportunities, and begin to overcome the gap between students and the built landscapes which inspire them. Despite the challenges inherent in maintaining a digital collection, the collection will prove to enhance learning, preserve the past, and inspire the future.
Mogharreban and Guggenheim (2008) defined learning objects as “object-oriented programming, a paradigm of software engineering where software programs are built using modules that are interoperable, reusable, and easier to maintain than their monolithic counterparts. In a similar fashion, an academic course can be broken up into computer-mediated instructional units that possess these same qualities—portability, adaptability, reusability, and ease of maintenance.” In a study of high school students studying engineering and architecture in 2006 and 2007, two-thirds of the students in the classroom reported benefits in understanding through this pedagogical tool known as learning objects (Kay, 2006). First credited to Wayne Gerard in 1994 (Polsani, 2003), learning objects gained broad recognition from Hodgins’ (Wiley, 2000) application to a working group within the Computer Education Management Association in that same year. These learning objects provide motivational, interactive, and visual qualities that help increase attention and aid in understanding (Nugent, 2006). Learning objects are often used and reused in partial form for teaching material (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh, & Murphy, 2002; Rehak & Mason, 2003; Boyle, 2003; El Saddik, Fischer, & Steinmetz, 2001). “Instead of constantly re-inventing the wheel, educators can access shared online libraries of quality interactive Learning Objects to enhance the delivery of their courses and the quality of the learning experience for their students” (Cochrane, 2005). Learning objects are valuable as learner guided tools (Bannan-Ritland, et al., 2002). As part of the learning orientations theory, personalizing learning based on a whole-person perspective,
including emotion and intentions on learning, learning objects help to increase the depth of knowledge students gain (Martinez, 2002). Oral histories, timelines, and final products can help address different learning methods for students. With computers becoming an inseparable part of the student environment, the importance of learning objects is inextricably linked to education (McGreal, 2004).

One specific goal of the Design Workshop pilot year involved experimentation with the creation of learning objects. During the collection appraisal process, a running list of potential learning object themes was compiled. Numerous topics were identified within the Kananaskis project alone, including large-scale issues such as the evolution of a master plan and the design process. At a more focused level, possible topics ranged from grading to graphics. There were evident evolutions in the site plan, which could inform a study of the progression from the earliest to the final design. Showing time lapse evolution of the design through sequential schematics, developed as the plan matured, could be used to illustrate changes. Employing “voice-over” from the firm, information could be shared about reasons for changes and allow students to explore the differences. Studies from a redesign of the Banff Downtown, a spin-off project from Kananaskis, demonstrate the production of numerous concepts in a short amount of time. A study of the design constraints that were faced and their impacts on the final design would be valuable to understand. Looking at the unique design process exhibited by Sergio Santana, a frequent collaborator on Design Workshop projects, and his subtractive design method could help students see variations in the design process. A significant potential learning object identified by Design Workshop principal and co-founder Joe
Porter might portray the project’s site analysis. A conglomerate of more than forty hand-drawn maps including site inventory, attractiveness studies, and vulnerability studies led to alternative plans representing the feasibility for the resort. This analysis was a landmark effort in site analysis and planning, an ideal focus for a learning object. One of the stories of the Kananaskis project which really stands out in the site illustrative plans, the perspectives, elevations, and site photographs is the respect paid to the genius loci, or spirit of the place, through siting and design expression. The quality of the renderings really helps users understand what it feels like to be in the place and what Design Workshop had in mind in its creation. While these drawings may not fit into a learning object on their own, their integration into the display for the archives really captures the attention.

During the time that learning objects were being considered using the Kananaskis project, the accessioning and processing of the High Desert project began. It was immediately evident that High Desert’s quantity of drawings detailed the design process much more comprehensively than the Kananaskis project. Because Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department faculty were interested in employing a digital learning module in the spring semester of the pilot year, the course offerings were examined to find where a learning object from Kananaskis or High Desert could enhance the classroom curriculum. Within the High Desert project, a particularly rich group of drawings had been retained portraying the multiple phases of the design process for a portion of the development known as Parcel 7, depicting numerous aspects of analysis, adaptation, and creativity. Because of the quantity, quality, and subject matter
of these drawings, High Desert Parcel 7 was selected as the pilot learning module developed by the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department. Professor Carlos Licón developed the creation and storyline of the module to fit the needs of his Residential Planning and Design course, which focuses on introducing theory and methods of neighborhood and community planning. The potential for immediate application in this classroom setting helped expedite the creation of the learning module. A copy of this learning module is contained in Appendix E.

High Desert contains a large collection of illustrations and details that had been produced for the sustainability guidelines document. Samples of arches, columns, and chimneys, among others features, were drawn in ink on trace. There was also a collection of building and landscape perspectives for approved and unapproved styles. The graphic quality and techniques exhibited in the drawings are wonderful additions to the archives.

Beyond the illustrations, High Desert contained numerous other stories to tell. Computer-created line work was used to lay out wire-frame perspectives of the development. These were then traced and enhanced by hand. These computer drafting techniques were revolutionary for the time, and have since been superseded by other computer programs. Processes that students use to render perspectives today often use new computer program such as Google Sketch-Up, AutoCAD, and VectorWorks to create three-dimensional images much more efficiently.

Other landscape architecture faculty initiated use of archive drawings and prints in the classroom for object lessons. The students respectfully cared for the drawings and were enriched by the experience. During the archiving of High Desert, one of the
graduate research assistants was enrolled in a construction document class. Recognizing the value of the construction documents and the current subject matter of the class, with the teacher’s supportive interest a set of construction documents were brought into the classroom to help explain the title page of a package. Students did not stop at the examination of the front page of the construction document package, but delved into many of the other lessons they could learn from the print set. Several times after the original showing of the package, students requested their return to the classroom for additional study. This instance helps show the value the archives hold for the landscape architecture students and the eagerness students have to incorporate them into classroom learning.

High Desert was the first project to really be integrated into classroom learning and has proven to be a success. Students are eager to review the drawings and professors are willing to incorporate the material into their lessons. An alumnus of the program who is currently studying information technology is eager to help the program incorporate the archives into distance learning opportunities. The work with High Desert has really propelled the educational pursuits of the archives.

As sorting and cataloguing of the Design Workshop collection proceeded, selected drawings were scanned for possible use in learning objects based on the pre-identification of potential themes. The learning object probing the design process of High Desert Parcel 7, having been clearly outlined, greatly facilitated the scanning efforts for that project. Results from the pilot year emphasize the value of “mining” the collection for its educational benefits. The involvement of landscape architecture faculty members
in the collection to enhance across-the-board awareness of its value as a classroom resource is critical. Project narratives, descriptions, box file contents, and the finding aid should be available to faculty as new projects are added to the collection. This should help inspire professors to work directly with processors to generate ideas for additional learning objects. Because of the interest that students have already exhibited in the collection, it would be beneficial to incorporate them in the selection of those learning objects. Advanced students are often very aware of the topics which could use more attention and support in the classroom. Compiling a list of their interests may also help in the selection of learning modules and their subsequent success. This could be accomplished through classroom assignments to use the archives, mid- and end-of-semester course reviews, and general polling. Whether the drawings have been reformatted into digital media or are only available in their original form, their use in the classroom will help stimulate interest in the archives and augment learning opportunities.
CHAPTER IX

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

The Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection provides a unique opportunity for Utah State University Libraries and the LAEP Department to partner with one of the top landscape architecture firms in the United States. It is a chance to place an emphasis on “the coordination and collaboration of records creators, custodians such as archivists, and the users of records” (Cox, 1996, p. 146). The Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection are built around the goal of melding professional and academic endeavors, preserving history while bridging the gap between academia and the profession. The archives reach far beyond that scope, though, by telling the story of the development of the modern western United States. With the digital collection available, students, scholars, and designers throughout the world will have access to this monumental compilation of work. The collection offers an opportunity for professionals to preserve their work in a way which will allow students and other professionals to access it from a distance or work with the actual documents. Within the collaboration between Design Workshop, the Merrill-Cazier Library, and the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department, each participant has a unique interest in the preservation of the collection, helping to insure its use and vitality.

The pilot year of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection was a year of new experiences, experimentation with techniques, and an intensive review of best practices. As a result of hours in dim rooms amidst the fumes of deteriorating sepia prints, the archival process for the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection has
developed principles that can be applied flexibly according to a plethora of scenarios. While Kananaskis, High Desert, ASPCOL, and Summerlin each offered new challenges to the archiving methodology, their variations have helped create principles by which the archives can be appraised and processed. Additional learning opportunities will continue to surface with the archiving efforts, but the lessons that have been learned should prove beneficial for further endeavors to archive the work of landscape architecture firms and enhance their relationship with academia.

Through various additions and outlets for the collection, the digital collection is of high interest and utility for its users. A mixture of oral histories to enhance the archives, an exhibition of its contents for key interests groups, and integration into learning objects secure utility of the collection. The digital collection is an important effort within the field of landscape architecture, opening up opportunities for learning and exploration of remote locations. Classroom learning modules are already being created by the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department to utilize the archives. Digital access will also afford opportunities for teaching satellite and internet courses in a field that currently lacks that ability. Professionals can interact with the archives from the desk at their office to gain design inspiration and improve techniques. Property owners can enjoy access to the plans for their own sites and reference the archives for restoration efforts. The possible applications of the digital collection are endless. With a variety of uses and users eager to utilize the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, the archiving of the four pilot projects portends a useful future.
The digital portion of the archives should increase use of the collection, help in disseminating content, and provide additional access to those interested in the contents. As a component of the digital archives, oral histories, project story interviews, site retrospective visits, and other materials will be filmed and preserved within the collection. These will provide the possibility for researchers to examine the thread connecting projects from design inception through post-construction occupancy, as well as link with the underlying philosophies of the designers.

One of the efforts at Utah State University to familiarize potential users with the creation of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection was the installment of a large exhibit in the foyer of the Merrill-Cazier Library. During the entire archival

*Figure 9.1. Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection exhibit in the Merrill-Cazier Library on March 25, 2011.*
assessment and appraisal, possibilities for stories to tell and interesting images to display were tracked for use in the display. When it was time to select items for the display, the list of possible drawings was first scrutinized by the landscape architecture department faculty, and then presented to the library staff. Final selections of the images were often determined by feasibility for framing based on size and condition. To help visualize the space and the arrangement of the panels for the display, computerized three-dimensional Google Sketch Up models of the library foyer were created. Library and landscape architecture staff decided to pursue a theme throughout the display focusing on the people, projects, and process at Design Workshop. Kananaskis drawings were used to show site analysis and the sense of place. Trace paper drawings from High Desert were fastened behind Plexiglas to illustrate the design process, show hand rendered graphics, and emulate the pin-up board in a design office. A computer was set up for visitors to peruse the digital collection. Another set of panels held photographs and framed documents of the founders and key people of the Design Workshop firm, tying their professional lives back to their educational roots at Utah State University.

The Utah Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects hosted their annual meeting at the University on March 25, 2011 surrounding the grand opening of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection. The display for the archives and digital collection was the centerpiece for the morning breaks in the conference. Design Workshop founders Joe Porter and Don Ensign, along with current partner and principal Kurt Culbertson gave presentations during the morning session of the conference at the library about the archives and the importance of preserving the past for the future.
With rising interest in the archives, numerous discussions have begun about the future impacts of the collection and its direction. Learning objects and modules will continue to be created based on the digital collection. Oral histories are being gathered as accessioning is completed and time allows. The general process of accessioning is laid out by principles which will help to inform future work and aid in decision-making.

Implications

There was not a model available which outlined the specific issues involved in the creation of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collections. Accessioning the collection proved that the materials being addressed will dictate to some extent how the archives will be defined and the processes that will be involved. The system of checks and balances which were utilized by a collaborative team of landscape architects, library staff, landscape architecture faculty, and students helped mold the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection into its current format. As the processing of the archives continues to evolve, the roles within the collaborative team may change as well. Design Workshop has modified their in-house analysis of the records which will be sent to Utah State University for archiving. Because of the quantity of drawings encompassing the individual projects, the time required processing each project, and the cost of shipping the entirety of work, Design Workshop has begun to use the lead designer on each project to filter what is sent to the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection at Utah State University. After reevaluation of their own methodology in selecting documents for preservation, Design Workshop created a decision tree and guidelines to direct the lead
designers in culling the projects before the collection is sent to Utah State University. The shareholders want to limit the archives to specific key images which illustrate the essence of each project. The lead designer for each project at the firm decides what to keep after they have reviewed the firm’s *Records Retention Guidelines*. Their retention guidelines are fairly vague, and it is left up to the lead designer to filter through the drawings to preserve the drawings which tell the story of the project. This helps in so many ways. People intimately aware and informed of the project choose what is preserved, determining the story that is told. They are able to preserve drawings that may have gone unnoticed to uninformed archive staff. It saves on the expense of shipping. It takes much less time and expense for archive staff to prepare the drawings for the collection since they do not have to make as many value judgments on the drawings and their potential retention. Many of the benefits of Design Workshop filtering through the collection before it is sent to the University are also drawbacks. Limiting the amount of drawings by culling the collection before it is sent to the University limits the stories that can be told by the collection. Many working drawings may be purged from the collection by the firm when those may hold more educational impact for the students. Communication is still vital. Reviews should be conducted to insure that the depth of information remains intact despite the reduction in quantity of drawings. Having an informed lead designer preprocessing the collection will limit the work required to accession the archives, possibly removing the need for landscape architecture students and faculty to review the collection. It may remove the need for archivists informed of the design process. This may also highlight the need for landscape architecture faculty to
communicate with Design Workshop shareholders to specify their needs of which records should be kept.

In the pilot year of the archives, Design Workshop has been very involved. They have helped to streamline the filing system, provided project narratives, and communicated actively with the others on the collaborative team. They have endeavored to assist in problem solving and implementation of new protocol at the firm for future projects. The accessioning of the four initial projects has helped clarify the process for enlarging the collection. Because of space constraints, it was decided in the proposal phase of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection that not every project would be acquisitioned. Original estimates limit the collection that would be donated to between fifty and seventy projects.

In light of the interest generated by this collection, it is likely that other firms or individuals may approach the University seeking a repository for their works. In anticipation of this future demand, a thoughtful and well-articulated collection policy was created by the Merrill-Cazier Library Archives Department. Whether beginning a new archive or continuing work on an existing collection, challenges will arise in the preparation, accessioning, and processing. Waverly Lowell has created the seminal work on archiving design records and should be referenced as an important guide. Retiring professional landscape architects are noticing the archives, aware of their own desires to preserve their work. Those interested in preserving their own work in an institution’s archives should consider self-funding and where their work can have the most beneficial effect. Project selection is often based on the archiving institution’s interests. Institutions
can define what is held or maintained in the archives. For example, when Design Workshop approached the Colorado Library in Denver to archive their collection, the library was only interested in the projects done in Colorado. Most institutions have specific interests or stories they want to tell, and will often pursue collections that work with their theme. At Utah State University, there is an interest in hosting a Western Environmental Collection. Of their collection, approximately 20% is work that has been sought after by USU, and 80% is reactive. Each entity will want to reflect their own interests, and so it is important that when starting an archive, all interests are clarified. Self-funding the collection at an institution that has similar interests will guarantee the collection’s use and magnify its value.

Conclusion

The Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection have the potential to become a vital part of the learning environment at Utah State University. This collection will play a vital role because of the depth of knowledge it conveys, the influence it preserves from throughout the western United States, and the access it provides to students, the profession, and the general public to great works of landscape architecture. The pilot year endeavored to accession and process Kananaskis, High Desert, ASPCOL, and Summerlin for the archive collection. The integration of a digital collection gathered from physical drawings, paper manuscripts, and computer files offers exclusive opportunities to establish standards and procedures for the creation of the archives at Utah State University. Scholarly review of the archives evidenced the need for an altered
approach to the archiving process in order to support the creation of the digital collection and the quantity of project material. Additional measures were created to appropriately represent and preserve the unique visual components of the works. Processing protocol, classroom learning objects, an exhibition, and oral histories have been developed to enhance the collection based on best practices. The collaboration of professionals, archivists, and landscape architecture staff to create the archives has proven to be very useful. The further growth and development of the collection will capitalize on the lessons learned in the pilot year while undoubtedly inspiring new protocol as its uses augment. The history of Design Workshop, portrayed through the contents and further development of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection, will help to enrich the field of landscape architecture and the comingling educational pursuits.
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APPENDIX A

DECISION TREE
Decide which order of preservation based on intended uses, a desire to preserve project integrity, preserve the work included in award winning projects, and enhancing preservation decisions already exhibited by the firm.

Attain complete set of drawings and informational spreadsheet

Research information to inform the archivist of the essence of the project, including its importance and the key aspects as outlined by Design Workshop. Information could be resourced from Design Workshop’s Legacy, project narratives provided by the firm, independent internet research, award applications, and conversations with Design Workshop representatives.

Record drawing name and supplemental information, including the date the drawing was created, the scale, and any information about who the drawing is attributed to, in project spreadsheet.

