

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting FINAL NOTES

Meeting #23: September 16, 2014 9 AM-10 PM Central

I. Attendance

Role	Name	Participated
DRT Member	Tom Bradley	X
DRT Member	Maggie Hales	X
DRT Member	Vern Remiger	
DRT Member	Judith Deel	X
DRT Member	Bill Hart	X
DRT Member	Karen Bode Baxter	
DRT Member	Ann Honious	X
DRT Member	Mark Miles	X
Advisor: National Trust	Jennifer Sandy	
Advisor: National Trust	Betsy Merritt	
Facilitator	Margo Brooks	X
Facilitator	Greg Cody	
JEFF	Kathryn Thomas	X
JEFF	Janet Wilding	X
JEFF	Frank Mares	X
NPS	Phil Lawrence	X
CAR2015	Anna Leavey	X
JNPA	David Grove	X

II. Museum Store and Cafe Floors

Phil Lawrence discussed a proposal to use Retro Plate Concrete or similar finish floors in the proposed museum store and cafe spaces. The store space is currently a theater and an entirely new floor will be built in this space. The cafe is currently a gift shop and has a wood floor overlying concrete. Neither space is part of the character-defining, terrazzo-floored lobby, but they need to work well with the lobby.

Discussion

The DRT asked questions about the samples presented in the review packet, particularly about the colors and aggregate sizes presented.

The concrete aggregate will necessarily be smaller than the terrazzo, which is being specially sourced for large aggregate. The colors, however, are much more variable. They can either be applied to the concrete mix directly, or stain the concrete at a later time. The floor is then ground and polished. The sheen can be anywhere from highly glossy to matt.

The park asked if we could provide design parameters that the design team and Jefferson National Parks Association (a cooperating association) could then use to choose a suitable floor. The DRT agreed to this proposal.

The DRT listed important things to consider: 1. The color should match the terrazzo or complement it in a subtle way without stark contrast. 2. The sheen should match the sheen of the terrazzo or have less sheen, down to a matt finish. It should not be shinier than the terrazzo. 3. The material should be distinguishable from terrazzo, but that distinction should be subtle.

A question was asked about price and durability of the concrete floor versus terrazzo. Concrete is approximately \$6/sq. ft. Terrazzo is approximately \$25/sq. ft. The concrete application is suited for heavy use areas. Phil Lawrence directed the team to the following web site to better understand the characteristics and applications for similar type floors:

http://www.retroplatesystem.com/performance/case_studies/photos

Finally, Margo Books asked the DRT if they would like to see and approve the color or a sample of the material, or, if given the design parameters, they would allow the design team, concessioner and park to approve the sample. The DRT felt that the sample could be approved internally, unless the design team chooses a different type of flooring.

DRT Comments

The DRT agreed that the concrete finish floors were acceptable and that: 1. The color should match the terrazzo or complement it in a subtle way without stark contrast. 2. The sheen should match the sheen of the terrazzo or have less sheen, down to a matt finish. It should not be shinier than the terrazzo. 3. The material should be distinguishable from terrazzo, but that distinction should be subtle. Unless a change in floor material is contemplated, the design team with the park and the concessioner can pick the color, texture and sheen of the floor in accordance with the design parameters above without further consultation with the DRT.

III. DRT Future Role

The DRT protocol states:

“At a minimum, the Team will review 100% draft schematic and design development documents. Additional reviews may be requested by the Team and/or the designers to ensure that S106 concerns are addressed as early in the design process as possible.”

Since the formal design process is beginning to wrap up, the question is what will the DRT role be in the future. What types of projects and concerns should be brought forward? What should not be brought to DRT? How do we want to handle reviews of details in an orderly way?

Discussion

The DRT members indicated that they believed that the process has worked well and that they should continue to be consulted if changes are made in the future.

They were asked if every change should be brought forward. The team thought it was hard to know. If there are simple changes (such as the temporary antenna installation) that the CRM Team believes will have no adverse effect, do these need to be brought to DRT? The members said no, but that Ann Honious and Kathryn Thomas should make that decision.

The DRT will receive the final construction plans for the project, but on plan sets that they have previously approved and for which there are not major changes, DSC will not send CDs. Is that acceptable? DRT said yes.

Finally, because design is wrapping up, there are lots of big and small issues that will need rapid review. Monthly DRT meetings would help organize the design

team and ensure timely review. The DRT agreed and also requested that information be sent for review several days before the meeting date.

DRT Comments

The DRT would like to continue to see changes to the design plans that the CRM team has questions about or feels may be adverse. Ann Honious and Kathryn Thomas will decide what will move forward to the DRT.

The DRT will receive final construction plans for all work as a baseline for potential in-construction changes.

III. Next DRT Meetings

October 21, 9-11 CT
November 18, 9-11 CT
December 16, 9-11 CT