

University of Colorado Design Review Board Amended Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, May 17, 2023
Time: 8:15 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: Rooftop Terrace Lounge, Champions Center, 2150 Stadium Drive, Boulder Campus, Boulder, Colorado, and Via Zoom

DRB and Campus Members present:

Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Newly-appointed DRB members Laurel Raines and Chris Shears were also present. Chris joined for the morning portion of the meeting via Zoom.

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 note taker
Emily Parker, Sr. Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Office of the VP for Budget & Finance

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:11 a.m.

8:15 – 8:30 a.m. Tour Residence One Project Site

Prior to the public portion of the meeting, the DRB met at 20th and Marine Streets in Boulder to tour the Residence One project site.

8:45 – 9:30 a.m. Study Session/Administrative Matters – Board Only

Don Brandes introduced Laurel Raines and Chris Shears, newly appointed members to the DRB. The terms of the new members begin in July. Don also reviewed administrative and agenda items prior to convening the public portion of the meeting. He noted that this would be Cheri Gerou's last meeting before her term expires at the end of June. He recognized her for her exceptional commitment to the DRB.

9:30 – 10:15 a.m. Stadium – Replace South Scoreboard in Folsom Field – CU Boulder Information/Pre-Design (Information/Direction)

Architects:
Populous Architecture

Presenters:
Ryan Sellinghausen, Sr. Associate, Architect, Populous

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Jason DePaepe, Deputy Athletic Director, Department of
Intercollegiate Athletics
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect,
Facilities Planning

Others Present:

Erik Cain, Daktronics
Meg McWilliam, Populous, via Zoom

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planning
Ryan Moore, Project Manager, Facilities Planning

Description:

Information/Pre-Design submittal for a new scoreboard and
ribbon board at south end of Folsom Field.

A/E Presentation

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

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- There is an opportunity to make the exterior stadium signage more prominent and iconic.
- Study if the new score board can be installed on the north side of the stadium. Is there improved visibility at this location?

B. Architecture

- The scale of the proposed scoreboard from inside the stadium seems acceptable. The scale from the exterior, especially the view from the south, appears overwhelming and monumental.
 - The challenge is to determine how to integrate the scoreboard and address the appearance from the south.
- At Concept Design, work with CU Boulder Facilities staff to prepare studies that:
 - Note standards for height, structure, wind loading, wind sheer, etc.
 - Include alternatives addressing these standards.
 - Detail how the structure of the score board will be supported and/or integrated into the stadium to the ground level.
 - It may be difficult to integrate due to the proportions.
 - Consider making the supports tight to the building or creating a vertical truss structure with a walkway large enough to allow for a sidewalk below.

- At Concept Design, include:
 - Examples illustrating how Daktronics has approached adding video boards at other historic stadiums, including faceted video boards.
 - If possible, a photo of the south bowl façade prior to the scoreboard installation in 2002, and/or labels on the south bowl façade in the 1960s photo.
 - A comparison of elevations of the proposed video board and ribbon boards to the existing south end video board and ribbon board.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- Provide more information about using natural ventilation for passive cooling and how this strategy impacts the planned structure, in addition to the potential energy savings.
- Include at the next submittal more information about new technologies and the energy strategies related to the scoreboard technology. Include information about opportunities and constraints and other additional relevant information.

DRB Action

The DRB thanked staff and the design and consultant team for their good work and for the great presentation. No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above.

10:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Chemistry and Applied Math Building – CU Boulder Information/Pre-Design (Information/Direction)

Architects:

ZGF
James Corner Field Operations

Presenters:

Braulio Baptista, Design Partner, ZGF
Justin Brooks, Lead Designer, ZGF
Sarah Astheimer, Principal, Field Operations
Arathi Gowda, Sustainability Designer, ZGF

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect,
Facilities Planning, CU Boulder

Others Present:

Sadie Cline, ZGF
Karli Molter, Field Operations

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Emina Begovic, Office of the Provost
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planning
Christopher Sachs, Facilities Planning
Zach Tupper, College of Arts and Sciences

Description:

Pre-Design submittal for a new 147,000 GSF Chemistry and Applied Mathematics (CHAP) academic/ research building on the Business Field (a 4-acre recreational field on Main Campus), including 50,000 ASF for research labs and 15,000 ASF for offices for the Chemistry program; 15,000 ASF for offices for the Applied Math program; and 5,000 ASF for centrally-scheduled classrooms. The fixed limit of construction is \$132.7M (CMGC delivery), with a planned occupancy of August 2026.