Inscribe using pencil the origination tube number on the back of the drawing in the bottom right-hand corner as well as the number in which it was processed to preserve original order.

Remove articles that will definitely not be included in the archive: documents with severe tears, sepia prints, duplicates, staples, paperclips, sticky notes after recording content, and other objects which may compromise the structural integrity of the documents.

For those drawings with inherent value despite their existing condition, it may be necessary to take additional measures for their preservation. This could include removing compromising materials such as gummy residue or preparing the drawing for digital replication. Scanning or photographing the drawing will preserve its current condition since marker lines may continue to bleed and the material will continue to degrade.

Organize drawings into clusters following the design process with additional project-specific drawings at the end. Cluster titles could include Site Inventory & Analysis, Construction Documents, Illustrative Plans, Studies & Schematics, Project Timelines, Construction Details & Specifications, Topography & Grading, Planting & Irrigation, Illustrations & Imagery, and Master Plans.

Further culling can be conducted on individual clusters when they are divided, laid out, and examined in smaller number. At this time it is easier to recognize duplicates and recognize chronological order.

Assign a call number to each document, inscribing the call number on the reverse side of the drawing in the lower righthand corner in pencil. Record the call number with document details on spreadsheet following the call number protocol: Project #. Cluster #. Document #.
APPENDIX B

KANANASKIS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 1: Illustrative Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.  Pen &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sheet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sheet 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.  Pencil on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.  Pencil on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4.  Print on Acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5.  Pen &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6.  Pen &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7.  Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8.  Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9.  Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.10. Print splices on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.11. Print &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12. Print on Vellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.13. Print on Vellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.14. Print on Acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.15. Print &amp; Marker on Photo Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.16. Print on Photo Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.17. Print, Ink, &amp; Pencil on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 2: Site Analysis & Inventory**

<p>| 1.2.1. | Print &amp; Pencil on Mylar | Canmore Corridor Sub-Region: Recreation Facilities Map |
| 1.2.2. | Ozalid on Bond | Site plan with existing features labeled |
| 1.2.3. | Reduction on Acetate | Nakiska/Mount Allan map of ski runs/routes and chairlifts |
| 1.2.4. | Print on Mylar | Survey map of topography compiled by Walter E. Bright A.L.S. 1979 |
| A. Sheet 1 |
| B. Sheet 2 |
| 1.2.5. | Print on Mylar | Survey map of topography with Village footprint added 5 May 1982 compiled by Walter E. Bright A.L.S. |
| 1.2.6. | Ozalid on Bond | Survey map of topography with Village footprint added 5 May 1982 compiled by Walter E. Bright A.L.S.; includes handwritten notes |
| 1.2.7. | Print on Mylar | Regional contour map with 5 meter intervals |
| 1.2.8. | Print on Bond | Regional contour map with 5 meter intervals containing vegetated boundaries, roads, poles, etc; Scale 1:5000 |
| 1.2.9. | Print on Mylar | Filed plan of survey of Parcel 1 in Section 35, Twp. 22, Rge. 9, W. 5th M. &amp; Section 2, Twp. 23, Rge. 9, W 5th M. and intervening road allowance; Scale 1:2000; 2 January 1987 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.10.</td>
<td><strong>Print on Mylar</strong></td>
<td>Schedule A Property Subject to Common Area Lease; Scale 1:2000; 3 May 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.11.</td>
<td><strong>Print on Mylar</strong></td>
<td>Schedule A Property Subject to Common Area Lease; Scale 1:2000; 7 October 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.12.</td>
<td><strong>Ozalid on Bond</strong></td>
<td>Pan of Survey of Subdivision of a Portion of Parcel 1, Plan 851 0413 within Section 35, Twp. 22, Rge. 9, W 5th M. and Section 2, Twp. 23, Rge. 9, W 5th M. and Intervening Closed Road Allowance; Scale 1:2000; April 1, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.13.</td>
<td><strong>Print on Acetate</strong></td>
<td>Evan Thomas Development Area Outline Plan Alternatives Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.14.</td>
<td><strong>Print on Acetate</strong></td>
<td>Evan Thomas Development Area Outline Plan Alternatives Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.15.</td>
<td><strong>Sepia Print</strong></td>
<td>Evan Thomas Development Area Outline Plan Alternatives Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.16.</td>
<td><strong>Print on Acetate</strong></td>
<td>Evan Thomas Development Area Outline Plan Alternatives Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.17.</td>
<td><strong>Ozalid on Bond</strong></td>
<td>Plan showing location of select trees and access road cross sections compiled by D.R. McWilliam, A.L.S.; Scale 1:1000; 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.18.</td>
<td><strong>Ozalid on Bond</strong></td>
<td>Plan showing control monuments established access road existing clearings and utilities; D.R. McWilliam, A.L.S.; Scale 1:1000; 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.19.</td>
<td><strong>Ozalid Package</strong></td>
<td>Kananaskis Country Recreation Plan Regional Utilities (Evan Thomas Regional Utilities Underground Utilities) compiled by Reid,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Sheet 1
B. Sheet 2
C. Sheet 3
D. Sheet 4
E. Sheet 5
F. Sheet 6
G. Sheet 7
H. Sheet 8
I. Sheet 9
J. Sheet 10
K. Sheet 11
L. Sheet 12
M. Sheet 13

1.2.20. Print & Ink on Mylar
Ribbon Creek Village Regional Plan;
Scale 1:10,000; July 1985

1.2.21. Print & Marker on Bond
Ribbon Creek Village Regional Plan;
Scale 1:10,000; July 1985

1.2.22. Print & Colored Pencil on Bond
Developable land summary;
Scale 1:500; 19 May 1986

1.2.23. Print & Marker on Bond
Analysis of slopes, critical wildlife
area, and sun points

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 3: Studies & Schematics

1.3.1. Pencil on Trace
Parcel C: Roof height calculations

1.3.2. Pencil on Trace
Day Lodge: Roof height calculations

1.3.3. Ozalid on Bond
Day Lodge: Ground floor plan
designed by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine; Scale 1:100; 1 June 1985

1.3.4. Pencil on Trace
Calculations for support, parking,
and vehicular circulation

1.3.5. Pencil on Trace
Calculations for food and beverage,
parking, and support

1.3.6. Pencil on Trace
Calculations for circulation, storage,
and bay windows

1.3.7. Print on Mylar
Site plan circulation study
1.3.8. Print on Mylar  
Site plan circulation study

1.3.9. Print on Mylar  
Site plan circulation study

1.3.10. Marker on Ozalid  
Design constraints including paving, water features, open space, fire lanes, and pedestrian circulation

1.3.11. Marker on Trace  
Circulation study

1.3.12. Marker on Ozalid  
Landscape plan with limit of irrigation highlighted

1.3.13. Ink on Trace  
Concept drawing of Village and surroundings; Scale 1:2000

1.3.14. Sepia on Mylar  
Concept drawing of Village and surroundings; Scale 1:2000

1.3.15. Ink & Marker on Trace  
Concept drawing of Village and surroundings

1.3.16. Ink & Marker on Trace  
Concept drawing of Village and surroundings

1.3.17. Ink on Mylar  
Vegetation layer for proposed entry revisions Parcels B & C; Scale 1:200m

1.3.18. Print & Marker on Bond  
Proposed entry revisions for Parcel B & C; Scale 1:200m; 27 October 1986

1.3.19. Pencil on Trace  
Proposed entry revisions for Parcel B & C; Scale 1:200m; 25 September 1986

1.3.20. Ink on Mylar  
Vegetation layer for Proposed Entry Revision for Parcels B & C; Scale 1:200 m

1.3.21. Pencil & Ink on Mylar  
Hardscape and Grading Layer for Proposed Entry Revision for Parcels B & C; Scale 1:200m

1.3.22. Ink on Vellum  
Study for service and parking entry for Parcel B; Scale 1:200; 12 August 1985

1.3.23. Ink on Vellum  
Study for entry, lobby, and service for Parcel B; Scale 1:200; 12 August 1985
1.3.24. Pencil on Trace
Proposed entry revisions for Parcels B & C attributed to Don Ensign; Scale 1:200; 25 September 1986

1.3.25. Ink & Marker on Trace
Concept drawing for Village core attributed to Sergio Santana

1.3.26. Marker on Ozalid
Concept drawing for proposed entry for Parcels B & C attributed to Don Ensign

1.3.27. Ink on Trace
Pool level and lobby level plan transferred into site section; Scale 1:500

1.3.28. Pencil on Trace
Constraint map

1.3.29. Pencil & Marker on Trace
Concept drawing of Village core with spot elevations

1.3.30. Ink & Pencil on Trace
Proposed entry revisions for Parcels B & C attributed to Richard Shaw; Scale 1:200m; 14 January 1986

1.3.31. Pencil on Mylar
Concept drawing of Village core including hardscape & Grading
   A. Sheet 1
   B. Sheet 2

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 4: Graphic Process

1.4.1. Print on Photo Paper
Spot enlargements of contour map

1.4.2. Print on Photo Paper
Spot enlargements of contour map

1.4.3. Red Contact Paper on Mylar
Limit of irrigation throughout Kananaskis

1.4.4. Red Contact Paper on Mylar
Limit of irrigation

1.4.5. Negative for Printing
Landscape plan of Village core

1.4.6. Negative for Printing
Illustrative Plan title block

1.4.7. Negative for Printing
Illustrative plan of Kananaskis with staff housing

1.4.8. Negative for Printing
Parcel A Master Plan elevations and unit plans

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 5: Timelines

1.5.1. Print on Acetate
Proposed Work Program – Kananaskis Country
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 6: Grading &amp; Topography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1. Print &amp; Ink on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2. Print &amp; Pencil on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sheet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sheet 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sheet 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3. Pencil on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.4. Pencil &amp; Ink on Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A. Sheet 1                                         |                                           |
| B. Sheet 2                                         |                                           |
| C. Sheet 3                                         |                                           |

| 1.5.2. Print on Mylar                               | Proposed Work Program – Kananaskis Country |
| 1.5.3. Print on Mylar                               | Proposed Work Program – Kananaskis Country |
| 1.5.4. Print on Mylar                               | Master Development Schedule              |
| 1.5.5. Ink on Vellum                                | Master Development Schedule              |
| 1.5.6. Pencil on Mylar                              | Kananaskis Work Schedule                 |
| A. Sheet 1                                         |                                           |
| B. Sheet 2                                         |                                           |
| C. Sheet 3                                         |                                           |

| 1.5.7. Pencil on Mylar                              | Tentative Schedule for Resort Related Operations |
| 1.5.8. Ink on Mylar                                 | Draft resort association activity schedule resort resources |
| 1.5.9. Print on Acetate                             | Summary Plan Evaluation: Outline Plan Alternatives |
| A. Sheet 1                                         |                                           |
| B. Sheet 2                                         |                                           |

| 1.5.10. Print on Acetate                            | Conceptual Design Process                |
| 1.5.11. Print on Bond                               | Conceptual Design Process                |
| 1.5.12. Print on Bond                               | Conceptual Design Process                |
| 1.5.13. Print on Photo Paper                        | Conceptual Design Process                |
| A. Sheet 1                                         |                                           |
| B. Sheet 2                                         |                                           |
| 1.5.14. Negative for Printing                       | Conceptual Design Process                |
| 1.5.15. Negative for Printing                       | Conceptual Design Process                |

| A. Sheet 1                                         |                                           |
| B. Sheet 2                                         |                                           |
| 1.6.5. | Ink on Mylar | Road ROW and recommended 40 meter setback; Scale 1:500 |
|  | A.  | Sheet 1 |
|  | B.  | Sheet 2 |
| 1.6.6. | Ink on Mylar | Road ROW and recommended 40 meter setback revision; Scale 1:500 |
|  | A.  | Sheet 1 |
|  | B.  | Sheet 2 |
| 1.6.7. | Ink on Mylar | Site grading plan; January 1985 |
| 1.6.8. | Ink on Mylar | Road ROW and recommended 40 meter setback; Sheet 2; Scale 1:500 |
| 1.6.9. | Ink on Mylar | Existing site topography; Scale 1:500; January 1986 |
|  | A.  | Sheet 1 |
|  | B.  | Sheet 2 |
|  | C.  | Sheet 3 |
| 1.6.10. | Print on Mylar | Existing site topography |
| 1.6.11. | Print on Mylar | Existing site topography; January 1985 |
| 1.6.12. | Print on Mylar | Existing site topography; revised June 1985 |
| 1.6.13. | Print on Mylar | Existing site topography; Scale 1:500; January 1986 |
| 1.6.14. | Sepia on Mylar | Regional topography map |
| 1.6.15. | Sepia print | Regional topography map; Scale 1:10,000 |
| 1.6.16. | Ozalid on Bond | Site Grading Plan |
| 1.6.17. | Print on Diazo Mylar | Phase One Master Plan with spot elevations and site grading; January 1985 |

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 7: Construction Details & Specifications

| 1.7.1. | Ozalid on Bond | South Play Structure Layout; Scale 1:200; 19 February 1988 |
| 1.7.2. | Ozalid on Bond | North Play Structure Layout; Scale 1:200; February 1988 |
| 1.7.3. | Ozalid on Bond | Play Structure Details; 19 February 1988 |
1.7.4. Ozalid on Bond

Tennis court layout and fencing

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 8: Master Plans

| 1.8.1. | Print on Mylar | Master Plan; 31 July 1985 |
| 1.8.2. | Splices on Mylar | Signage Master Plan; January 1986 |
| 1.8.3. | Print and Ink on Mylar | Village Master Plan; Scale 1:1000; January 1985 |
| 1.8.4. | Print on Mylar | Master Plan; Scale 1:1000; January 1985 revised June 1985 |
| 1.8.5. | Print and Ink on Mylar | Master Plan; January 1985 |
| 1.8.6. | Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar | Village Master Plan; Scale 1:1000; January 1985 revised June 1985 |
| 1.8.7. | Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan; January 1985 revised June 1985 revised August 1985 revised 15 October 1985 |
| 1.8.8. | Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan; January 1985 revised June 1985 revised August 1985 revised 15 October 1985 |
| 1.8.9. | Print on Diazo Mylar | Landscape Master Plan; Scale 1:200; January 1986 |

| A. | Sheet 1 |
| B. | Sheet 2 |
| 1.8.10. | Print, Ink, & Pencil on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan, January 1985 |
| 1.8.11. | Print, Ink, & Pencil on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan, January 1985 |
| 1.8.12. | Print and Splices on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan with snow maintenance provided by Alberta Transportation added to drawing on 29 October 1987; Scale 1:500 |
| 1.8.13. | Print and Splices on Diazo Mylar | Lighting Master Plan; Fall 1985 |
| 1.8.14. | Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan with building ground floor plans; January 1985 |
| 1.8.15. | Print on Mylar | Master Plan; January 1985 |
| 1.8.16. | Print and Ink on Mylar | Master Plan; Scale 1:500 |
| 1.8.17. | Print and Ink on Mylar | Master Plan drawn by Gin and Bon; January 1986 |
| 1.8.18. | Pencil on Mylar | Site Plan |
| 1.8.19. | Pencil on Mylar | Site Plan |
| 1.8.20. | Print and Ink on Spliced Mylar | Use Allocation Plan |
| 1.8.21. | Print and Pencil on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan; Scale 1:500; 19 February 1986 |
| 1.8.22. | Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar | Master Plan; Scale 1:500; January 1986 |
| 1.8.23. | Print on Mylar | Use Allocation Site Plan |
| 1.8.24. | Print on Acetate | Village Master Plan; Scale 1:1000; 30 June 1982 |
| 1.8.25. | Ink and Pencil on Mylar | Village Master Plan; Scale 1:1000; 30 June 1982 |
| 1.8.26. | Print on Mylar | Limit of Irrigation |
| 1.8.27. | Print on Mylar | Landscape Master Plan |
| 1.8.28. | Sepia Print on Mylar | Phase One Master Plan attributed to Sergio Santana; January 1985 |
| 1.8.29. | Ink and Pencil on Mylar | Use Allocation Site Plan |
| 1.8.30. | Sepia Print | Master Plan; January 1985 revised June 1985 |
| 1.8.31. | Ink on Sepia Print | Landscape Master Plan; Scale 1:500; January 1986 |
| 1.8.32. | Print on Acetate | Master Plan; January 1985 revised June 1985 |
| 1.8.33. | Ozalid on Bond | Master Plan; January 1985 |
| 1.8.34. | Print on Bond | Phase One Master Plan with Parcel A view analysis |
| 1.8.35. | Print, Ink, & Pencil on Mylar | Phase One Master Plan; January 1985 |
| 1.8.36. | Ink on Mylar | Pin Bar Master Plan Documents |
| 1.8.37. | Print on Mylar | A. Landscape |
| 1.8.38. | Ink on Mylar | B. Buildings and Surrounding Vegetation |
| 1.8.39. | Ink on Mylar | Village Core Hardscape Pin Bar Document |
| 1.8.40. | Ink on Mylar | Master Plan; Scale 1:200; January 1986 |
| 1.8.41. | Ink on Mylar | Landscape Plan Pin Bar Document |
| 1.8.42. | Ink on Mylar | Site Lighting Plan Pin Bar Document |
| 1.8.43. | Ink on Mylar | Fire Access Plan Pin Bar Document |
| 1.8.44. | Ink on Mylar | Grading Plan Pin Bar Document |
| 1.8.45. | Ink on Mylar | Landscape Master Plan Pin Bar Document |
| 1.8.46. | Ink on Mylar | Master Plan Pin Bar Document |
1.8.45. Ink on Mylar  
Landscape Vegetation Plan

