

**University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes**

Date: Friday, April 10, 2020
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:45 p.m.
Location: Zoom Meeting

DRB and Campus Members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgyay, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Jered Minter, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver (“CU Denver”), Richelle Reilly, interim campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder (“CU Boulder”), and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”). Cheri Gerou, DRB member, was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Kori Donaldson, Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:30 a.m.

8:30 – 10:00 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

Administrative and scheduling matters were discussed in addition to reviewing the items on the agenda.

10:00 – 11:30 a.m. UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital Garage 2 – CU Anschutz Medical Campus Schematic Design (Action Required)

Architects/Engineers:

Pact Studios LLC, Denver, Colorado, architectural design
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Denver, Colorado,
landscape architecture

Martin/Martin, Inc., Lakewood, Colorado, civil and structural
engineering

Presenters:

Sheila Elijah-Barnwell, Ph.D., AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, EDAC,
Pact Studios

Sean Menogan, Vice President, Facilities, Design and
Construction, UCHealth

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional
Planning, CU Denver|Anschutz

Others Present:

Chris Barnwell, AIA, Leed AP, Design Architect, Pact Studios
Tanner Draemel, Senior Project Designer, Pact Studios
Chris Hice, Landscape Architect, Senior Project Manager,
Kimley-Horn
Chris Shelton, UCHHealth Project Manager
John White, UCHHealth
Emily Wilson, PLA, Landscape Architect, Kimley-Horn

Description:

Schematic Design submittal for a new 1,300 stall outpatient/visitor parking structure to be designed and built on Lot 2 located east of the Anschutz Outpatient Pavilion (AOP) to serve the AOP, the Anschutz Cancer Pavilion, and the Sue Anschutz-Rodgers Eye Center as well as visitors to the University of Colorado Hospital.

A/E Presentation:

A submittal package can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 1 – Anschutz Parking Garage Lot 2 - 04-10-2020]

DRB General Comments:

- The DRB continues to be concerned with the overall project in terms of site planning and site relationships related to pedestrian crossings and vehicle conflicts. Specifically, the stacking, drop off, pedestrian circulation patterns and how vehicles circulate, enter, and exit the project do not seem to improve or resolve these existing pedestrian conflicts. The current plans seem to accentuate and not reduce conflicts that pedestrians are required to negotiate by crossing through multiple lanes of traffic.
- Concerns remain regarding the project entry way, creating a sense of arrival/gateway for the hospital, and how the location of the parking structure could help shape that sense of arrival and gateway.
- For discussion purposes, the DRB prepared sketches of a number of project alternatives that may not have been previously explored that could, at a minimum, potentially improve the pedestrian access issues, the length of the drop off, and the stacking capacity. The sketches simply illustrated pedestrian conflict issues and were intended to generate further thought and consideration as the project proceeds.
- The DRB has focused on solving specific site planning issues before moving the focus to the exterior facades of the structure.

- The DRB acknowledges that although the concept design has been approved, it may be worth reviewing:
 - the pedestrian conflict issues outlined above;
 - the size, massing, and siting of the structure;
 - whether the structure has too many spaces;
 - if the project accomplishes everything that needs to be accomplished within the existing site, budget, and user constraints.

- Further consideration of these issues need to be addressed before the DRB is willing to approve schematic design.

DRB Action:

Due to the concerns expressed by the DRB, as noted above, the Board was unwilling to move the project forward to Design Development review until the pedestrian conflicts and other issues have been resolved.

By consensus of the DRB Board, UHealth, and the Campus Architect this matter was tabled to a time to be determined in order to allow the A/E design team an opportunity to review and consider other options, including those proposed at this meeting, that would resolve the conflicts discussed at the meeting and noted above. If needed, the DRB will reconvene outside of its normal meeting schedule in order to continue this matter and review revised site improvement plans.

