

University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024

Time: 9:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Location: Anschutz Engineering Center Conference Room 302, Third Floor,

1420 Austin Bluffs Parkway, Colorado Springs, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:

Mike Winters, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Laurel Raines, Chris Shears, and Fawn Behrens-Smith, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Kori Donaldson, AVP of Budget, Finance, and Capital and ex officio member of the DRB Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB notetaker Emily Parker, Sr. Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Office of the VP for Budget & Finance

Mike Winters, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 2:45 p.m.

9:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m. Campus Tours - *UCCS*

Prior to convening the public portion of the meeting, the DRB toured several campus facilities, including:

Cybersecurity Building

William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center

Engineering and Applied Science Building

Anschutz Engineering Center

After the tours, the DRB met for the following presentation. During the presentation, Chancellor Jennifer Sobanet joined the meeting for a few minutes to thank the DRB for coming to the campus and for their efforts on behalf of the UCCS campus.

2:45 – 4:15 p.m. Engineering and Applied Science Building Renovation –

UCCS

Schematic Design (Action Requested)

Architects/Consultants/Contractors:

HDR Architecture Inc.

FTB Architects

Saunders Norwood, CMGC

Presenters:

James Braam, Design Principal, HDR Christopher Kleingartner, Principal in Charge, HDR Tony Mazzeo, Landscape Architect, Principal, HDR

UCCS Campus Presenter:

Fawn Behrens-Smith, Director, Planning, Design and Construction, Campus Architect

Others Present:

SJ Acin, HDR Rebecca McFarland, HDR Rod Rogers, Saunders Norwood Eric Stephan, Saunders Norwood

Other UCCS Campus Representatives Present:

Michael Brubaker, Energy and Utilities
Michael Corl, College of Engineering and Applied Science
Tom Dewar, University Advancement
Mark Ferguson, Campus Planning and Facilities
Management
Don Wright, Planning, Design and Construction

Description:

Schematic Design submittal for strategic renovation and finish updates of 70,019 GSF Engineering and Applied Science Building, plus small, targeted additions.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

General

- The DRB appreciated the opportunity to see and walk the space with the design team. The layout tapes the design team provided at the courtyard were helpful to visualize the scale of the spaces.
- Saunders Norwood will receive the SD pricing package on Friday, April 26. Saunders
 Norwood will get prices from their subcontractors based upon this SD package. Saunders
 Norwood believes the price for the current design is within the budget. Provide an update
 on the budget at the next DRB workshop meeting. If needed, notify the DRB earlier if there
 any budgetary issues.

A. Energy and Sustainability

The campus is looking to add an energy modeling consultant to the design team. The campus intends to work with Colorado Springs Utilities to help make good energy decisions regarding the utilities that the city provides.

The DRB understands that work is underway to gather existing utility information to help
define the existing, baseline EUI, and to begin energy modeling the proposed
improvements. As soon as the baseline information and initial energy modeling results are
available, provide an update to the DRB, ideally ahead of the Design Development
submittal.

B. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The inclusion of a people space (the "perch") to replace the existing courtyard in front is good.
- Break down the length of the concrete seat wall that surrounds the aerie (perch) potentially by adding some planting.
- Explore whether a low wall can be added along the pedestrian path on the front of the building to lessen slope of existing grade and promote revegetation along the building.
- Consider ways to create more shade in the perch through the addition of more trees.
 - o Look at other species of trees that could allow for a denser canopy.
- Study whether the perch can be raised above the height of the courtyard.
- If the campus determines it is appropriate (i.e., within the project scope), study and illustrate
 how the pedestrian path from the AEC to the EAS Building can be made ADA compliant.
 This is recommended.
- ADA accessibility at the back of building needs to be studied and accommodated.

C. Architecture

- Pull the massing of the proposed atrium back.
 - o Bring a larger study model of the space to the next meeting.
- Consider electrochromic glazing to replace the need for exterior shading devices.
 Electrochromic glazing could help illustrate and communicate "Engineering on Display" to
 the exterior of the building. A mullion pattern could be developed that would allow a
 combination of clear insulated glass with electrochromic glass. The electrochromic glass
 could be programmed to respond to the seasonal and daily changes in the solar positions to
 provide necessary shading to the atrium. Perhaps a monitor in the atrium could provide an
 educational opportunity to illustrate how the glass is responding to the sun on a daily basis.
- Inside the building:
 - o Study the potential to open the student lounge into the atrium.
 - Articulate the atrium to the north façade/entry of building.

- At the back of the building:
 - Additional study is needed to resolve ADA access.
 - o Metal panels for the façade at new addition are acceptable.
 - o Give thought to how to purposefully integrate the observatory into the site.

DRB Action

Chris Shears moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for the Engineering and Applied Science Building Renovation. Mike Winters seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 4:25 p.m.