1.8.46. Ink on Mylar  
Landscape Vegetation Plan Pin Bar Document

1.8.47. Ink on Mylar  
Monuments and Markers

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 9: Day Lodge

1.9.1. Ozalid Package  
Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; October 1985
A. Site Plan and Drawing Index  
B. Ground Floor Plan  
C. Ground Floor Plan  
D. Site Plan and Legend

1.9.2. Ozalid on Bond  
Ground Floor Plan by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:100m; 15 & 17 April 1985

1.9.3. Ozalid on Bond  
Site Plan by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:500; 8 May 1985

1.9.4. Ozalid Package  
Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; 4 October 1985
A. Site Plan and Drawing Index  
B. Ground Floor Plan

1.9.5. Ozalid Package  
J.H. Cook Architects and Engineers; 8 July 1982
A. Site Plan  
B. Ground Floor Plan

1.9.6. Ozalid Package  
J.H. Cook Architects and Engineers; 2 June 1982
A. Site Plan  
B. Ground Floor Plan

1.9.7. Print on Bond  
Ground Floor Plan by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; 10 June 1985
1.9.8.  Print on Acetate Spliced on Mylar  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.9.  Print on Acetate Spliced on Mylar  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.10. Print on Diazo Mylar Spliced  Day Lodge Use Allocation
1.9.11. Print on Acetate Spliced on Mylar  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.12. Ink on Ozalid  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.13. Ink on Ozalid  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.14. Ink on Ozalid  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.15. Ink on Ozalid  Day Lodge Use Allocation; Scale 1:100m; 10 November 1986
1.9.16. Print on Bond  Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; 23 July 1985

A. Site Plan
B. Ground Floor Plan
C. Elevation
D. Elevation
E. Elevation
F. Elevation
1.9.17.  Pencil on Mylar  Day Lodge Facility at Ribbon Creek
1.9.18.  Pencil on Mylar  Day Lodge Facility at Ribbon Creek

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 10: Parcel A

1.10.1.  Ink on Mylar  Parcel A Master Plan
A. Parking Level Floor Plan
B. Lobby Level Floor Plan
C. Level Two Floor Plan
D. Level Three Floor Plan
E. Loft Level Floor Plan
F. Roof Plan
G. Sections
H. Unit Plans
I. Detail Elevations
1.10.2. Ink on Mylar
   A. Lower Level
   B. Ground Level
   C. 2nd Level
   D. 3rd Level

1.10.3. Ink on Mylar
   A. Lower Level
   B. Ground Level
   C. 2nd Level
   D. 3rd Level
   E. 4th Level

1.10.4. Ink on Mylar
   A. Lower Level
   B. Ground Level
   C. 2nd Level
   D. 3rd Level

1.10.5. Print and Ink on Bond
   A. Lower Level
   B. Ground Level
   C. 2nd Level
   D. 3rd Level

1.10.6. Print and Ink on Bond
   A. Ground Level
   B. 2nd Level
   C. 3rd Level
   D. Lower Level

1.10.7. Pencil on Mylar
   Parcel A Program Summary 3rd Level

1.10.8. Pencil on Vellum
   Parcel A Program Summary Ground Level

1.10.9. Ozalid on Bond
   Master Plan by Rick Balbi Architect

1.10.10. Pencil on Ozalid
   Main Floor Plan by Rick Balbi Architect

1.10.11. Ozalid on Bond
   Main Floor Plan by Rick Balbi Architect

1.10.12. Ozalid on Bond
   Site Plan and Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; June 1985

1.10.13. Ink on Ozalid
   Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; 29 May 1985
1.10.14. Print on Acetate  
Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; 6 May 1985

1.10.15. Ozalid on Bond  
Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; 25 May 1985

1.10.16. Ink on Ozalid  
Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; 6 May 1985

1.10.17. Ozalid on Bond  
Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; August 1985

1.10.18. Ozalid on Bond  
Main Floor Plan by Balbi Architects; 6 May 1985

1.10.19. Ozalid on Bond  
Lobby Level by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:100

1.10.20. Ozalid on Bond  
Section by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:100; 18 November 1985

1.10.21. Ozalid on Bond  
Enterance and Exit Ramps by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:100; 5 December 1985

1.10.22. Ozalid on Bond  
Loading Area by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; 3 December 1985

1.10.23. Ozalid on Bond  
Enterance Court Area by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; 25 November 1985

1.10.24. Ozalid on Bond  
Main Floor Plan by Proppe Architect Ltd; 23 December 1985

1.10.25. Ozalid on Bond  
Main Floor Plan by Proppe Architect Ltd; 17 December 1985

1.10.26. Ozalid on Bond  
Main Floor Plan by Proppe Architect Ltd; Scale 1:200

1.10.27. Marker on Ozalid  
Main Floor by Proppe Architect Ltd

1.10.28. Marker on Ozalid  
Main Floor by Proppe Architect Ltd; 4 February 1986
1.10.29. Ozalid on Bond
Paving at Front Entrance by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:200; 15 November 1985

1.10.30. Ozalid on Bond
Lobby Level by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:200; 22 November 1985

1.10.31. Ozalid on Bond
Nightclub/Bar Lobby Level by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:200; revised 25 November 1985

1.10.32. Ozalid on Bond
Lobby Level by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:100; November 1985

1.10.33. Ozalid on Bond
Hotel at Parcel A Lobby Level; Scale 1:500; 25 October 1985

1.10.34. Ozalid on Bond
Lobby Level Floor Plan by Cook, Culham, Montgomery, Pedersen, & Valentine Architects & Engineers; Scale 1:200; 11 November 1985

1.10.35. Ink on Ozalid
Ribbon Creek Hotel by B. James Wensley; 29 March 1984

A. Main Floor
B. Parking Level
C. Second Floor
D. Third Floor

1.10.36. Ink on Trace
Parcel A area calculations; 1985

1.10.37. Ink on Mylar
Schedule A Parcel A; ± May 1985

1.10.38. Ink and Print on Mylar
Schedule A Parcel A

1.10.39. Print on Mylar
Plan of Survey of Parcel A in the N.E. ¼ Sec. 15, Twp. 21, Rge. 9, W. 5th M.; Scale 1:2000; 1983

1.10.40. Ozalid on Bond
Concept Plans by McKellar Architects; Scale 1:500; October 1981

A. Sheet 1
B. Sheet 2

1.10.41. Ink on Ozalid Program Calculation Sheets; 19 May 1985
   A. Ground
   B. 2nd
   C. 3rd

1.10.42. Ink on Ozalid Program Calculation Sheets; 19 May 1985
   A. Level 3
   B. Ground Level
   C. Ground Level
   D. Level 2
   E. Lower Level

1.10.43. Print on Acetate Use Location Diagram Package A
   A. Level One (Basement) Plan
   B. Level Two (Ground Level) Plan
   C. Level Three Plan
   D. Level Four Plan
   E. Level Five Plan

1.10.44. Print on Acetate Design Concept Diagram Package A
   A. Level One (Basement) Plan
   B. Level Two (Ground Level) Plan
   C. Level Three Plan
   D. Level Four Plan
   E. Level Five Plan

1.10.45. Print on Acetate Parcel A Floor Plan
1.10.46. Print on Acetate Parcel A Floor Plan
1.10.47. Print on Acetate Parcel A Floor Plan
1.10.48. Print on Acetate Parcel A Floor Plan
1.10.49. Print on Acetate Parcel A Floor Plan
1.10.50. Print on Acetate Parcel A Second Floor
1.10.51. Print on Acetate Parcel A Third Floor
1.10.52. Print on Acetate Parcel A Fourth Floor

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 11: Parcel B

1.11.1. Ink on Diazo Mylar Schedule A Parcel B; Revised 10 December 1985
1.11.2. Ink on Mylar  Schedule A Parcel B; Scale 1:500; February 1985
1.11.3. Pencil on Mylar  Parcel B Floor Plan; Scale 1:200; February 1985
1.11.4. Ozalid on Bond  Ground Floor by Nelson MacDonald Design Ltd; Scale 1:200
1.11.5. Ozalid on Bond  Ground Floor by Nelson MacDonald Design Ltd; Scale 1:200
1.11.6. Ozalid on Bond  The Heathwood Resort at Ribbon Creek by Nelson MacDonald Design; Scale 1:200; 29 August 1985
1.11.7. Ozalid on Bond  Heathwood Hotel Ground Floor Plan by Nelson MacDonald Design Ltd; Scale 1:100; 14 August 1985
1.11.8. Colored Pencil on Ozalid  Hotel – Ribbon Creek – Parcel B Ground Floor; Scale 1:200; 13 February 1985
1.11.9. Marker on Ozalid  Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Building Section by Stephenson, Raines, Barrett, Christie, Hutton, Seton, & Partners; Scale 1:100; 28 October 1981
1.11.10. Ozalid on Bond  Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Building Section by Stephenson, Raines, Barrett, Christie, Hutton, Seton, & Partners; 10 August 1981
1.11.11. Ozalid on Bond  The Inn at Ribbon Creek Ground Floor Plan by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, & Partners; Scale 1:100
1.11.12. Ozalid on Bond  The Inn at Ribbon Creek Ground Floor Plan by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, & Partners; Scale 1:100
1.11.13. Ink on Ozalid on Bond  The Inn at Ribbon Creek Ground Floor Plan by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, & Partners; Scale 1:100
1.11.14. Ozalid on Bond  The Inn at Ribbon Creek Ground Floor Plan by Raines, Finlayson,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11.15</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Parcel B by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, &amp; Partners; Scale 1:200; 20 November 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.16</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Master Plan for Parcel B by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, &amp; Partners; 31 January 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.17</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Hotel – Ribbon Creek Village – Parcel B Ground Floor by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, &amp; Partners; Scale 1:200; 13 October 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.18</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Ground Floor Plan for the Inn at Ribbon Creek by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, &amp; Partners; Scale 1:200; 5 December 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.19</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Ground Floor Plan for the Inn at Ribbon Creek by Raines, Finlayson, Barrett, &amp; Partners; Scale 1:100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.20</td>
<td>Marker on Ozalid</td>
<td>Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Floor Plans by Stephenson, Raines, Barrett, Christie, Hutton, Seton, &amp; Partners; Scale 1:200; 30 October 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.21</td>
<td>Marker on Ozalid</td>
<td>Nakiska Hotel Site Plan by Proppe Architects Ltd; Scale 1:250; 6 October 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.22</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>The Manor at Kananaskis Main Entrance Layout by Proppe Architects Ltd; Scale 1:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.23</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>The Manor at Kananaskis Ground Floor Plan by Proppe Architects; Scale 1:100; November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.24</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>The Manor at Kananaskis Site Plan by Proppe Architects Ltd; Scale 1:250; 6 October 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.25</td>
<td>Marker on Ozalid</td>
<td>Nakiska Hotel Ground Floor by Proppe Architects Ltd; Scale 1:100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.11.26. Sepia Print  
Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Site Plan

1.11.27. Marker on Print on Bond  
Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Site Plan

1.11.28. Sepia Print  
Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Ground Level; 20 November 1981

1.11.29. Marker on Print on Bond  
Heathwood at Ribbon Creek Ground Level; 20 November 1981

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 12: Parcel C

1.12.1. Print on Mylar  
Parcel C Boundaries and Utilities

1.12.2. Print on Mylar  
Schedule A Parcel C

1.12.3. Print on Mylar  
Schedule A Parcel C

1.12.4. Print on Mylar  
Schedule A Parcel C

1.12.5. Print on Mylar  
Schedule A Parcel C

1.12.6. Ink on Mylar  
Schedule A Parcel C Description of Tentative Lease Area

1.12.7. Ozalid Package  
Pocaterra Lodge created by Lemermeyer Architect Ltd; 2 December 1985

A. Master Plan on Sheet a-1
B. Main Floor Plan on Sheet a-3
C. Elevations on Sheet a-8

1.12.8. Ozalid Package  
Red Ribbon Inn created by Wayne H. Wright and Lemermeyer Architects; 23 July 1985

A. Site Plan on Sheet 1
B. Main Floor Plan on Sheet 3
C. Elevations on Sheet 7

1.12.9. Ozalid Package  
Pocaterra Lodge created by Lemermeyer Architect Ltd; 28 January 1986

A. Master Plan on Sheet a-1
B. Main Floor Plan on Sheet a-3
C. Elevations on Sheet a-8

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 13: Fortress Junction Service Centre

1.13.1. Ozalid on Bond  
Ron Boruk Architect
A. Site Plan
B. Main Floor Plan
C. Floor Plan for Proposed Residence

1.13.2. Ozalid on Bond

Floor Plan by Ron Boruk Architect;
12 April 1983

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 14: Maintenance Building

1.14.1. Ozalid Package

Village of Ribbon Creek
Maintenance Facility

A. Floor Plans
B. Elevations
C. Site Plan (1)
D. Site Plan (2)

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 15: Staff Housing

1.15.1. Print & Contact Paper on Diazo

Employee Housing Site Plan; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986

1.15.2. Ozalid on Bond

Staff Housing Parking Phase I; Scale 1:500; 14 June 1986

1.15.3. Ink on Mylar

Existing Topography; Scale 1:500

1.15.4. Print on Diazo Mylar

Existing Topography; Scale 1:500;
15 January 1985

1.15.5. Ozalid on Bond

Employee Housing; Scale 1:500; 4 February 1986

1.15.6. Ink on Ozalid on Bond

Employee Housing; Scale 1:500

1.15.7. Ozalid on Bond

Staff Housing Concept; Scale 1:500;
6 June 1986

1.15.8. Ozalid on Bond

Ribbon Creek Employee Housing Scheme Two

1.15.9. Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

Employee Housing Site Plan; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986

1.15.10. Ozalid on Bond

Ribbon Creek Staff Housing Plans and Elevations; April 1986

1.15.11. Marker on Ozalid on Bond

Employee Housing Scheme #1;
Scale 1:500; 27 May 1986

1.15.12. Marker on Ozalid on Bond

Employee Housing; Scale 1:500

1.15.13. Pencil on Mylar

Employee Housing Site Plan
Grading Rough Draft
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.15.14</td>
<td>Pencil and Ink on Trace</td>
<td>Employee Housing Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.15</td>
<td>Ozalid</td>
<td>Employee Housing Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.16</td>
<td>Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Site Plan; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.17</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Grading and Utilities Ground Survey of Staff Housing Area by Reid, Crowther, &amp; Partners Ltd.; Scale 1:500; 13 June 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.18</td>
<td>Pencil on Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Site Plan; Scale 1:500; 4 February 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.19</td>
<td>Pencil and Ink on Mylar</td>
<td>Landscape Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.20</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.21</td>
<td>Pencil and Ink on Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Scheme #1; 27 May 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.22</td>
<td>Print on Acetate</td>
<td>Topography of Employee Housing Site; Scale 1:500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.23</td>
<td>Ink on Trace</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.24</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.25</td>
<td>Pencil and Ink on Trace</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.26</td>
<td>Ink on Trace</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.27</td>
<td>Pencil and Ink on Trace</td>
<td>Employee Housing Master Plan; 19 June 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.28</td>
<td>Ink and Marker on Trace</td>
<td>Concept Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.29</td>
<td>Pencil and Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Site Plan; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.30</td>
<td>Pencil on Mylar</td>
<td>Concept Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.31</td>
<td>Print on Diaz Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Site Plan; Scale 1:500; 22 January 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.32</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Employee Housing Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.33</td>
<td>Pencil on Trace</td>
<td>Parking Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.34</td>
<td>Pencil on Trace</td>
<td>Parking and Circulation Study Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.35</td>
<td>Marker on Ozalid</td>
<td>Employee Housing Scheme Four; Scale 1:500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.36</td>
<td>Ink and Pencil on Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Scheme One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.37</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
<td>Employee Housing Scheme Two; Scale 1:500; 13 May 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.38</td>
<td>Ink and Pencil on Mylar</td>
<td>Employee Housing Scheme Three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.15.39. Ink on Mylar  
Employee Housing Scheme Four

1.15.40. Pencil on Trace  
Concept Drawing

1.15.41. Ink on Ozalid  
Employee Housing Scheme Four; Scale 1:500

1.15.42. Black Tape on Mylar  
Fire Access Plan Pin Bar Document

1.15.43. Ink on Mylar  
Site Plan Pin Bar Document

1.15.44. Ink and Pencil on Mylar  
The Village at Ribbon Creek
Employee Housing Pin Bar Document; Scale 1:500; 27 October 1981

1.15.45. Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar  
Employee Housing Site Plan Pin Bar Document; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986