**11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. UHealth Lots 4 & 6 Expansion – *CU Anschutz Medical Campus*
Combined Pre-Design/Conceptual Design (Action Required)**

Architects/Engineers:

Dig Studio, Denver, Colorado, architectural design
Martin/Martin, Inc., Lakewood, Colorado, civil and structural
engineering

Presenters:

Adam Bent, Martin/Martin, Inc.
Chris Brueckner, Dig Studio
Rob Frankenberger, Martin/Martin, Inc.
Bill Vitek, Dig Studio

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional
Planning, CU Denver|Anschutz

Others CU Anschutz Campus Representatives Present:

Sean Menogan, Vice President, Facilities, Design and
Construction, UHealth
Chris Shelton, UHealth Project Manager
John White, UHealth

Description:

Combined pre-design/conceptual design submittal for analysis and concept of Lot 4 and 6 surface parking lot expansion with landscape screening along Colfax.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 2 – Anschutz Surface Lots 4 & 6 - 04-10-2020]

DRB Comments:

The DRB complimented the team on a great, well-thought out, and complete presentation. The following comments were noted by the DRB:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Continue to investigate the use of a drought-tolerant, native grass mix along the edge of the parking lots to help with water usage and sustainability; and
- Review the cadence of the new tree plantings and pedestrian-scale lighting poles along Colfax to ensure the plantings adhere to the local municipality's guidelines related to tree species.

B. Architecture:

No comments were provided regarding this subject.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

No comments were provided regarding this subject.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved approval of the Combined Pre-Design and Conceptual Design submittal for the UCHealth Surface Parking Lots 4 and 6 Expansion. Victor Olgyay seconded the motion, which unanimously passed except for Mike Winters who was absent for this item due to a scheduling conflict.

As requested by André Vite, the Campus Architect for the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, the DRB agreed that the next submittal could be a combined Schematic Design/Design Development package. Please refer to the DRB Policies and Procedures document for the submittal requirements.

12:30 – 1:15 p.m.

**Lynx Crossing Residence Hall (f/k/a Campus Village Apartments)
Renovations – CU Denver
Pre-Design** (Information/Direction)

Architects:

Hord Coplan Macht, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Gwen Gilley, Principle in Charge, Hord Coplan Macht
Jason Bently, Project Manager, Hord Coplan Macht

CU Denver Campus Presenters:

Ben Bowman, Construction Manager, CU Denver Campus
Jered Minter, Campus Architect, CU Denver Campus

Description:

Pre-Design submittal regarding renovations to the Lynx Crossing Residence Hall, including review of project and project team, potential project scope, DRB process, and project schedule.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 3 – Denver Lynx Crossing Renovations - 04-10-2020]

DRB General Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- The proposed site and architecture improvements included in this submittal can be divided into three categories: site and landscape, building-related, and wayfinding and branding, specifically:
- Site and Landscape improvements:
 - Include patios, courtyards, fixtures, furnishings, storm drainage-related improvements, the ADA parking areas, the canopy, the parcel delivery boxes, etc.;
 - Identify in the next submittal where these improvements will occur;
- Building-related improvements:
 - Include glazing, window flashing, cement board replacement, roofing, exterior refinishing, building flashing-related improvements, etc.;
 - Identify which improvements are more urgent or functional in nature and which are cosmetic;

- Wayfinding, Signage and Branding:
 - Please provide a wayfinding/signage location map showing where the proposed improvements would be located;
 - Signage may be the most important level of improvement and includes many levels of signage and rebranding;
 - External signage visible from Highway I-25 and Auraria Parkway should brand Lynx Crossing as a University of Colorado housing facility and mark a gateway to the campus;
 - The DRB doesn't necessarily have the project area knowledge or expertise to propose specific locations, please advise.
 - Signage visible to building occupants:
 - Includes directional, regulatory, lighting, and materiality;
 - Determine and define what is informational, directional, interior, and around the building;
 - Details of the signage package should include:
 - What is mounted, what the materials are, what the message is, how the signage will be lit, where will it be located.
 - Consider adding an auto/pedestrian level sign to the NE elevation.
 - Temporary signage should include:
 - Location, size, appearance, materiality type, and durability;
 - Use and placement of temporary signage needs considerable thought as well. Temporary signage needs a campus policy so that precedents are not set which are hard to correct.

- When considering the placement of future signage, think about the master plan in terms of the connection to Larimer Street and how pedestrian-level signage is important to that connection.

- Consider the idea that signage related to the Auraria Campus could have an appropriate place on the building to identify the project as not only a part of the University of Colorado but also a part of Auraria Campus.