A/E Presentation

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

DRB Comments

The DRB explored various 3D model site options with the design team. Below are a few comments made by the DRB. These comments are not all-inclusive of everything discussed during this exploration.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The site planning and urban design relationship of the proposed buildings to Regent Drive will be critical. Similarly, the site planning and urban design of the future building to a renovated/expanded walkway leading from Regent Drive to the Engineering/Business Quad will be equally important. These seem like key site planning connections and urban design opportunities for the project.
- The potential interior views of open space and long-range views of the Flatirons are exceptional. Please continue to incorporate conceptual studies that evaluate how the site plan and architectural massing can capture and enhance these on-site and off-site views throughout the season.
- The preliminary development program suggests the possibility of two buildings; one for Chemistry and Applied Math and another future building that is, as yet, undetermined. The design should reflect the potential use of the overall building site.
 - In many ways, this planning effort will provide the basis for a second potential building site that is, as yet, undetermined. It would be helpful to conceptually outline the site opportunities and constraints of this “second” building pad once the location of CHAP has been determined.
- Given the site constraints associated with the extensive existing utilities, could the lab space be separated from the office space? Are there ways to connect the programming other than with a physical connection? This would help the massing of the building.
 - From an infrastructure standpoint, determine the extent of the utility connections.
 - Study adding a bridge over the utility lines running east-west across the site in order to tie services and programs between the two buildings along the east side.
 - Could the desired intermixing of the two programs happen at a ground plane someplace else as a smaller connection? Could it be done more cost effectively?

- Does the benefit of adding a bridge outweigh the costs associated with building two buildings split by the location of the utilities?
- From a programming standpoint, there are two buildings that want to be one. What the bridge is and how it's programmed could create one great site and create opportunities for a phase II building.
- Continue to explore and study ways to create usable open space corridors with the placement of the building(s) and ways to define the edges.
 - Can landscaping define the edge?

B. Architecture

- The DRB appreciated the thought and emphasis on the seven (7) design principals noted in the Pre-Design submittal. As you move through the Conceptual Design phase, please continue to reference how these goals and principals can be achieved.
- Investigate designs that would be a series of towers or something that would be porous, stacked, stepped, and staggered, etc., to maximize the open space and the views.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- In terms of site, program, and massing, consider wind, sun, microclimate, and passive strategies to improve outdoor comfort, indoor comfort, and reduced energy consumption.

DRB Action

No formal action is required for pre-design review. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above during the workshop portion of the presentation.

1:30 – 2:00 p.m.

Update Regarding Various Campus Projects – CU Boulder

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Dan Gette, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning

Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner

d'Andre Willis, the Campus Architect and Director of Planning for the Boulder campus, provided updates to the DRB regarding Residence One and the parking garage associated with the Conference Center and Hotel project.

Residence One

d'Andre Willis indicated that the Residence One project was withdrawn from the May agenda due to cost concerns. Comments and direction from the DRB include:

- The DRB complimented the design team for the SD submittal packet. The site development elements—landscape, architectural, urban design, the parti, the connections, the simplification of the site, including the plant material palette, the materiality for seating and lighting, all site related fixtures—have all improved from prior submittals.

- It now looks like one project with well-made connections.
 - Additionally, the connections of the three buildings and the site constraints of the L-shaped site, the variability of the heights, slope, the two-foot floodplain, etc., while maintaining the views, have been successfully addressed.
 - The DRB hopes to not lose any of these elements.
- As the overall project is evaluated for cost and budget, please consider exploring if the project could be simplified architecturally in ways that address the budget without impacting the general visual appearance of the project. It is important to maintain a sensitivity to the massing, ground plain, and other design elements previously vetted.
 - In coordination with the University administration, the DRB suggested that in order to minimize costs, a potential workshop with CU Boulder staff may be scheduled prior to the SD submittal for the DRB to review a cost benefit analysis and to review the suggested changes rather than a full re-submittal of the SD package.
 - At the formal SD review, the design team would only need to modify the original SD submittal package by including the suggested changes within the SD submittal for review by the DRB at the workshop.

Conference Center and Hotel

d'Andre Willis provided an update on the parking garage at the Conference Center and Hotel project. The design was modified due to budgetary constraints. She noted that a new parking consultant was engaged on the project.

She briefly reviewed the changes to the parking garage design, including the following:

- The footprint and elevation are slightly smaller and lower.
- The impact of the headlights from the cars in the garage at night will be reduced.
- The design of the pocket park at the top of the hill adjacent to the garage is better.
- Regarding the bike parking located on the outside of the garage, staff is trying to relocate a small amount of bike parking for staff and eliminate the bike parking shelter.
- From a site standpoint, the reorientation of the building is better and more functional.