1.15.46. Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar  
Financial Trustco Proposed Site Plan Pin Bar Document; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986

1.15.47. Print and Ink on Diazo Mylar  
Grading Employee Housing Site Plan Pin Bar Document; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986

1.15.48. Pencil and Ink on Mylar  
Grading Employee Housing Site Plan Pin Bar Document

1.15.49. Ink on Mylar  
Employee Housing Site Plan Pin Bar Document

1.15.50. Ink on Mylar  
Lot Delineation Pin Bar Document; 29 April 1986

1.15.51. Ink on Mylar  
Right of Way and Topography Pin Bar Document

1.15.52. Print on Diazo Mylar  
Site Plan Pin Bar Document; 25 June 1986

1.15.53. Ink and Pencil on Mylar  
Grading Plan Pin Bar Document

1.15.54. Ink on Mylar  
Schedule A Area Subject to Lease Pin Bar Document; 31 October 1986

1.15.55. Print on Diazo Mylar  
Employee Housing master Plan Pin Bar Document; Scale 1:500

1.15.56. Pencil and Ink on Diazo Mylar  
Employee Housing Grading Plan Pin Bar Document

1.15.57. Ink on Mylar  
Suitability Study Pin Bar Document
1.15.58. Print and Ink on Mylar
Proposed Circulation Plan; Scale 1:500; 15 January 1986

1.15.59. Ink on Trace
Ribbon Creek Employee Housing Scheme Two

1.15.60. Ink on Trace
Employee Housing Scheme Two

1.15.61. Ozalid on Bond
Fire Access Plan; Scale 1:500

1.15.62. Ozalid on Bond
Employee Housing Landscape Plan; Scale 1:500

1.15.63. Print on Acetate
Employee Housing Master Plan Pin Bar Document; 25 June 1986

1.15.64. Pencil on Trace
Cut and Fill Calculations from 1st Pass Grading; 22 June 1986

1.15.65. Ink and Pencil on Trace
Employee Housing Study; Scale 1:500; 14 January 1986

A. Plan View
B. Cross-sections

1.15.66. Ozalid on Bond
Staff Housing Package; 2 July 1986

A. (Clearing) Layout Plan
B. Grading and Utilities: Road and Parking Layout
C. Grading and Utilities: Road and Parking Grading
D. (Utilities) Layout Plan

1.15.67. Marker on Ozalid w/ Yellow Sheet
Walkway, Turf, and Lighting Area Calculations; 23 June 1986

A. Walkway Area Calculations
B. Site Plan with Calculations

1.15.68. Ozalid on Bond
Staff Housing Lot One by Snihur Consulting Ltd.; April 1987

A. Site Development Plan
B. Floor Plans

1.15.69. Ozalid on Bond
Staff Housing by McKellar Architects; 10 August 1981

1.15.70. Ozalid on Bond
Ribbon Creek Staff Housing by Proppe Architect Ltd.; 24 December 1985

1.15.71. Ozalid on Bond
Ribbon Creek Staff Housing 76 Unit Complex Plans and Elevations by Proppe Architect Ltd.; 7 April 1986
1.15.72. Ozalid on Bond
88-Pillow Staff Housing by Western Professional Design Centre Ltd.; 10 August 1986
A. Street Elevations
B. Front Elevations
1.15.73. Ozalid on Bond
Staff Housing by Western Professional Design Centre Ltd.; 10 August 1986
A. Floor Plan
B. Front Elevations
1.15.74. Ozalid on Bond
Staff Housing by Western Professional Design Centre Ltd.; 10 September 1986
A. Floor Plan Main Level
B. Floor Plan
C. Floor Plan Main Level
1.15.75. Pencil on Mylar
Employee Housing Site Plan Sections; Scale 1:250; 15 January 1986
A. Section A
B. Section B
C. Section C
D. Section D
E. Title block
1.15.76. Sepia Print on Acetate
Employee Housing Site Plan Sections; Scale 1:250; 15 January 1986
Series 1: Kananaskis Cluster 16: Illustrations
1.16.1. Ink on Mylar
Axonometric Drawing of Village
1.16.2. Print and Ink on Mylar
Axonometric Drawing of Village by Robert L. McIlhargey; 1982
1.16.3. Print on Bond
Perspective of Village; August 1981
1.16.4. Print on Bond
Perspective of West Gateway in Winter
1.16.5. Marker on Bond
Computer-Aided Perspective
A. View 1
B. View 2
C. View 3
D. View 4

1.16.6. Pencil on Trace
Day Lodge Roof Plan

1.16.7. Marker on Trace
Day Lodge Roof Plan

1.16.8. Ozalid on Bond
Day Lodge Second Floor Plan by
CCMP&V Architects and
Engineers; Scale 1:100; 10 June
1985

1.16.9. Marker on Trace
Day Lodge Elevations
A. South Elevation
B. South Elevation
C. East Elevation

1.16.10. Pencil on Trace
Roof Plan and Calculations

1.16.11. Ozalid on Bond
Main Floor; Scale 1:200

1.16.12. Marker on Trace
Building Elevations
A. Unnamed
B. Unnamed
C. East
D. South
E. South
F. North
G. West

1.16.13. Pencil on Trace
Proposed Entry Revisions for Parcel
B & C: Section Looking Northeast
to Parcel B & C; Scale 1:100; 25
September 1986

1.16.14. Pencil on Trace
North Elevation

1.16.15. Pencil on Trace
Parcel A Elevation Studies; July
1985

1.16.16. Pencil on Trace
West and East Elevations; 10 July
1985

1.16.17. Ozalid on Bond
Elevations Package
A. East
B. South
C. Roof Plan

1.16.18. Pencil and Ink on Mylar
Sections for Worksheet on Rooms
and Cold Roof Details

1.16.19. Ink on Mylar
Snow Deflection Studies for
Architectural Design Guidelines
1.16.20. Ink on Mylar  East Elevation Parcel A Master Plan; Scale 1:200; 4 March 1986
1.16.21. Pencil and Print on Diazot Mylar  East Elevation Parcel A Master Plan; Scale 1:200; 4 March 1986
1.16.22. Ink on Mylar  South Elevation Parcel A Master Plan; Scale 1:200; 4 March 1986
1.16.23. Pencil and Print on Diazot Mylar  South Elevation Parcel A Master Plan; Scale 1:200; 4 March 1986
1.16.24. Sepia Print and Pencil on Mylar  Elevations of Ribbon Creek Village
1.16.25. Pencil on Mylar  Day Lodge and Building C Elevation; Scale 1:200
1.16.27. Pencil on Vellum  Roof Plan for Ribbon Creek Package A with Hagman Yaw; 29 June 1982
1.16.28. Pencil on Vellum  Sections
1.16.29. Pencil on Vellum  Section B-B
1.16.30. Pencil on Sepia on Mylar  Composite Elevation
1.16.31. Marker and Print on Bond  Composite Elevation
1.16.32. Print on Acetate  Sections
1.16.33. Print on Photopaper  Sections
1.16.34. Print on Photopaper  Composite Elevation

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 17: Document Packages

1.17.1. Print on Photopaper  The Village at Ribbon Creek Master Plan; January 1986

   A. Fire Access Master Plan
   B. Master Plan
   C. Landscape Master Plan
   D. Landscape Master Plan
   E. Master Plan
   F. Lighting Master Plan
   G. Grading Master Plan
   H. Illustrative Plan
   I. Signage Master Plan
1.17.2. Print on Photopaper

Commercial Signage Policy Design
Standards and Approval Process for
Kananaskis Village and Association
Membership Adopted 13 March 1987

A. Cover Page
B. Page 9
C. Pages 4 & 5
D. Contents
E. Pages 3 & 6
F. Pages 2 & 7
G. Pages 1 & 8

1.17.3. Print on Mylar

Printing Package

A. Site Analysis
B. Illustrative Plan
C. Parking and Circulation Plan
D. Ground Level Plan
E. Landscape Concept Plan
F. Common Elements Plan
G. Subdivision Plan
H. Area Utility Plan
I. Schematic Utility Plan
J. Conceptual Grading Plan

1.17.4. Print on Bond

Village Master Plan

A. Cover
B. Building Location
C. Landscape Plan 1:500
D. Landscape Plan 1:200
E. Grading Plan
F. Site Lighting Plan
G. Signage Plan
H. Fire Access Plan

1.17.5. Print on Acetate

Printing Package Site Analysis Iterations

A. Print on Acetate
B. Print on Photopaper
C. Print on Photopaper
D. Print on Vellum
1.17.6. Printing Package Parking and Circulation Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Vellum
   B. Print on Acetate
   C. Marker and Print on Photopaper

1.17.7. Printing Package Ground Level Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Photopaper
   B. Sepia on Acetate
   C. Print on Acetate

1.17.8. Printing Package Landscape Concept Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Photopaper
   B. Print on Acetate

1.17.9. Printing Package Common Elements Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Photopaper
   B. Print on Photopaper
   C. Print on Vellum
   D. Print on Acetate

1.17.10. Printing Package Subdivision Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Vellum
   B. Print on Acetate
   C. Print on Vellum
   D. Print on Photopaper

1.17.11. Printing Package Area Utility Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Acetate
   B. Print on Photopaper

1.17.12. Printing Package Schematic Utility Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Acetate
   B. Print on Photopaper

1.17.13. Printing Package Conceptual Grading Plan Iterations
   A. Print on Acetate
   B. Print on Photopaper

1.17.14. Print and Ink on Mylar
         Village Master Plan Site Analysis
1.17.15. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Site Analysis
1.17.16. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Area Utility Plan
1.17.17. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Landscape Concept Plan
1.17.18. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Area Utility Plan
1.17.19. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Schematic Utility Plan
1.17.20. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Conceptual Grading Plan
1.17.21. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Subdivision Plan
1.17.22. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Subdivision Plan
1.17.23. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Conceptual Grading Plan
1.17.24. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Parking and Circulation Plan
1.17.25. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Parking and Circulation Plan
1.17.26. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Ground Level Plan
1.17.27. Print on Mylar Village Master Plan Schematic Utility Plan
1.17.28. Pencil on Sepia Print Mid-Point Document Package
   A. Elevations and Sections
   B. Subdivision Plan
   C. Elevations
   D. Landscape Concept Plan
   E. Pencil on Sepia; Concept Diagram
   F. Elevations and Sections
   G. Bill Johnson Sketches
   H. Road Exposure and Alignment
   I. Perspective Sketches

Series 1: Kananaskis  Cluster 18: Banff Downtown Enhancement

1.18.1. Ozalid on Bond Area Map
1.18.2. Ozalid on Bond
Banff Alberta Downtown
Enhancement; 11 March 1992

1.18.3. Ozalid on Bond
Banff Calculation Studies

1.18.4. Ozalid on Bond
2 Lane Scheme

1.18.5. Ozalid on Bond
4 Lanes Section

1.18.6. Ozalid on Bond
3 Lanes – 2 Lanes in One Direction

1.18.7. Ozalid on Bond
3 Lane Options

1.18.8. Marker on Ozalid on Bond
Boundaries and Circulation

1.18.9. Ozalid on Bond
Concept Sketch

1.18.10. Ozalid on Bond
Visitor Auto Access and Parking

1.18.11. Ozalid on Bond
Parking Management; Fall 1992

1.18.12. Ozalid on Bond
Shuttle Stops and Route

1.18.13. Ozalid on Bond
2 Lane One-Way System

1.18.14. Ozalid on Bond
Modified Street Section with Review of Parking Lanes

1.18.15. Ozalid on Bond
Circulation Schematic

1.18.16. Ozalid on Bond
Existing Service Access

1.18.17. Ozalid on Bond
Circulation Schematic

1.18.18. Ozalid on Bond
Intersection Schematic

1.18.19. Ozalid on Bond
Intersection Schematic

1.18.20. Ozalid on Bond
Entry in Plan View and Section

1.18.21. Ozalid on Bond
Entry Concept Schematic

1.18.22. Ozalid on Bond
Entry Concept Schematic

1.18.23. Ozalid on Bond
Circulation Schematic

1.18.24. Ozalid on Bond
Parking Study

1.18.25. Ozalid on Bond
Routes and Nodes

1.18.26. Ozalid on Bond
Banff Avenue Paving

1.18.27. Ozalid on Bond
Banff Avenue Paving

1.18.28. Ozalid on Bond
Intersection Plans and Sections

1.18.29. Ozalid on Bond
Off Banff Avenue Schematic

1.18.30. Ozalid on Bond
Area Map with Circulation

1.18.31. Ozalid on Bond
BDEP Design Component: Traffic

1.18.32. Ozalid on Bond
Circulation Schematics

1.18.33. Ozalid on Bond
BDEP Design Component: Linkages

1.18.34. Ozalid on Bond
BDEP Design Component:
Intersections and Nodes

1.18.35. Ozalid on Bond
Banff Springs Hotel Signage
APPENDIX C

HIGH DESERT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.</td>
<td>High Desert Trailhead Parcel Revised Plan; Scale 1”:60’;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 November 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.A.</td>
<td>Pin Bar Document Package</td>
<td>Finished Site Grading</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.B.</td>
<td>Pin Bar Document Package</td>
<td>Building Footprints with Setback</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.C.</td>
<td>Pin Bar Document Package</td>
<td>Roadways &amp; Property Boundaries</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Trailhead Setbacks and ROW; Scale 1”:60’; 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.</td>
<td>December 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.A.</td>
<td>Setback and Lot Line Dimensioning; 5 November 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.B.</td>
<td>Setback and Lot Line Dimensioning; 5 November 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil on Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Trailhead Site Plan; Scale 1”:60’; 14 December 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marker on Print on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Desert Trailhead Landscape Plan Pin Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.A.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Base Lines</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.B.</td>
<td>High Desert Trailhead Landscape Plan Pin Bar</td>
<td>Sheet 18 of 25</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.C.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Setbacks and ROW</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.D.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.E.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Sheet 19 of 25</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.F.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Title Block</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.G.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Base Lines</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.H.</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Desert Trailhead Landscape Plan Pin Bar

2.1.6.1. Documents Sheet 20 of 25

2.1.7. Tree Streetscape Pin Bar Document

2.1.8. Topography

2.1.9. Juniper, Pine & Oak Streetscape

2.1.10. Tree Streetscape with Cul-de-Sacs

2.1.11. Tree Streetscape with Cul-de-Sacs

2.1.12. High Desert Area Map

2.1.13. Tract 8 Area Calculations

2.1.14. Tract A Sheet 6

2.1.15. Tract A Sheet 7

2.1.16. Preliminary Utility Layout

Preliminary Plat of Trailhead Subdivision Albuquerque New Mexico; January 1994

2.1.17. High Desert Trailhead Parcel 28 Lot Scheme Alternative

2.1.18. ‘A’: Phase 1 Landscape Plan; 1”:50’; 12 October 1993

2.1.19. Simms Reservoir No. 2 Site Development Plan

Trailhead Subdivision Grading/Drainage Plan; Scale 1”=60'

2.1.20.A. Revisions

2.1.20.B. Base Map

2.1.21. Embudito Trail Planting Plan

2.1.22. La Luz Trail Planting Plan
2.1.23. Lotting Plan with Grading
High Desert Trailhead Parcel Revised Plan; Scale 1":60’;
Print on Mylar

2.1.24. 23 November 1993
Print on Bond

2.1.25. Lot & Building Footprint Arrangement on Trace
Ink on Trace

2.1.26. Aerial Photograph with Grading & Lotting Plan
Setbacks and Lotting Plan; Scale 1"=60’; 5 November
Sepia Print on Acetate

2.1.27. High Desert Trailhead Parcel 28 Lot Scheme Alternative ‘B’; Scale 1”:50’; 12 October 1993
Ozalid on Bond

2.1.28. Aerial Photograph with square footage
Ink on Ozalid on Bond

2.1.29. Topography
Print on Photo paper

2.1.30. La Luz Trail Place Spot Elevations
Adhesive on Mylar

2.1.31. La Luz Trail Place Spot Elevations
Print on Photo paper

2.1.32. Lotting Plan
Print on Mylar

2.1.33. The Trailhead Site Plan
Adhesive on Mylar

2.1.34. Sections for Seeding with native grass mix
Sepia Print on Acetate

2.1.35. High Desert Trailhead Landscape Plan; Scale 1"=20’; 7 March 1994
Print on Acetate

2.1.36. Lotting Plan with Square Footage
Print on Acetate

2.1.37.A. Lotting Plan with Square Footage
Print on Acetate

2.1.37.B. Plat of Trailhead Subdivision Albuquerque New Mexico Sheet 2 of 2; January 1994
Ink on Trace

2.1.38. Trailhead Perimeter Planting Alternative 2 Sheet 2; Scale 1"=60’; 7 March 1994

2.1.39.
2.1.40. Trailhead Perimeter Planting Alternative 1 Sheet 1 of 2; Ink on Trace
7 March 1994