- Review the existing and proposed signage to ensure that the ground plane and pedestrian level signage with proximity to the building has been adequately placed.

- Student-oriented signage may be helpful:
 - The welcome home banner sign is a nice, more casual sign;
 - The courtyard is a little sterile, think of ways it could be more fun;
 - Consider ways to include signage that is designed to attract students.

- Consider mapping and identifying bikeways to the transportation links shown in the next submittal package.

- Determine a way to include the Amazon package lockers so they can serve their purpose but not detract from or interfere with the building entrance. Provide a cut-sheet of the proposed lockers and proposed quantity.

- In developing master plans for improvements to the building, determine how a landscape improvement/enhancement approach around the building and throughout the parking lots could attract and retain future student residents.

B. Architecture:

No comments were provided regarding this subject.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

No comments were provided regarding this subject.

DRB Action:

No formal action is required for the Pre-Design submittal; however, the DRB provided comments and feedback noted above.

After Jered Minter inquired about the process going forward, Don Brandes indicated that the DRB would send a few examples of Conceptual Design (“CD”) and Schematic Design (“SD”) submittals that have been reviewed and approved for Jered to review. These examples will reflect the level of detail the DRB will be expecting in forthcoming submittals. Jered and the design team can then determine whether they are comfortable with a combined CD/SD submittal, or whether they want to take more the time to prepare a SD submittal.

1:45 – 3:15 p.m.

**Multi-Site Solar Projects – CU Boulder
Schematic Design (Action Required/Direction)**

Architects:

Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Jennifer Cordes, AIA, LEEP AP, Principal, CPSO, Hord
Coplan Macht

Terry Stone, PLA, Associate, Hord Coplan Macht

Robyn Bartling, PLA, Principal, Hord Coplan Macht

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Richelle Reilly, Interim Campus Architect and Facilities
Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Brian Moffitt, Project Manager, Planning, Design &
Construction, Facilities Management

Description:

Schematic Design (“SD”) submittal for solar structure to hold
PV panels on the Boulder Campus

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 4 – Boulder Multi-Site Solar - 04-10-2020]

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Continue to study lighting options to resolve visibility at night:
 - Would can lights work better with the structures than strip lights and be less visible?
 - Can down-light fixtures be attached to the Vs of the columns to light the areas where the cars and pedestrians are located?
 - Consider using an LED rope light in the beams to provide downlighting. This option may provide the desired lighting density and be less intrusive;
 - Please provide exhibits in the next submittal showing night lighting.
- Study making the pedestrian lanes between the cars wider and adding striping to show where pedestrian crossings are located.
- Further investigate the grading to ensure drainage has been accommodated appropriately, along with snow storage areas.

B. Architecture:

- Study the connectivity of the downspouts at the Y structures.
- Investigate making the flatter portion of the butterfly roof a more pronounced angle to address architectural concerns or consider using a shed structure instead of a butterfly structure.
- If the butterfly structure is retained, further design the pedestrian path within the butterfly structure.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Consider using micro-inverters on the PV panels to encourage fewer converter boxes and provide better efficiency.
- Provide the Environmental Product Declaration sheet for the project steel in the next submittal.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved for approval of the Schematic Design submittal regarding the multi-site solar panels on the CU Boulder campus with the comments noted above. Chris Shears seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

3:15 – 4:45 p.m.

**1135 Broadway Renovation – CU Boulder
Schematic Design (Action Required)**

Architects/Engineers:

OZ Architecture, Denver, Colorado
DLANDStudio, Brooklyn, New York
NORESO, Denver, Colorado

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Interim Campus Architect and Facilities
Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Edward von Bleichart, Program Manager, Campus
Sustainability and Resiliency
James Zarske, PE, CEM, LEED AP, Director of Sustainability
Services, NORESO

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Jacob Lee, Campus Mechanical Engineer
Stacy Lindholm, Planning, Design and Construction

Description:

Schematic Design submittal for a renovation of the former commercial building and site improvements at 1135 Broadway for research offices of the new Renee Crown Wellness Institute.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 5 – Boulder 1135 Broadway Renovations - 04-10-2020]

DRB General Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- The green wall and the alley improvements would make great additions to the building. The DRB regrets that these improvements have been noted as add-alternates. We do look forward to the site and landscape improvements as illustrated in the SD submittal;
- Remove the proposed tree in front of the building sign.