The DRB agreed that the new design is preferred to the previous design and that there is no need for the new consultants to seek formal DRB review.

As recommended by staff, the DRB also agreed that, if possible, it would be preferable if the bike parking building adjacent to the parking garage were removed.

d'Andre also indicated that mock ups of the materials for the Conference Center and Hotel and the parking garage are still forthcoming and will be shared with the DRB when they are available. The DRB asked to see a sample of the screen material approved for the garage prior to the mock ups.

**2:15 – 3:45 p.m. Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre
Renovation – CU Boulder
Design Development (Action Requested)**

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

Hacker Architects
Handprint Architecture
Wenk Associates, Inc., Landscape Architecture
Ambient Energy

Presenters:

Tania Salgado, Handprint Architects
Nick Hodges, Hacker Architects
Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates, Inc.
Renee Azerbegi, Ambient Energy

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Others Present:

Kaitlin Bernal, Wenk Associates

CU Boulder Campus Facilities Planning Representatives Present:

Jan Becker, via Zoom
Richelle Goedert
Blake Guyer, via Zoom
Dena Heisner, via Zoom
Marni Wheaton, via Zoom

Description:

Design Development submittal for a complete renovation of Hellems, site work at building entries, and a limited scope renovation of the Mary Rippon Theatre.

A/E Presentation

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

DRB Comments and Action

The DRB noted that the project submittals at every phase of review have been so well done that it would like to use the submittals as a comprehensive model for other design teams.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Overall, the DRB is pleased with the proposed landscape plans, the plant material selections, and the suggested size and spacing. It is a thoughtful and well-documented landscape plan.
 - Regarding the proposed planting plan, the enhanced details are appreciated.
 - The small retaining walls look good, and the details, dimensionality, and callouts of these walls are also appreciated.
 - The planting scheme fits in well with the overall plan.

- For the planting plan at the north entry:
 - Retaining the six existing trees (four lindens, an elm, and a pine) is a good solution.
 - The Panchito Manzanita is a good, low, broadleaf evergreen to include for groundcover along the front edge of the building.
 - The Columnar English Oak is acceptable as proposed.

Regarding the Mary Rippon Theatre:

- The overall design is an improvement, and the curvilinear access is an improvement over the rectilinear, straight access in the previous submittal.
 - Staff and consultants noted that one side of the theatre seating is ADA accessible, and if add alternate 2 is included in the project, ADA access will be available to the outside at the bottom of the theatre.
 - The consultants stated that there will continue to be aisles through the rows of seats and that this is the preferred way for people to access their seats. The landscaping paths to the outer edges will be also be available.
 - Consider making the path next to the outer edge of the seats a little wider, if possible.
- The changes to the grading and the elimination of the deep window wells are a big improvement.
- Think about reconfiguring areas of the landscaping where it curves into hardscaping in order to eliminate the slivers of grass shown on the plan, which will be difficult to maintain.
- Consider adding shrubbery in some areas in lieu of turf.
- The Accolade Elm trees and Spring Snow Crab Apple trees are a nice addition and will accentuate the areas where they have been placed.
- The proposed lighting trusses will be a good improvement over the existing system.

Regarding the overall lighting:

- The proposed EL1 lighting strips along the back side of the caps on the landscaping walls are a nice addition.
- The location and type of the EB1 bollard lights on the north entry are acceptable.
- The catenary lighting proposed for the porches at the Mary Rippon Theatre is nice.
- Because the lights in the handrails aren't trimmed or concealed, the lighting within the handrails may be distracting from the level of the audience seating during performances.
 - Consider looking at alternatives that may be linear but that are shielded or trimmed.

B. Architecture

- After discussing the window glass samples brought to the meeting and physically studying them inside and outside, the DRB concluded that the preferred Low E option was acceptable.
- The long door handles shown on page 78 are not appropriate for the historic application. As discussed at the meeting, ensure the campus standard door handles are used in lieu of the handles shown.
- The proposed doors at the node into the Mary Rippon Theatre look great and are a good solution.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- The study of the building envelope and the attention to detail are great.
- The extra daylighting studies for some of the unique spaces are appreciated.
- The energy and sustainability aspects of the project are where they need to be at this time.

DRB Action

The DRB thanked the entire design team for their efforts.

Don Brandes moved to approve the Design Development submittal for the Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre Renovation, including the comments noted above. Cheri Gerou seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

d'Andre Willis also thanked Jan Becker for her amazing work on this project and indicated how much she will be missed in the Facilities Planning Department as she is nearing the date of her retirement and won't be participating in any more projects coming before the DRB.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

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