2.1.41. Trailhead Parcel Adjacent Subdivision Footprint/Lot Size Comparison; Scale 1”=50’; 15 November 1993 Ink on Trace

2.1.42. Lotting Plan Print on Vellum

2.1.43. The Trailhead Cul-de-Sac Concepts; Scale 1”=60’ Ink on Trace

Series 1: High Desert

2.2.1. Proposed Planting and Berm Grading Ink on Mylar
2.2.2. Trees and Turf Ink on Mylar
2.2.3. Pedestrian Routes and Signage Ink on Mylar
2.2.4. Building Footprints and Setbacks Ink on Mylar
2.2.5. High Desert Tract 2-A Ink on Mylar

Cluster 2: Parcel 2

2.2.6. Parcel 2 Building Footprints and Setbacks; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.7. Lotting Plan with Pedestrian Routes; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.8. Trees and Turf; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.9. Labels; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.10. Grading and Drainage; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.11. Building Footprints and Setbacks; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.12. Labels; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.13. Roads; 29 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.14. Grading Sepia Print on Acetate
2.2.15. Landscape
2.2.16. Parcel 2 Cul-de-Sac Plan; Scale 1"=30'
2.2.17.A. Parcel 2 Notes on Site Plan; 20 September 1993
2.2.17.B. Parcel 2 Notes on Site Plan; 20 September 1993
2.2.18. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.19. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.20. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.21. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.22. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.23. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.24. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.25. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.26. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.27. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.28. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.29. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.30. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.31. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints
2.2.32. Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints

Notes
Site Plan
Parcel 2 Lot Acreage; 2 July 1993
Revised Proposed Landform Along Tramway Boulevard; Scale 1":20’; 2 July 1993
Landform Cross Section
Trees and Turf Pin Bar Document
Pedestrian Route and Signage
Lotting Plan Alternative #1
Lotting Plan Alternative #2
Lotting Plan Alternative #2
Lotting Plan Alternative #2
Lotting Plan Alternative #3
Spot Elevations
Boundaries Pin Bar Document
Revisions to Parcel 2; 30 September 1993
Grading and Drainage
Grading and Drainage

Sepia Print on Acetate
Print on Bond Pencil & Ink on Trace
Acetate
Ink on Ozalid on Bond
Print on Bond Pencil & Ink on Trace
Ink on Ozalid on Bond
Pencil & Ink on Trace
Ink on Mylar Sepia Print on Acetate
Pencil & Ink on Trace
Ink on Trace Pencil & Ink on Trace
Ink on Trace
Pencil on Trace
Ink on Mylar
Ink on Ozalid on Bond
Pencil on Trace
Pencil on Trace
| 2.2.33. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Grading and Drainage | Pencil on Trace |
| 2.2.34. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Lotting Plan Alternative #2 Variation | Ink on Trace |
| 2.2.35. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Lotting Plan | Ink on Trace |
| 2.2.36. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Lotting Plan | Ink on Trace |
| 2.2.37. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Project Boundary & Acreage Pedestrian Routes and Street Lights | Pencil & Ink on Trace |
| 2.2.38. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Trees and Grading | Pencil & Ink on Trace |
| 2.2.39. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Roadway Curvature | Pencil on Trace |
| 2.2.40. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Roadway Curvature | Pencil on Trace |
| 2.2.41. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Lotting Plan | Pencil on Print on Mylar |
| 2.2.42. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Site Plan Revisions with Grading & Drainage | Ink on Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.2.43. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | Site Plan Revisions | Ink on Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.2.44. | Parcel 2 Sections, Trace Studies, & Working Prints | | Sepia Print on Acetate |
| 2.2.45. | High Desert Parcel 2; Scale 1"=100’; 29 November 1993 | | |
| 2.2.46. | High Desert Tracts 2A-1A & 2A-1B Scheme A; Scale 1"=50’; 2 May 1994 | | |
| 2.2.47. | High Desert Tracts 2A-1A & 2A-1B Scheme C; Scale 1"=50’; 2 May 1994 | | |
| 2.2.48. | Land Survey for Parcel A | | |
| 2.2.49. | Parcel 2 Grading & Spot Elevations; Scale 1"=100’; 29 November 1993 | | |

Series 1: High Desert

Cluster 3: Parcel 3

2.3.1.A. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Final" Setbacks; 25 February 1994 Ink on Mylar
2.3.1.B. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Final" Grading and Drainage; 24 November 1993 Ink on Mylar
2.3.1.C. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Final" Labels Ink on Mylar
2.3.1.D. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Final" Trees and Turf Ink on Mylar
2.3.1.E. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Final" Pedestrian Routes and Signage Ink on Mylar
2.3.1.F. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Final" Parcel Boundaries Ink on Mylar
2.3.2.A. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Obsolete" Grading and Drainage Ink on Mylar
2.3.2.B. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Obsolete" Trees Ink on Mylar
2.3.2.C. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Obsolete" Turf Ink on Mylar
2.3.2.D. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Obsolete" Pedestrian Routes and Signage Ink on Mylar
2.3.2.E. Parcel 3 Pin Bar Documents Labeled "Obsolete" Building Footprints and Setbacks Ink on Mylar

2.3.3. High Desert Parcel 3 Alternative; Scale 1":100'; 30 June 1993 Ink on Trace
2.3.4. Parcel 3 Utility Layout Plan Discussion Level; 11 October 1993 Sepia Print on Mylar
2.3.5. Parcel 3 Grading and Drainage; 24 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.3.6. Parcel 3 Pedestrian Circulation & Signage Sepia Print on Acetate
2.3.7. Parcel 3 Master Plan of Combined Pin Bar Documents Sepia Print on Acetate
2.3.8. Parcel 3 Grading; Scale 1"=100'; 24 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate
2.3.9. Parcel 3 Combined Pin Bar Documents from Final; Scale 1"=100'; 24 November 1993 Sepia Print on Acetate

Series 1: High Desert

2.4.1. Scenario 1: 25 October 1991 Ink on Trace
2.4.2. Scenario 2: 25 October 1991 Ink on Trace

Cluster 4: Site Analysis & Inventory
2.4.3. Scenario 3: 25 October 1991
2.4.4. Scenario 4: 25 October 1991
2.4.5. Scenario 5: 25 October 1991
2.4.6. Scenarios #1-4
2.4.7. Scenario #2a
2.4.8. Scenario
2.4.9. Scenario 2A
2.4.10. Scenario 2B
2.4.11. Scenario 2C
2.4.12. Open Space Governance
2.4.13. Draft Zoning Plan
2.4.14. High Desert Phasing Plan
2.4.15. Developable Land Summary
2.4.16. Landscape Concept Plan
2.4.17. Land Use Plan with Golf
2.4.18. Cultural and Community Centers: Retirement Center, Teens, Golf, & Cultural Center
2.4.19. Cultural and Community Centers: School, Neighborhood Commercial, Park, & Church
2.4.20. Cultural and Community Centers: Roads, Reservoir, Potential Land Trade, & Lot Size
2.4.21. Academy Lands East Conceptual Master Plan

Ink on Trace
Ink on Trace
Ink on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Ink & Marker on Trace
Draft Zoning Plan
High Desert Phasing Plan
Developable Land Summary
Landscape Concept Plan
Land Use Plan with Golf
Cultural and Community Centers: Retirement Center, Teens, Golf, & Cultural Center
Cultural and Community Centers: School, Neighborhood Commercial, Park, & Church
Cultural and Community Centers: Roads, Reservoir, Potential Land Trade, & Lot Size
Academy Lands East Conceptual Master Plan
2.4.22. Circulation Diagram
2.4.23. Utility Plan
2.4.24. Building Footprints & Travel Routes
2.4.25. Vegetation
2.4.26. Drainage Concept Plan
2.4.27. Circulation Plan
2.4.28. Floodplain
2.4.29. Landscape Concept Plan
2.4.30. Open Space/Trails Plan
2.4.31. Phasing Plan
2.4.32. Street Names Plan
2.4.33. Soils Plan
2.4.34. Land Use Plan

2.4.35. Road Use Diagram

2.4.36.A. Site Suitability on Trace
2.4.36.B. Site Suitability on Trace

2.4.37. Riparian Vegetation Zone & Floodplain with Building Envelopes; 16 December 1992; Scale 1"=200'

2.4.38. Aerial Photograph with Existing Topography
2.4.39. Aerial Photograph with Existing Topography
2.4.40. Dam Locations/Arroyo Delineation
2.4.41. Site Inventory & Analysis; Scale 1"=300'
2.4.42. 100 Year Flood Plain Map
2.4.43. Tracts & Floodplains Diagram
2.4.44.A. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 1 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.B. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 2 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.C. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 3 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.D. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 4 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.E. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 5 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.F. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 6 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.G. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 7 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.H. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 8 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.I. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 9 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.J. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 10 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.K. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 11 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.L. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 12 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.44.M. Plat of High Desert Albuquerque New Mexico; 18 October 1993 Sheet 13 of 13 Print on Bond
2.4.45. Soils Map; Scale 1"=400' Print on Bond
Series 1: High Desert

2.5.1. Topographic Survey for High Desert Sales Office; Scale 1”:20’; February 1995

2.5.2. Topographic Survey for High Desert Sales Office with Plant Relocation Program; Scale 1”:20’; February 1995

2.5.3. High Desert Sales Office Grading and Utility Plan; 28 June 1995

2.5.4. High Desert Office Revised Planting Plan 22 May 1995

2.5.5. Context Diagram; Scale 1”:20’; 2 June 1995

2.5.6. Grass Location Diagram, Aesthetic Groupings, & Boulder Placement

2.5.7. Plan with Sections A-A & B-B

2.5.8. Planting Plan

2.5.9. High Desert Office Grading with Section; Scale 1/8”:1’; 25 January 1995

2.5.10. High Desert Office Planting with Section; Scale 1/8”:1’; 25 January 1995

2.5.11. Context Diagram; Scale 1”:20’; 2 June 1995

2.5.12. Natural Plant Associations Diagram; 2 June 1995

2.5.13. Spatial Diagram and Circulation Loops; 2 June 1995

2.5.14. Genus/Plant Type Comparison Groupings; 2 June 1995

2.5.15. Water Use; 2 June 1995

2.5.16. Seasonal Color Diagram

2.5.17. Planting L-1.1

2.5.18. Planting

2.5.19.A. High Desert Office; 14 July 1995

Cover Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.B</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Details D-1.0</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.C</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Planting Plan Detail</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.D</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>L-5.0; Scale 1/8”:1’</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.E</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Planting Plan Title block</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.F</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>L-4.0; Scale 1/8”:1’</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.G</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Planting Plan Title block</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.H</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>L-3.0; Scale 1/8”:1’</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.I</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Planting Plan Details</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.J</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Base 1</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.K</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>L-2.0; Scale 1/8”:1’</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.L</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.M</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Plant Details</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.N</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Plant Details</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.O</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Planting Plan L-1.0</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19.P</td>
<td>14 July 1995</td>
<td>Planting Details</td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Mylar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.19.Q. High Desert Office; 14 July 1995
Groundcovers
Pencil & Ink on Mylar

2.5.19.R. High Desert Office; 14 July 1995
Path Layout Plan L-1.1
Pencil & Ink on Mylar

2.5.20.A. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Cover Page
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.5.20.B. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Planting Plan L-1
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.5.20.C. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Planting Plan L-2
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.5.20.D. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Planting Plan L-3
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.5.20.E. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Planting Plan L-4
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.5.20.F. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Planting Plan L-5
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.5.20.G. High Desert Office Ozalid Package
Details D-1
Marker & Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

Series 1: High Desert

2.6.1. Plant Schedule by Region
Series 1: High Desert
Pencil & Ink on Bond

2.6.2. Planting Plan
Planting Plan
Ozalid on Bond

Series 1: High Desert

2.7.1. Parcel 7 Apartments; Scale 1”:100”; 26 May 1993
Cluster 6: Planting Design
Ink on Print on Photo paper

2.7.2. Parcel 7 Apartments; Scale 1”:100”; 26 May 1993
Cluster 7: Parcel 7: Apartments
Ink on Print on Photo paper

2.7.3. Parcel 7 Apartments; Scale 1”:100”; 26 May 1993
2.7.4. Vegetation Regions
2.7.5. Concept Diagram
2.7.6. Illustrative Master Plan
2.7.7. Illustrative Master Plan
2.7.8. Illustrative Master Plan
Parcel 7 Notes on Trace with Acetate Site Plan; 30 September 1993
2.7.9.A. Parcel 7 Notes on Trace with Acetate Site Plan; 30 September 1993
2.7.9.B. Planting Concept; Scale 1":50’; 25 March 1994
2.7.10. Thompson Fiasco Grading and Drainage
2.7.11. Culbertson Creation Grading Concept; Scale 1":50’; 25 March 1994
2.7.12. Concept Site Plan
2.7.13.A. Concept Site Plan
2.7.13.B. Concept Site Plan
Potential Stub Locations; Scale 1":100’; 23 September 1993
2.7.14. High Desert Parcel 7; Scale 1":300’
2.7.15. Parcel 7 Pedestrian Routes and Signage; 11 November 1993
2.7.16. Roadway Curvature Study
2.7.17. Trees and Turf Pin Bar Document; June 1993
2.7.18. Grading and Drainage; June 1993
Ink & Marker on Trace Paper
Marker on Trace
Ink on Trace
Ink on Trace
Print on Photo paper
Trace Paper
Print on Acetate
Ink on Trace Paper
Ink on Trace Paper
Ink on Trace Paper
Print on Acetate
Print on Diazo
Mylar
Print on Bond
Print on Acetate
Ink on Mylar
Ozalid on Bond
Ink on Mylar
Ink on Mylar
Ink on Mylar
2.7.22. Parcel 7 Spot Elevations and Grading Pin Bar Document; 11 November 1993

2.7.23. Parcel 7 Trees Pin Bar Document; 11 November 1993
Parcel 7 Pin Bar Document Compilation; Scale 1"=100'; 11 November 1993

2.7.25. Parcel 7 Site Plan with Acreage and Unit Calculations
Site Plan with List of Elements to Address; Scale 1"=100'

2.7.27. Concept Diagram with Analysis
2.7.28. Concept of Roadways and Lots
Parcel 7 Title block Pin Bar Document; Scale 1"=100'; 26 May 1993
Alternative A with Floodplain Delineation; Scale 1"=100'; 26 May 1993
Alternative B with Floodplain Delineation; Scale 1"=100'; 26 May 1993

2.7.31. Parcel 7 Unit and Parking Concentration Study
Parcel 7 Apartments Site Plan Pin Bar Document; Scale 1"=100'; 23 April 1993
Parcel 7 Proposed Contours Pin Bar Document

2.7.36. Parcel 7 Section; 7 June 1993
Parcel 7 Apartments Alternative A; Scale 1"=100'; 26 May 1993
Parcel 7 Apartments Alternative B; Scale 1"=100'; 26 May 1993
2.7.39. Topographic Map with Parcel Boundaries  
Trammell Crow Residential High Desert Apartments by Todd & Associates, Inc. Preliminary Building Plans; 11 April 1993 (2)  
Acetate Spliced on Mylar

2.7.40. Trammell Crow Residential High Desert Apartments by Todd & Associates, Inc. Perspective; 5 April 1993  
Print on Bond

2.7.41. Trammel Crow Residential High Desert Apartments Preliminary Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc; 11 May 1993  
Print on Bond

2.7.42. Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 21 January 1994  
Print on Vellum

2.7.43. Tract 7 Conceptual Grading/Drainage Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; March 1994  
Ink on Ozalid on Bond

2.7.44. Tract 7 Conceptual Grading/Drainage Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; March 1994  
Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

2.7.46. Tract 7 Preliminary Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 28 February 1994  
Ozalid on Bond

2.7.47. Tract 7 Preliminary Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 28 February 1994  
Ozalid on Bond

2.7.48. Pinnacle at High Desert The Hilltop Landscape Cover Sheet; 14 April 1994  
Ozalid on Bond

2.7.49. Tract 7 Landscape Plan; 8 March 1994  
Ozalid on Bond

2.7.50. Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 14 April 1994  
Ozalid on Bond

2.7.51.A. Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 14 April 1994  
L2

2.7.51.B. Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 14 April 1994  
L3
Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Site Plan by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 14 April 1994

Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Schematic by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 12 April 1994

Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Schematic by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 12 April 1994

Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Schematic by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 12 April 1994

Pinnacle at High Desert Landscape Schematic by Todd & Associates, Inc.; 12 April 1994

High Desert Parcel 7; Scale 1” : 300’

Series I: High Desert

Cluster 8: The Parks at High Desert

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents; 22 January 1998

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Ozalid on Bond

Cover Sheet

High Desert Park Performance Stage & Picnic Shelter

High Desert Bike Storage, Sign, & Wall Details

High Desert Site Amenities

Legend

High Desert Enlargement of Play Areas

High Desert Proposed Park Site Grading Plan

High Desert Layout Plan
| 2.8.1.H. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Layout Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.I. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Layout Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.J. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Layout Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.K. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Electrical Site Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.L. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Electrical Site Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.N. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Park Irrigation Plans | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.O. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Park Irrigation Plans | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.P. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Park Irrigation Plans | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.Q. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Park Irrigation Details | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.R. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Planting Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.S. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Planting Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.T. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Planting Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.8.1.U. | The Park at High Desert Construction Documents Package; 22 January 1998 | High Desert Planting Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.V. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Planting Plan
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.W. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Planting & Seeding Legend
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.X. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Basketball Details
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.Y. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Tennis & Sand Volleyball Details
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.Z. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Play Equipment Details
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.AA. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Site Furnishings Details
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.BB. Package; 22 January 1998
Signing & Construction Traffic Control Standards
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.CC. Package; 22 January 1998
Typical Traffic Control & Signing Examples
Ozalid on Bond