B. Architecture:

- On the east side of the building:
 - Continue researching the strategy for repairing the windows with broken seals so the window façade will remain consistent in both light transmission and in color;
 - Ensure that the replaced windows won't be visually distracting but will be visually compatible with the existing windows;
 - Consider adding electronically-controlled shades for effective glare control so the bottoms of the shades for individual windows will not be drawn up at different levels appearing patchy from the outside.

- Concerning the wall in the covered parking area where the entrance and exit doors are located:
 - Investigate illuminating the vertical surface of the wall to ensure the doors are appropriately lit, at perhaps a level of five footcandles, to ensure the entrance into the building is obvious to visitors and to help brighten the parking area space;
 - Consider adding signage to the wall to direct visitors to the correct entrance door;
 - Contemplate installing bollards near the two doors to protect pedestrians on the sidewalk;
 - Identify the color that the building will be painted, and provide illustrative samples.

- Include documentation regarding the extent of the exterior improvements in the DD submittal.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

- Continue working on driving down the interior energy loads as this will be key to making the building operate more efficiently:
 - Show some details on how the proposed wall insulation will be constructed;
 - Ensure that daylight harvesting and occupancy sensors are included in the electric light design. Provide a connected load LPD as well as a "in use" lighting load estimate;
 - Identify which windows will be operable;
 - Create a daylighting strategy that will provide an opportunity for daylight to be used without it causing disabling glare inside.

- Concerning the building's energy and sustainability and envelope improvements:
 - Include a complete energy analysis in the next submittal with documentation of the results. Show how the proposed design compares to code and the expected design EUI;
 - Identify which energy efficiency measures are selected for inclusion and which are not;
 - Determine the most cost-effective areas to make energy improvements for the best return on investment; i.e., what improvements will result in the highest performance for the least cost;
 - Identify the areas of greatest heat loss and gain, and show how they will be mitigated;
 - Show the proposed mechanical systems for the building, including the location of any site mounted units. Consider the multiple health and safety benefits of eliminating gas combustion on site;
 - Further investigate if weight or area is limiting the quantity of PV that could be accommodated on the roof. Consider creating an "energy budget," where the electricity generated on the roof is equal to or greater than the energy consumed by the building;
 - Strive to create a net zero energy building that is aligned with CU Boulder's emission goals, which could become a flagship building for the campus.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve the Schematic Design (“SD”) submittal package for the 1135 Broadway Renovations for the Renee Crown Wellness Institute, contingent upon a review of certain items prior to Design Development (“DD”) submittal. The design team will meet with the DRB to review these items prior to the DD submittal. The intent of this Pre-DD submittal meeting will be to address the following items:

- address the issues that have been noted above;
- confirm that the architectural issues described above have been addressed and will be illustrated and detailed in the DD submittal;
- verify that the project is moving in the right direction concerning energy and sustainability, including the practical issues noted above, lighting, glazing of the windows, materials, painting, colors, etc.;
- address concerns regarding the budget, knowing there is \$220K of add-alternates for site improvements, and approximately \$200K of add-alternates for interior improvements;
- confirm that the building infrastructure improvements relating to energy and sustainability are not compromised due to the budget issues.

In addition to the comments noted above, the design team should also take into account specifically:

- The priorities of the project improvements for the DRB are, in order:
 - window glazing;
 - interior finish of the garage re: ceiling and front wall;
 - clear demarcation of ingress and egress to the building in the parking area;
 - preference that the budget shortfall not affect improvements to the windows or other sustainability improvements.

The purpose of the mid-step check in with the DRB prior to the DD submittal will be to provide an update on the issues and concerns noted and to share with the DRB implications of what can and what cannot be achieved based on the budget. With these and other issues clearly identified the DRB will have a much clearer understanding of what is included within the base improvements or add-alternates.

Victor Olgay seconded the motion, which unanimously passed except for Chris Shears who had to leave the meeting before the motion was made due to a scheduling conflict.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

(For assistance with the attachments referenced within this document, please contact Linda Money at (303) 860-6110 or linda.money@cu.edu.)