The Park at High Desert Construction Documents

2.8.1.DD. Package; 22 January 1998
High Desert Proposed Park Site Grading Plan
Ozalid on Bond

Lot Allocations

2.8.2.A. Sheet 1
Print on Acetate

Lot Allocations

2.8.2.B. Sheet 2
Print on Acetate

Lot Allocations

2.8.2.C. Sheet 3
Print on Acetate

Lot Allocations

2.8.2.D. Sheet 4
Print on Acetate

New Mexico Educators Federal Credit Union Pathway

2.8.3.A. Site Plan & Arroyo
Trace

New Mexico Educators Federal Credit Union Pathway

2.8.3.B. Office Park Site Plan & Arroyo
Print on Bond

New Mexico Educators Federal Credit Union Pathway

2.8.3.C. Office Park Site Plan & Arroyo
Trace Paper
2.8.3.D. New Mexico Educators Federal Credit Union Pathway Office Park Site Plan & Arroyo Fountain A Colored Pencil & Ink on Trace
2.8.3.E. New Mexico Educators Federal Credit Union Pathway Office Park Site Plan & Arroyo Fountain B Colored Pencil & Ink on Trace
2.8.4. Pathway Office Park: New Mexico Educators Federal Credit Union Landscaping Plan; 29 August 1997
2.8.5. Vista Del Norte Park Layout Plan (2) Vista Del Norte Park Schematic Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 8 Colored Pencil & Ink on Mylar
2.8.6. February 2000 Tracts 8A, 8B, and 8C Drainage Plan Proposed Phase I Conditions and Drainage Basins Map; Scale 1"=100'; 31 Ink on Mylar
2.8.7. March 1994 Jogging/Walking Trail Vista Del Norte Park Schematic Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 8 Ozalid on Bond with Redlining
2.8.8. February 2000 Vista Del Norte Park Schematic Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 8 Ozalid on Bond with Redlining
2.8.9. February 2000 Vista Del Norte Park Schematic Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 8 Ozalid on Bond with Redlining
2.8.10. February 2000 Vista Del Norte Park Schematic Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 8 Print on Bond
2.8.11. Phase I of Vista Del Norte Park; Scale 1"=40' Vista Del Norte Layout Plan Angle Parking Trace
2.8.12. February 2000 Boca Negra Trail Overlook Design Development Plan; Scale 1/8"=1' Vista Del Norte Layout Plan Base Map Copy on Bond
2.8.13.A. Print on Vellum
2.8.13.B. Print on Vellum
2.8.14. Topographic Map Print on Photo paper
2.8.15. Print on Mylar
2.8.16. Arial Photograph with Contours
2.8.17. Print on Mylar
2.8.18.A. Plat of High Desert Bernalillo County New Mexico June 1993 Sheet 1 Print on Acetate
2.8.18.B. Plat of High Desert Bernalillo County New Mexico June 1993 Sheet 2 Print on Acetate
2.8.18.C. Plat of High Desert Bernalillo County New Mexico June 1993 Sheet 3 Print on Acetate
2.8.18.D. Plat of High Desert Bernalillo County New Mexico June 1993 Sheet 4 Print on Acetate

**Series 1: High Desert**

2.9.1. Century Theaters Landscape Concept Plan A; Scale 1"=50'; 28 July 1995 Pencil & Ink on Vellum

**Cluster 9: Century Theaters**

2.10.1. Tramway Corridor: Existing Power Poles and 12 VHP Gas Line Locations; 24 July 1993
2.10.2.A. Revised Proposed Landform Along Tramway Boulevard with Trace Revision Overlay; Scale 1":20'; 2 July 1993 Revision Overlay Pencil on Trace In on Ozalid on Bond
2.10.2.B. Revised Proposed Landform Along Tramway Boulevard with Trace Revision Overlay; Scale 1":20'; 2 July 1993 Base In on Ozalid on Bond

**Cluster 10: Streetscapes**

2.10.3. Roadway Map
2.10.4. Spot Elevations
2.10.5.A. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 1 Print on Bond
2.10.5.B. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 2 Print on Bond
2.10.5.C. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 3 Print on Bond
2.10.5.D. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 4 Print on Bond
2.10.5.E. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 5 Print on Bond
2.10.5.F. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 6 Print on Bond
2.10.5.G. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 7 Print on Bond
2.10.5.H. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 8 Print on Bond
2.10.5.I. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 9 Print on Bond
2.10.5.J. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 10 Print on Bond
2.10.5.K. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 11 Print on Bond
2.10.5.L. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 12 Print on Bond
2.10.5.M. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 13 Print on Bond
2.10.5.N. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 14 Print on Bond
2.10.5.O. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 15 Print on Bond
2.10.5.P. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 16 Print on Bond
2.10.5.Q. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 17 Print on Bond
2.10.5.R. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 18 Print on Bond
2.10.5.S. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 19 Print on Bond
2.10.5.T. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 20 Print on Bond
2.10.5.U. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 21 Print on Bond
2.10.5.V. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 22 Print on Bond
2.10.5.W. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 23 Print on Bond
2.10.5.X. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 24 Print on Bond
2.10.5.Y. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 25 Print on Bond
2.10.5.Z. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 26 Print on Bond
2.10.5.AA. 9th and I Street Improvements; 30 June 1997 Revision A Sheet 27 Print on Bond

2.10.6.A. Proposed Sidewalk Layout
2.10.6.B. Proposed Sidewalk Layout
2.10.6.C. Proposed Sidewalk Layout
2.10.6.D. Proposed Sidewalk Layout
2.10.7. Proposed Sidewalk Layout; Scale 1”=20’; 12 November 1995 Marker on Trace

Proposed Sidewalk Layout Base; Scale 1”=20’; 12 November 1995 Marker on Trace
Option #1; Scale 1”=20’; 5 November 1995 Marker on Trace
Option #2; Scale 1”=20’; 5 November 1995 Marker on Trace
Option #3; Scale 1”=20’; 5 November 1995 Marker on Trace
Marker & Print on Bond
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.8</td>
<td>Sidewalk Plan; Scale 1&quot;=30'; December</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.9</td>
<td>Sidewalk Plan; Scale 1&quot;=40'; 12 December 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil &amp; Ink on Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.A</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Cover Sheet</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.B</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Spain Road Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.C</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Spain Road Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.D</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Spain Road Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.E</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Academy Boulevard Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.F</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Academy Boulevard Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.G</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Cortaderia Road Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.H</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Mirror Planting</td>
<td>Trace Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.I</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Cortaderia Road Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.J</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Cortaderia Road Planting</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.K</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Planting Details</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10.L</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995</td>
<td>Spain Road Irrigation</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10.10.M. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Spain Road Irrigation Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.N. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Spain Road Irrigation Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.O. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Academy Road Irrigation Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.P. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Academy Road Irrigation Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.Q. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Cortaderia Road Irrigation Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.R. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Cortaderia Road Irrigation Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.S. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Irrigation Details Ozalid on Bond
2.10.10.T. High Desert Streetscape Phase I: Academy, Spain, and Cortaderia Medians; City Approved Set 13 April 1995 Irrigation Details Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.A. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians Cover Sheet Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.B. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians Spain Road Planting Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.C. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians Spain Road Planting Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.D. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians Academy Boulevard Planting Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.E. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians Academy Boulevard Planting Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.F. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians Academy Boulevard Planting Ozalid on Bond
2.10.11.G. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians

2.10.11.H. High Desert Streetscape Phase II: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians

2.10.11.I. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.A. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.B. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.C. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.D. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.E. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.F. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.G. High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994

2.10.12.H. High Desert Streetscape: Academy, Spain, and High Desert St. Medians

High Desert Road Planting Ozalid on Bond

High Desert Road Planting Ozalid on Bond

Planting Details Ozalid on Bond

Cover Sheet Ozalid on Bond

L-1.1 Ozalid on Bond

L-1.2 Ozalid on Bond

L-1.3 Ozalid on Bond

L-2.1 Ozalid on Bond

L-2.2 Ozalid on Bond

L-2.3 Ozalid on Bond

L-2.4 Ozalid on Bond
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.12.I.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.12.J.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.12.K.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Academy Boulevard, Spain Road, Cortaderia Street Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.12.L.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.A.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.B.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.C.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.D.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.E.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.F.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.G.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13.H.</td>
<td>High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10.13.I. High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994 L-2.6 Ozalid on Bond
2.10.13.J. High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994 L-2.7 Ozalid on Bond
2.10.13.K. High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994 L-2.8 Ozalid on Bond
2.10.13.L. High Desert Streetscape: Tramway Boulevard Issued for 90% Review; 8 July 1994 L-2.9 Ozalid on Bond

2.10.14. Design Development Plan Phase One Streetscape; Scale 1”:40’; 7 April 1994 Print on Mylar
2.10.15. Schematic Streetscape Plan for Imperata Street Typical Landscape Plan; Scale 1”:50’; 14 September 1993 Colored Pencil on Ozalid on Bond
2.10.16. Schematic Streetscape Plan for Spain Street Typical Landscape Plan Ink & Colored Pencil on Ozalid on Bond
2.10.17. Schematic Streetscape Plan for Cortaderia Street Typical Landscape Plan; Scale 1”:50’; 14 September 1993 Ink & Colored Pencil on Ozalid on Bond
2.10.18. Schematic Streetscape Plan for Academy Road Typical Landscape Plan; Scale 1”:50’; 8 September 1993 Ink & Colored Pencil on Ozalid on Bond
2.10.19. Schematic Streetscape Plan for Tramway Boulevard Typical Landscape Plan; Scale 1”:50’; 8 September 1993 Ink & Colored Pencil on Ozalid on Bond

2.10.20.A. High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 Cover Sheet
2.10.20.B. High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 List of Drawings
| 2.10.20.C. | High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 high desert unit 1 streetscape design development; 25 | Academy Boulevard (Tramway to Cortaderia) | Print & Acetate Splices on Vellum |
| 2.10.20.D. | High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 high desert unit 1 streetscape design development; 25 | Academy Boulevard (Cortaderia to High Desert) | Print & Acetate Splices on Vellum |
| 2.10.20.E. | High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 high desert unit 1 streetscape design development; 25 | Spain Road (Tramway to Cortaderia) | Print & Acetate Splices on Vellum |
| 2.10.20.F. | High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 high desert unit 1 streetscape design development; 25 | Spain Road (Cortaderia to Imperata St.) | Print & Acetate Splices on Vellum |
| 2.10.20.G. | High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 high desert unit 1 streetscape design development; 25 | Cortaderia Street (Spain Road to Academy Blvd.) | Print & Acetate Splices on Vellum |
| 2.10.20.H. | High Desert Unit 1 Streetscape Design Development; 25 July 1995 high desert unit 1 streetscape design development; 25 | Imperata Street (Spain Road to Cul-de-sac) | Print & Acetate Splices on Vellum |
| 2.10.21. | High Desert Streetscape Unit 1: Highlands at High Desert high desert streetscape unit 1: highlands at high desert | Tramway Boulevard Landscape Construction Plan Package | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.10.22.A. | Tramway Boulevard Landscape Construction Plan Package | Sheet 3-6 | Print on Bond |
| 2.10.22.B. | Tramway Boulevard Landscape Construction Plan Package | Sheet 3-7 | Print on Bond |
| 2.10.22.C. | Tramway Boulevard Landscape Construction Plan Package | Sheet 3-8 | Print on Bond |
| 2.10.23. | Planting Plan along Unlabeled Roadway street sections; 11 April 1992 with Utilities Added 20 August 1992 high desert streetscape highlands at high desert | Colored Pencil & Print on Bond |
| 2.10.24. | Street Sections; 11 April 1992 with Utilities Added 20 August 1992 high desert streetscape highlands at high desert | Print on Diazo Mylar |
| 2.10.25. | Rancho Viejo Streetscapes; June 1997 high desert streetscape highlands at high desert | Print on Bond |
| 2.10.26.A. | High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert high desert streetscape highlands at high desert | Package (Incomplete) | Ozalid on Bond |
2.10.26.B. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Grading Plan Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.C. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Grading Plan Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.D. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Grading Plan and Sidewalk Layout Ozalid on Bond Pencil & Ink on Trace

2.10.26.E. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) Planting Concept Plan on Trace

2.10.26.F. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan Ozalid on Bond Pencil & Ink on Trace

2.10.26.G. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) Planting Concept Plan on Trace

2.10.26.H. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.I. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.J. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan Ozalid on Bond Pencil & Ink on Trace

2.10.26.K. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete) Planting Concept Plan on Trace
2.10.26.L. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete)  
High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan  
Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.M. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete)  
High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan  
Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.N. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete)  
High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Planting Plan  
Ozalid on Bond

2.10.26.O. High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Package (Incomplete)  
High Desert Streetscape Highlands at High Desert Detail Sheet  
Ozalid on Bond

*Series 1: High Desert*

2.11.1. Topographic Map

2.11.2. Enlargement of Retention Basin

2.11.3. Topography & Spot Elevations

2.11.4. Topographic Map

2.11.5. Simms Park Trail Plan; Scale 1”=100’; 16 April 1992

2.11.6. Simms Park Trail Plan; Scale 1”=100’; 16 April 1992

*Cluster 11: Topography & Grading*

2.11.7. Flood Control Authority Portion of East Heights Topographic Map; Scale 1”=200'

2.11.8. Portion of Elena Gallegos Grant Topographic Map; Scale 1”=200’
2.11.9. Topographic Map; 11 April 1992
2.11.10. Topographic Map
2.11.11. Topographic Map

Series 1: High Desert

2.12.1.A. Sediment Pond Proposals
2.12.1.B. Sediment Pond Proposals
2.12.1.C. Sediment Pond Proposals
2.12.1.D. Sediment Pond Proposals

Cluster 12: Studies & Schematics
Spliced Print on Acetate

Sheet 1
Sheet 2
Sheet 3
Sheet 4

2.12.2. Estate Lot Study; 1”:30’
2.12.3. Estate Lot Study with Topography; 1”:30’
2.12.4. Estate Lot Study; 8 April 1993

2.12.5. Concept Diagram
2.12.6. Site Plan on Trace
2.12.7. 50x100 Single Family Detached Lots; Scale 1”:50’

Series 1: High Desert

Cluster 13: High Desert Master Plan
Ink on Mylar

2.13.1. High Desert Vicinity Map
2.13.2. Location Map
2.13.3. High Desert Site Plan
2.13.4. Lotting Plan
2.13.5. Lotting Plan
2.13.6. Topographic Map

Series 1: High Desert

Cluster 14: Illustrations & Imagery
Pencil on Vellum

2.14.1. Perspective Sketch of Project Area
2.14.2. Color Perspective Sketch of Project Area  Pencil on Bond
2.14.3. Non-Native Planting Zone Inside Walled Yards   Pencil on Vellum

Native L.S. Front Yards: Taller Non-Native Trees in
2.14.4. Rear Yards  Pencil on Vellum
2.14.5. Contemporary Ranch Style (Approved)  Ink on Trace
2.14.6. Approved Pueblo Style (One Story)  Ink on Trace
2.14.7. Territorial (Approved)  Ink on Trace
2.14.8. Colonial Spanish  Ink on Trace
2.14.9. Doors & Entrance Windows  Ink on Trace
2.14.10. Contemporary Style (Approved)  Ink on Trace
2.14.11. Ranch Style (Approved)  Ink on Trace
2.14.12. Approved Pueblo Style (2 Story)  Ink on Trace
2.14.13. Not Approved Styles  Ink on Trace
2.14.14. Stepped Fascia: Contemporary or territorial  Ink on Trace
2.14.15. Stepped Fascia Territorial  Ink on Trace
2.14.16. Balcony Detail  Ink on Trace
2.14.17. Stepped Fascia: Colonial Spanish or Mediterranean  Ink on Trace
2.14.18. Column Alternatives  Ink on Trace
2.14.19. Archway Alternatives  Ink on Trace
2.14.20. Chimney Designs  Ink on Trace
2.14.21. Exterior Stairs  Ink on Trace
2.14.22. A/C Unit Location  Ink on Trace
2.14.23. Wind Orientation  Ink on Trace
2.14.24. Cul-De-Sac Schematic  Ink on Trace
2.14.25. Create Undulating Landform and Gentle Slope Transition  Ink on Trace
2.14.26. Wall Alternatives  Ink on Trace
2.14.27. Exterior Lighting  Ink on Trace
2.14.28. Curb Drops  Ink on Trace
2.14.29. Switch Box Alternatives
2.14.30. Building/Site Relationship Cross-Section
2.14.31. Parking Screens Alternatives
   Wall Grade Change & Horizontal Direction Change;
2.14.32. Obsolete 23 June 1993
2.14.33. Ornamental Iron at Cow Walls
2.14.34. Residential Lane Cross Section
2.14.35. Residential Street Cross Section
2.14.36. Residential Collector Cross Section
2.14.37. Minor Collector Road Cross Section
2.14.38. Major Collector Road Cross Section
2.14.39. Elevation
2.14.41. Computer Generated Perspective of Project Area
2.14.42. Computer Generated Perspective
2.14.43. Computer Generated Perspective
2.14.44. Pueblo Style Cross-Section in Color

Series 1: High Desert

2.15.1. Lotting Plan for Parcel 15
2.15.2. Lotting Plan for Parcel 15
2.15.3. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
   Lotting Plan with Existing Topography; Version 2 June
2.15.4. 1994

Cluster 15: Parcel 15

2.15. Lotting Plan for Parcel 15
2.15.2. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
2.15.3. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography; Version 2 June
2.15.4. 1994
2.15.5. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
Lotting Plan with Existing Topography; Version 21 June 1994
2.15.6. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
2.15.7. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
2.15.8.A. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
2.15.8.B. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
2.15.8.C. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
2.15.9.A. Trace of Intersection
2.15.9.B. Trace of Lotting Plan
2.15.9.C. Trace of Intersections
2.15.10. Lotting Plan with Existing Topography
High Desert Panhandle Aerial Photograph with
2.15.11. Topography
Lotting Plan with Existing Topography with Phase 1 Delineation
2.15.12. Lotting Plan
2.15.13. Highlands Planting Plan Schematic Plan; 30 August 1994
Orthophoto Contour Map of the Highlands Units 1. 2. & 3 at High Desert Subdivision
2.15.14. Property Allocation for Parcel 16
Series 1: High Desert
2.15.15. Cluster 16: Parcel 16: The Highlands
2.15.16. Marker on Ozalid on Bond
Ozalid on Bond
Pencil on Ozalid on Bond
Trace of Intersection
Pencil on Trace
Pencil on Trace
Pencil & Ink on Ozalid
Print on Mylar
Ink on Ozalid on Bond
Ink & Print on Mylar
Ink on Ozalid on Bond
Print & Ink on Bond
Print on Photo paper
2.16.1. Lot Allocations for Parcel 16: The Highlands

2.16.2.A. Planting Concept Plan over Highlands Planting Plan; Scale 1”:20’
   Planting Concept Plan on Trace

2.16.2.B. Planting Concept Plan over Highlands Planting Plan; Scale 1”:20’
   Planting Plan

2.16.3. Highlands Planting Concept Plan

2.16.4. Highlands Planting Concept Plan

2.16.5.A. Highlands Grading Plan; Scale 1”:20’ with Mylar Sheet of Grading Revision
   Grading Plan

2.16.5.B. Highlands Grading Plan; Scale 1”:20’ with Mylar Sheet of Grading Revision
   Grading Revision

2.16.6.A. Highlands Planting Plan; Scale 1”:20’ with Mylar Sheet of Grading Revision
   Planting Plan

2.16.6.B. Highlands Planting Plan; Scale 1”:20’ with Mylar Sheet of Grading Revision
   Grading Revision

2.16.7. Highlands Planting Plan; Scale 1”:20’

2.16.8. Planting Concept Plan

   Series 1: High Desert

2.17.1. Enlarged Master Development Schedule
   Print on Acetate

2.17.2. Master Development Schedule
   Print on Acetate

2.17.3. Master Development Schedule High Desert

   Series 1: High Desert

2.18.1.A. Irrigation Master Plan by aci
   Control System
2.18.1.B. Irrigation Master Plan by aci

2.18.2.A. Richard Emik Associates

2.18.2.B. Richard Emik Associates

2.18.2.C. Richard Emik Associates

Series I: High Desert

2.19.1. Gas

2.19.2.A. High Desert Subdivision Plan

2.19.2.B. High Desert Subdivision Plan

2.19.2.C. High Desert Subdivision Plan

Cluster 19: Engineering/Utility Packages

2.19.2.D. High Desert Subdivision Plan

2.19.2.E. High Desert Subdivision Plan

2.19.2.F. High Desert Subdivision Plan

2.19.2.G. High Desert Subdivision Plan

Phase I Water Sources
Street/Transition Landscape Concept and Entry Monumentation Elevation; 8 June 1994
High Desert Apartments Cross Sections
Plant Material Zones
Ozalid on Bond

Overall Paving Plan Phase I-B
Print on Bond with Redlining

Overall Paving Plan Phase I-A
Print on Bond with Redlining

Paving Plan and Profile
Academy Station 70+00 to Station 80+50
Print on Bond with Redlining

Paving Plan and Profile
Academy Station 57+50 to Station 70+00
Print on Bond with Redlining

Paving Plan and Profile Imperata Street Station 23+50 to 36+00 (S)
Print on Bond with Redlining

Paving Plan and Profile Imperata Street Station 12+00 to 23+50 (South)
Print on Bond with Redlining

Cortaderia Street Station 60+00 to 72+00
Print on Bond with Redlining
| 2.19.2.H. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Paving Plan and Profile Cortaderia Street Station 48+00 to 60+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.A. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Academy Station 46+00 to 57+50 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.B. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Academy Station 57+50 to 70+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.C. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Academy Station 70+00 to 80+50 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.D. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Academy Station 80+50 to 83+21.15 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.E. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: High Desert Street Station 1+00 to 8+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.F. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Spain Road Station 58+00 to 70+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.G. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Spain Road Station 70+00 to 81+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.H. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Cortaderia Street Station 60+00 to 72+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.I. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Cortaderia Street Station 48+00 to 60+00 Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.J. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Imperata Street Station 12+00 to 23+50 (South) Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.3.K. | High Desert Subdivision Plan | Utility Plan Profile: Imperata Street Station 23+50 to 36+00 (South) Print on Bond with Redlining |
| 2.19.4.A. | High Desert Subdivision Plan Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1 | Title Sheet Print on Bond |
Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

2.19.4.B. Paving Plan and Profile: Elena Gallegos Place Station 1+00 to 12+00 Print on Bond

2.19.4.C. Paving Plan and Profile: Elena Gallegos Place Station 12+00 to 16+84.92 Print on Bond

2.19.4.D. Paving Plan and Profile: Canada Del Oso Station 1+00 to 9+58.20 Print on Bond

2.19.4.E. Paving Plan and Profile: Canada del Oso Station 9+58.20 to 19+07.47 Print on Bond

2.19.4.F. Paving Plan and Profile: Canada del Oso Station 19+07.47 to 27+40.27 Print on Bond

2.19.4.G. Paving Plan and Profile: Apache Plume Place Station 1+12 to 8+28.74 Print on Bond

2.19.4.H. Paving Plan and Profile: Fringe Sage Court Station 1+12 to 7+49.10 Print on Bond

2.19.4.I. Paving Plan and Profile: Blue Flax Court Station 1+75 to 4+67.15 Print on Bond

2.19.4.J. Paving Plan and Profile: Elena Gallegos Court Station 1+12 to 2+56.70 Print on Bond

2.19.4.K. Paving Plan and Profile: Bear Grass Court Station 1+11 to 3+80.92 Print on Bond
2.19.4.L. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Paving Plan and Profile: Buffalo Grass Court Station 1+12 to 1+36.12

Print on Bond

2.19.4.M. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Elena Gallegos Place Station 1+00 to 12+00

Print on Bond

2.19.4.N. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Elena Gallegos Place Station 12+00 to 16+84.92

Print on Bond

2.19.4.O. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Canada Del Oso Station 1+00 to 9+58.20

Print on Bond

2.19.4.P. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Canada del Oso Station 9+58.20 to 19+07.47

Print on Bond

Utility Plan: Canada del Oso Station Utility Plan: 19+07.47 to 27+40.27

Print on Bond

2.19.4.Q. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Apache Plume Place Station 1+12 to 8+28.74

Print on Bond

2.19.4.R. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Fringe Sage Court Station 1+12 to 7+49.10

Print on Bond

2.19.4.S. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Blue Flax Court Station 1+75 to 4+67.15

Print on Bond

2.19.4.T. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Elena Gallegos Court Station 1+12 to 2+56.70

Print on Bond

2.19.4.U. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Bear Grass Court Station 1+11 to 3+80.92

Print on Bond

2.19.4.V. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Buffalo Grass Court Station 1+12 to 1+36.12

Print on Bond

2.19.4.W. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Waterline Easement

Print on Bond

2.19.4.X. Construction Plans for the Highlands at High Desert Subdivision Unit 1

Utility Plan: Waterline Easement

Print on Bond
<p>| 2.19.5.A. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Title Sheet/Vicinity Map | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.B. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Plan and Profile Station 2+08 to 8+50 | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.C. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Plan and Profile Station 8+50 to 20+50 | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.D. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Plan and Profile Station 20+50 to 32+00 | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.E. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Storm Drain Plan &amp; Profile: Academy Station 32+00 - 35+31.79 and North Bear Tributary Arroyo Desiltation Pond | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.F. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Plan and Profile Station 32+00 to 35+17.15 | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.G. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | North Bear Tributary Pond | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.H. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Plan and Profile Station 40+00 to 50+50 | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.I. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Academy Boulevard Station 50+50 to 52+33.74 and South Bear Tributary Arroyo Desiltation Pond | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.J. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | Plan and Profile Station 50+50 to 52+33.74 | Ozalid on Bond |
| 2.19.5.K. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) | South Bear Tributary Pond | Ozalid on Bond |
|          |                                           | Finished Grade Grid Map | Ozalid on Bond |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.L</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Plan and Profile Station 6+30.59 to 11+63.82 Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.M</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Desiltation Ponds Details Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.N</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Desiltation Ponds Details Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.O</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Riprap Details Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.P</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Tramway Ponds Grading Plan and Miscellaneous Details Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.Q</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Wire Enclosed Riprap Details Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.R</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Structural Details Ozalid on Bond Structural Details Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.S</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Special Wingwall and Headwall for 48” Diameter RCP Station 35+17.15 Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5.T</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase 1-B-1 Storm Drainage (Academy Storm Drain) Special Wingwall and Headwall for 84” Diameter RCP Station 52+17.49 Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.A</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Title Sheet Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.B</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A General Notes Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.C</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Key Map Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.D</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.E</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.F</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.G</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.H</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.I</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.K</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.L</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.M</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Overall Paving Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.N</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Overall Utility Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.O</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Overall Utility Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.P</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Paving Plan and Profile Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.Q</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Paving Plan and Profile Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.R</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I- A Paving Plan and Profile Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.19.6.S. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Paving Plan and Profile  
Academy Boulevard Station 80+50 to 83+21.16  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.T. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Paving Plan and Profile  
High Desert Street Station 1+00 to 8+00  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.U. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Paving Plan and Profile  
Spain Road Station 51+00 to 58+00  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.V. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Paving Plan and Profile  
Cortaderia Street Station 48+00 to 60+00  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.W. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Intersection Details:  
Academy/Tramway Intersection Detail  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.X. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Intersection Details:  
Spain/Tramway Intersection Detail  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.Y. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Intersection Details:  
Tramway Bike/Pedestrian Path Details  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.Z. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Storm Drain Plan and Profile:  
Academy Boulevard Station 57+50 to 70+00  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.AA. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Storm Drain Plan and Profile:  
Cortaderia Street Station 48+00 to 60+00  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.BB. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Drainage Plans: Desiltation Pond #6 and Academy Storm & Drain Outlet Works  
Print on Bond

2.19.6.CC. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Drainage Plans: Desiltation Pond #7  
Print on Bond
<p>| 2.19.6.DD. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Drainage Plans: Misc. Drainage Utility Plan and Profile: Academy Boulevard Station 46+00 to 57+50, Includes Storm Drain | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.EE. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Academy Boulevard Station 57+50 to 70+00 | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.FF. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Academy Boulevard Station 70+00 to 80+50, Includes Storm Drain | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.GG. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Academy Boulevard Station 80+50 to 83+21.16 | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.HH. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: High Desert Street Station 1+00 to 8+00 | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.II. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 41+00 to 51+00 &amp; SAS Extension | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.JJ. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Sanitary Sewer Extension in Spain Road | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.KK. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Sanitary Sewer Extension in Spain Road | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.LL. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | Utility Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 51+00 to 58+00, Includes Storm Drain | Print on Bond |
| 2.19.6.MM. | Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.NN.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Utility Plan and Profile: Cortaderia Street Station 48+00 to 60+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.OO.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Waterline Details Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.QQ.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Signal/Lighting Estimated Quantity Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.SS.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Traffic Signal Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.TT.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Traffic Signal Conduits and Cables Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.UU.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Traffic Signal Functions and Detectors Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.VV.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Spain/Tramway Demolition/Construction Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6.WW.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A Traffic Signal Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.19.6.XX. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Spain/Tramway Traffic Signal Conduits and Cables
Print on Bond

2.19.6.YY. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Spain/Tramway Traffic Signal Functions and Detectors
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Academy/Tramway Lighting Plans
Print on Bond

2.19.6.ZZ. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Spain/Tramway Lighting Plans
Print on Bond

2.19.6.AAA. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.BBB. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.CCC. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.DDD. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.EEE. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6FFF. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.GGG. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.HHH. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond

2.19.6.III. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
Traffic Signal and Lighting Plans: Traffic Signal Details
Print on Bond
2.19.6.JJJ. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Traffic Control Plans: Sequence of Construction
Traffic Control Plans: COA-Signing and Construction Traffic Control Standards
Traffic Control Plans: COA-Typical Traffic Control and Signing Examples
Striping and Signing Plans: Phase I-A Striping and Signing Plan for Academy Station 46+00 - Station 70+00
Striping and Signing Plans: Phase I-A Striping and Signing Plan for Academy Station 70+00 - 83+12.16 and High Desert Station 1+00 - 8+00
Striping and Signing Plans: Phase I-A Striping and Signing Plan for Spain Road Station 46+00 - 58+00 and Cortaderia Street Station 50+00 - 60+00
Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans
Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans
Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans
Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans
Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond

2.19.6.KKK. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.LLL. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.MMM. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.NNN. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.OOO. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.PPP. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.QQQ. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.RRR. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

2.19.6.SSS. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A

Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
Print on Bond
2.19.6.TTT. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
2.19.6.UUU. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-A
2.19.7.A. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.B. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.C. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.D. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.E. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.F. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.G. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.H. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.I. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.J. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.K. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.L. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
2.19.7.M. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Landscape and Irrigation Plans: Stamped on Bond

Title Sheet Print on Bond
General Notes Print on Bond
Key Map Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Plat/Survey Control Print on Bond
Typical Road and Pavement Sections Print on Bond
Typical Road and Pavement Sections Print on Bond
Overall Paving Plan Print on Bond
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.N.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Overall Utility Plan Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.O.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Paving Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 58+00 to 70+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.P.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Paving Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 70+00 to 81+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.Q.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Cortaderia Street Station 60+00 to 72+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.R.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Paving Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 1+00 to 12+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.S.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Paving Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 12+00 to 23+50 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.T.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Paving Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 23+50 to 36+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.U.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Spain Storm Drain Station 1+00 to 5+77.83 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.V.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 58+00 to 70+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.W.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 70+00 to 81+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7.X.</td>
<td>Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Cortaderia Street Station 60+00 to 72+00 Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 12+00 to 23+50
Print on Bond

Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 23+50 to 36+00
Print on Bond

Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Miscellaneous Drainage Details
Print on Bond

Storm Drain Plan and Profile: Desiltation Pond #1
Print on Bond

Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Drainage Plans: Desiltation Ponds #2 and #2A
Print on Bond

Drainage Plans: Desiltation Pond #3
Print on Bond

Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Drainage Plans: Desiltation Pond #4, #5A and #5B
Print on Bond

Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Drainage Plans: Spain Storm Drain Connection at Tramway
Print on Bond

Drainage Plans: Spain Storm Drain Connection Details
Print on Bond

Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B

Utility Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 58+00 to 70+00
Print on Bond

Utility Plan and Profile: Spain Road Station 70+00 to 81+00
Print on Bond

Utility Plan and Profile: Cortaderia Street Station 60+00 to 72+00
Print on Bond

Utility Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 1+00 to 12+00
Print on Bond
2.19.7.LL. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
Utility Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 12+00 to 23+50
Print on Bond

2.19.7.MM. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
Utility Plan and Profile: Imperata Street Station 23+50 to 36+00
Print on Bond

2.19.7.NN. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
Utility Plan and Profile: Waterline Details
Print on Bond

2.19.7.OO. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
Striping and Signing Plans: Spain Road Station 58+00 to 81+00
Print on Bond

2.19.7.PP. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
Striping and Signing Plans: Cortadera Street Station 60+00 to 72+00 & Imperata Street Station 10+00 to 12+00
Print on Bond

2.19.7.QQ. Construction Plans for High Desert Subdivision Phase I-B
Striping and Signing Plans: Imperata Street Station 12+00 to 36+00
Print on Bond
APPENDIX D

ASPCOL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topographic Map by Schmueser Gordon Meyer Inc. by Reids Aerial Mapping; Scale 1&quot;=50'; 10 October 1989</td>
<td>Sheet 1</td>
<td>Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.A.</td>
<td>Topographic Map by Schmueser Gordon Meyer Inc. by Reids Aerial Mapping; Scale 1&quot;=50'; 10 October 1989</td>
<td>Sheet 2</td>
<td>Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.B.</td>
<td>Topographic Map by Schmueser Gordon Meyer Inc. by Reids Aerial Mapping; Scale 1&quot;=50'; 10 October 1989</td>
<td>Sheet 3</td>
<td>Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.C.</td>
<td>Topographic Map by Schmueser Gordon Meyer Inc. by Reids Aerial Mapping; Scale 1&quot;=50'; 10 October 1989</td>
<td>Sheet 4</td>
<td>Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.D.</td>
<td>Topographic Map by Schmueser Gordon Meyer Inc. by Reids Aerial Mapping; Scale 1&quot;=50'; 10 October 1989</td>
<td>Sheet 5</td>
<td>Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.E.</td>
<td>Topographic Map by Schmueser Gordon Meyer Inc. by Reids Aerial Mapping; Scale 1&quot;=50'; 10 October 1989</td>
<td>Sheet 6</td>
<td>Print on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.</td>
<td>Unlabeled Plat; Scale 1&quot;=10'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Print on Vellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.</td>
<td>Starwood Plat Layout</td>
<td>Plat of Stern Ranch Subdivision and Starwood</td>
<td>Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subdivision; Scale 1&quot;=400'</td>
<td>Print on Vellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plat of Lots R-17-A and R-18-A, Starwood, and Plat of Starwood Fourteen; Scale 1&quot;=100'</td>
<td>Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amended and Restated Plat of Starwood Ranch Lot</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Split by Alpine Surveys, Inc.; Revised 23 March 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Amended and Restated Plat of Starwood Ranch

3.1.7. Lot Split by Alpine Surveys, Inc.; 2 August 1989
Star Mountain Ranch/Starwood Ranch; Lot Line
Adjustment by Alpine Surveys, Inc.; Revisions on 8

3.1.8. December 1986
Star Mesa 35 Acre Parcel Vicinity Map; Scale
1"=1025'

3.1.9. ASPCOL/Starwood Ranch Subdivision: Summary of
Area Irrigated by Red Mountain Ditch; Scale 1"=200';

3.1.10. 5 August 1991

Series 3: ASPCOL Cluster 2: Master Plan

3.2.1. ASPCOL Illustrative Master Plan; Scale 1"=60'
ASPCOL Residence Master Plan: Existing Conditions
Prepared by Design Workshop, Inc.; 1"=120'; 8

3.2.2. December 1989
ASPCOL Residence Master Plan: Existing Conditions
Prepared by Design Workshop, Inc.; 1"=120'; 2

3.2.3. February 1990
Topographic Map of ASPCOL and Surroundings with
Lot Lines; Scale 1"=200'

3.2.4. ASPCOL Topographic Map
ASPCOL Schematic Ranch Master Plan; Scale 1"=60';

3.2.5. 26 February 1990
ASPCOL Master Plan with Ski Amenities; Scale
1"=120'; 1 April 1990

3.2.6. ASPCOL Master Plan
Path to Caretakers

3.2.7. A. ASPCOL Master Plan
Path to Caretakers

3.2.8. Colored Pencil and Marker
on Print on Bond

3.2.9. Ink & Adhesive on Diazo
Mylar

3.2.10. Print on Mylar

3.2.11. Ink and Print on Mylar
Print on Mylar

3.2.12. Ink on Mylar

3.2.13. Print on Diazo Mylar

3.2.14. Pencil and Ink on Trace
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.8.B.</th>
<th>ASPCOL Master Plan</th>
<th>Roadway Redesign</th>
<th>Pencil and Ink on Trace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.8.C.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan</td>
<td>Revisions</td>
<td>Ink on Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.9.A.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=60'</td>
<td>Aspen Forest; 5 August 1991</td>
<td>Colored Pencil and Ink on Trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.9.B.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=60'; 1 April 1990</td>
<td>Base Map</td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.10.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=120'; 1 April 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ink on Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.11.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=60'; 1 April 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sepia on Acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.12.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=120'; 1 April 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.13.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; 1&quot;=200'; 3 July 1991</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>Ink and Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.14.A.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Print on Acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.14.B.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan</td>
<td>Blank Sheet</td>
<td>Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.15.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; 1&quot;=200'; 5 August 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ink and Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.16.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=200'; 5 August 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.17.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; Scale 1&quot;=120'; 7 January 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.18.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan: Irrigation Quantities; Scale 1&quot;=60'; 1 April 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sepia on Acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.19.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan: Irrigation Quantities; Scale 1&quot;=60'; 1 April 1990 Irrigation 8 August 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sepia on Acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.20.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan: Additional Landscape Zones; Scale 1&quot;=60'; Revised 23 October 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adhesive, Ink, and Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.21.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan: Additional Landscape Zones; Scale 1&quot;=60'; Revised 23 October 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ozalid on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.22.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan; --cess Alternatives; Scale 1&quot;=120'; 9 October 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Print on Diazo Mylar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.23.</td>
<td>ASPCOL Master Plan with Surroundings and Measurements; Scale 1&quot;=200'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Pencil on Print on Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.24.A. ASPCOL Pin Bar Document Set
Site Plan Base; Scale 1"=30'
Ink on Mylar

3.2.24.B. ASPCOL Pin Bar Document Set
L2.1: Site Grading Plan;
Scale 1":30'
Ink on Mylar

3.2.24.C. ASPCOL Pin Bar Document Set
L2.2: Site Grading Plan;
Scale 1"=30'
Ink on Mylar

3.2.25. ASPCOL Master Plan: Bricol Access Alternatives;
Scale 1"=120'; 9 October 1991
Ozalid on Bond

3.2.26. Revised 5 May 1992
Ink on Mylar

3.3.1.A. Bricol Log Home
L-1: Site Plan; Scale 1"=20'
Sepia on Acetate

3.3.1.B. Bricol Log Home
L-4: Tree Planting Plan;
Scale 1/8": 1'
Sepia on Acetate

3.3.1.C. Bricol Log Home
L-5: Shrub & Groundcover Planting Plan; Scale 1/8"=1'
Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.A. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.1: Entry Drive Planting Plan; 1"=30'
Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.B. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.2: House Planting Plan; 1/16"=1'
Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.C. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.3: Planting Plan Courtyards; Scale 1/8"=1'
Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.D. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.4: Planting Plan Stream Terrace; 1.8"=1'
Sepia on Acetate

Series 3: ASPCOL Cluster 3: Planting & Irrigation Plans
3.3.2.E. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.1: Irrigation Pump Plan; Scale 1"=30' Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.F. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.2: Entry Drive Irrigation Plan; No Scale Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.G. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.3: House Irrigation Plan; No Scale Sepia on Acetate

3.3.2.H. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.4: Irrigation Details; No Scale Sepia on Acetate

3.3.3.A. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.1: Entry Drive Planting Plan; 1"=30' Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.B. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.2: House Planting Plan; 1/16"=1' Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.C. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.3: Planting Plan Courtyards; Scale 1/8"=1' Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.D. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L4.4: Planting Plan Stream Terrace; 1/8"=1' Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.E. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.1: Irrigation Pump Plan; Scale 1"=30' Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.F. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.2: Entry Drive Irrigation Plan; No Scale Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.G. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.3: House Irrigation Plan; No Scale Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.3.H. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
L5.4: Irrigation Details; No Scale Sepia Print on Mylar

3.3.4. ASPCOL Landscape Plan
Print on Photo paper

Series 3: ASPCOL Cluster 4: Equestrian Center
3.4.1.A. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
1: Equestrian Center Grading; Scale 1"=20'; 13 August 1990
Sepia on Acetate
2: Equestrian Center Layout; Scale 1"=20'; 14 August 1990
Sepia on Acetate
3: Equestrian Center Planting Plan; Scale 1"=20'
Print on Mylar

3.4.1.B. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
Equestrian Center Details; 22 August 1990
Pencil & Print on Mylar

3.4.1.C. Starwood Ranch Lot Two

3.4.1.D. Starwood Ranch Lot Two
Equestrian Center Grading Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 13 August 1990
Pencil and Ink on Mylar
Equestrian Center Layout; Scale 1"=20'; 14 August 1990
Pencil on Mylar
Equestrian Center Planting Plan; Scale 1"=20'
Pencil and Ink on Mylar
Equestrian Center Hardscape
Ink on Mylar
Equestrian Center Planting Plan; Scale 1"=20'
Ink on Mylar

Series 3: ASPCOL Cluster 5: Tennis Court

ASPCOL Residence: Tennis Court Plan with Section;
Scale 1"=10'; 1 January 1990
Pencil and Ink on Mylar
Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents;
Proposed Tennis Court
Print on Mylar

TC 1: Scale 1"=10'; Issued for Construction 30 July 1990

3.5.3.A. Tennis Court Construction Documents
Print on Mylar
| 3.5.3.B. | Tennis Court Construction Documents | TC 2: Grading Plan; Scale 1"=10'; Issued for Construction 30 July 1990 | Ink and Print on Mylar |
| 3.5.3.C. | Tennis Court Construction Documents | TC 3: Details; Issued for Construction 30 July 1990 | Print on Mylar |
| 3.5.3.D. | Tennis Court Construction Documents | TC 4: Details; Issued for Construction 30 July 1990 | Print on Mylar |
| 3.5.4.A. | Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents Progress Print; Printed 5 June 1990 | Dimension Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 3.5.4.B. | Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents Progress Print; Printed 5 June 1990 | Grading Plan | Ozalid on Bond |
| 3.5.4.C. | Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents Progress Print; Printed 5 June 1990 | Retaining Wall/Fence Elevation and Tennis House/Retaining Wall/Fence Elevation | Ozalid on Bond |
| 3.5.4.D. | Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents Progress Print; Printed 5 June 1990 | Guard Rail Elevation, Gate Elevation, Sandstone Paving/Steps, Retaining Wall @ Tennis Court, Tennis Net Post, Paving Over Structure, Concrete Band/Fence Post Connection, Tennis Court/Light Connection/Footing | Ozalid on Bond |
| 3.5.5. | Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents Dimension Plan | | Print on Mylar |
| 3.5.6. | Schematic Tennis Court Grading; Scale 1"=10'; 22 February 1990 | | Marker on Mylar |
3.5.7.A. Schematic Tennis Court Grading  
3.5.7.B. Schematic Tennis Court Grading  
3.5.7.C. Schematic Tennis Court Grading  
3.5.8. Tennis Court Grading Plan  
3.5.9. Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents  
3.5.10. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.11. Starwood Ranch Lot Two; Construction Documents  
3.5.12.A. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.B. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.C. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.D. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.E. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.F. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.G. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.H. Tennis Court Details  
3.5.12.I. Tennis Court Details

Base Map  
Contours  
Contours  
Pencil on Mylar  
Pencil and Ink on Trace  
Pencil and Ink on Trace  
Print on Mylar  
Print on Mylar  
Print on Mylar  
Blank Sheet  
1: Gate Elevation; Scale 1"=1'  
Print on Mylar  
2: Typical Section - Paving Over Structure; Scale 1 1/2"= 1'  
Pencil on Graph Paper  
3: Sandstone Paving/Steps; Scale 1 1/2"=1'  
Pencil on Graph Paper  
4: Retaining Wall at Tennis Court; Scale 3/4" = 1'  
Print on Mylar  
5: Tennis Net Post; Scale 1"=1'  
Pencil and Print on Graph Paper  
6: Tennis Court Light Detail; Scale 1"=1'  
Pencil on Graph Paper  
7: Concrete Band/Fence Post Connection; Scale 1 1/2"=1'  
Pencil and Print on Graph Paper  
8: Fence Elevation; Scale 1"=1'  
Print on Mylar
ASPCOL Residence Foundation Plan; Scale 1/8"=1'; 8

June 1990

Print on Vellum

Series 3: ASPCOL Cluster 6: Pond

ASPCOL Pond Grading Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 9 January 1991

ASPCOL Pond Grading Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 9 January

ASPCOL Pond Grading Plan; Scale 1"=20'; 9 January 1991

ASPCOL Pond Study Alternative "A"; Scale 1"=30';

13 August 1991

ASPCOL Supplemental Pond Alternative A; Scale

1"=20'; 29 October 1991

ASPCOL Supplemental Pond Alternative B; Scale

1"=20'; 29 October 1991

ASPCOL Pond #2 Pin Bar Document; Scale 1"=20'; 30 October 1991

ASPCOL Pond Alternative; Scale 1"=30'; 23 December 1991

ASPCOL Pond Alternative; 23 December 1991

ASPCOL Pond Alternative; 23 December 1991

Bricol E.T. Beds

Site Plan and Sections; 29 January 1992

Bricol E.T. Beds

Grading Plan

Pond with Existing and Proposed Topography

Ink on Mylar

ASPCOL Pond Grading Plan

Ink on Mylar

Pond and Existing Topography

Ink on Mylar

Red & Black Ink on Mylar

Pencil & Black Ink on Mylar

Red & Black Ink on Mylar

Ink on Mylar

Ozalid on Bond

Red & Black Ink on Mylar

Ink on Mylar

Ink on Mylar

Ink on Mylar

Ink on Mylar
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3.6.17. ASPCOL Site Grading Ink on Mylar
APPENDIX E

PROPOSED TEACHING MODULE
The following is a teaching module proposed by Carlos Licón, a professor in the Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department at Utah State University, utilizing some of the Design Workshop Archives and Digital Collection.

A Learning Module for LAEP 3120 Residential Planning & Design

The Residential Planning and Design Studio focuses on residential projects, planned unit developments, transit-oriented development, and community facilities. It is an introduction to theory and methods of community and neighborhood design and planning. The sequence of projects goes from single family unit studies to housing development design proposals.

A learning module can be an excellent introduction to larger housing design methodologies in the second part of the semester. It will provide students with the opportunity to review the design process of the High Desert (Parcel 7) project, reflect, and understand better their own approach to design problems. The learning module presents different levels of information and knowledge changing through different phases of a design process. Students will analyze each phase and should discover the information relevant to each step in the process. The critical review of Design Workshop Archive and Digital Collection documents should also help the students develop and practice skills of critical analysis of design documents. They will have an opportunity to express in writing their findings and observations about a design.

Student will be presented with a series of documents showing the design process of a project. Two categories of information in the DW documents are relevant to the learning module: content and process information:
Content information: the substantive evidence contained in the documents. The student responsibility is to identify what type of information is present in each phase of the project and to describe its characteristics. Content information can be grouped in:

- Base drawing [photo, printed map, etc.]
- Text annotations describing features or comments about the project
- Diagrams
- Other drawings over the base drawing
- Quantitative information [tables, notes, etc.]

Process information: every document is part of a larger complete design process. This process requires different types of data and different ways of representing the information depending on the purpose of each document in the larger design process. The student can analyze each document to identify and describe not only what content information is evident, but how it is handled. This is the main portion of analysis for the student. This study on methods will help to interpret and define the DW analysis process. The student will identify purpose and process from information about:

- Relative importance of different elements of the project represented in the document
- Level of precision of the drawing elements
- Dominant type of information [text annotations, details, corrections, sketches, technical drawing, etc.]
- Intended purpose of drawing
• Types of analysis elements present [quantification of features, descriptions, tests…]

For the student to be able to analyze documents, it is important establish an initial framework of the design process. This framework will be used to organize DW documents before delivering them to students for the module activities. The list can initially be:

• Exploration
• Site analysis
• Concept development
• Draft proposal
• Full proposal
• Details
• Technical solutions
• Supporting document

Students will be presented with drawing images phase by phase. Together with the images the module will include a brief description of the document, a series of activities, and questions for the student. Each exercise requires the student to analyze a particular set of drawings, identifying and describing the components present, and write her description of that phase of the planning process as evident in the DW documents. At the end of the module the student will have described five to seven phases of the design process and should have identified evidence to support his descriptions.
For the final document of the module, the student will represent her understanding of the complete design process and will discuss the differences, shortcomings, and advantages of the DW approach compared to her personal approach. At the end of the module, the student should feel comfortable to talk about:

- The design process
- The type of information each design phase needs to handle
- The level of precision required
- The dialogue between designers and the project
- The communication power of documents
- The thinking process expressed in the documents
- The styles of designers [related to individual thinking process]

A structured analysis of DW documents allows the student to:

- Discover from the documents evidence of type of info, levels, etc.
- Describe how the elements identified interplay
- Explain the intentions of the designer and how the ideas are communicated
- Compare with her own approach to design and reflect on the differences
- Evaluate the design process
- Explain it

Possible student outcomes [products]:

- Process analysis papers
- Diagram of the design process with highlights and missing points
• Quantitative analysis of the project: areas, linear feet of road, patterns, typologies, mix of uses, circulation, entrances, etc.

This learning module needs additional support with
• Readings on design process
• Presentation of document information
• Discussion on the type of information included in a design process
• Project and activities descriptions
• Format for analysis and diagrams for terminology and process