

## University of Colorado Design Review Board Amended Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, July 19, 2023  
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Location: Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

### **DRB and Campus Members present:**

Mike Winters, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Laurel Raines, Chris Shears, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Chris Shears left the meeting from approximately 11:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. due to a scheduling conflict.

### **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

Mike Winters, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:05 a.m.

### **8:00 – 9:00 a.m. Study Session – Board Only**

The DRB reviewed administrative matters and items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

### **9:10 – 10:50 a.m. Residence One – CU Boulder Schematic Design (Action Requested)**

#### Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

Anderson Mason Dale Architects ("AMD")  
Bohlin Cywinski Jackson Architects ("BCJ")  
James Corner Field Operations  
Noresco

#### Presenters:

Megan Keogh, Associate Sustainability Consultant, Noresco  
Daniel Lee, Principal, BCJ  
Karli Molter, Senior Associate, Field Operations  
Andrew Nielsen, Principal, AMD  
James Zarske, Director of Sustainability Services, Noresco

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

Others Present:  
Luc Bamberger, AMD

CU Boulder Campus or Other CU Representatives Present:  
Daniel Gette, Student Affairs  
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning  
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planning  
Patricia McNally-Leef, Housing Facilities Services  
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planning  
Edward von Bleichert, Facilities Management

Description:  
Schematic Design (“SD”) submittal for Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek neighborhood, including design alternatives and preferred design direction.

## **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. Energy and Sustainability**

- Develop a sustainability story. What will students who live at Residence One promote to the other students as the sustainable aspects of the facility?
  - Embodied carbon could be a great part of the story.
    - Include embodied carbon in the proposed material palettes to illustrate that embodied carbon was considered when making materials decisions.
- Regarding energy, the EUI per bed—showing reduced energy per student per bed—is a good metric.
- For the envelope, the wall and the roof are good.
  - The windows are meeting the CU standard specifications at 0.270 at triple pane. It may be possible and cost effective to get to 0.20 or less with a vinyl window.
    - Study the window-to-wall ratio. The current ratio of 30% is good. Continue to optimize this ratio. A ratio of slightly below 30% may still be visually appealing while providing additional energy and budget savings.
- The limitations of the central plant on the energy model are understood. Proactively challenge the design team to hit the energy target by identifying and pricing strategies that work for the project.
  - At the next meeting, present an updated energy target and energy model. Be prepared to explain any gap between the energy target and the energy model and to identify ways in which the gap could be reduced.

- Concerning student health and wellness, the biophilic aspects of the landscape add value to the project.
  - Within LEED, there are benefits to the IQ side. Review the credits that are listed as “maybe” on the checklist, and determine if they can be updated.
- Regarding the LEED checklist, what was presented at SD was technically a LEED Silver checklist due to the number of maybe items. Lock in more yes items, and update the checklist to LEED Gold for DD.

## **B. Site & Landscape Architecture**

### General Landscaping:

- If possible, bring more naturalistic planting into the central lawn.
  - Consider reducing the total area of the lawn (at the corners) through the addition of low-maintenance and low-water plants and shrubs.
  - Explore reducing the volume of the landscaping at the walk up units on the northwest side and applying the landscaping budget “savings” to add more shade and texture at the front of the site.

### Regarding Trees:

- Boulder’s guidelines indicate trees should be spaced every 30’ to 40’.
  - Forty feet is recommended because this distance 1) allows for a greater soil volume which is needed for the trees to survive in our climate, and 2) allows for an improved line-of-sight from the building and lawn as the trees grow.
- Study the appropriate caliper for new tree plantings. The recommendation is to plant trees with a caliper of 2.0 to 2.5”.
- Denver City Guidelines recommend a minimum soil volume of 900 cubic feet, which is calculated as length x width x 3’ depth.
  - This may not be possible everywhere but where possible, this volume will encourage a greater success in the survival rate.
  - Hardscape shouldn’t be used over the soil volume, but using permeable pavers is acceptable.
- When planting trees along a street edge, don’t plant just one species of tree.
  - Using a variety of tree species will also encourage a greater survival rate.
- If you can, within budgetary limitations:
  - Consider strategically adding more trees to other areas of the landscaping, including:
    - the lawn;
    - the south entrance;
      - to the south and southwest of any hardscaping;
      - To provide more shade for the steps on the right side of the amphitheatre, consider eliminating or reducing the steps at the left side of the amphitheatre and replacing the hardscape with trees to protect from the western afternoon sun.

- Work with the campus landscape architect to determine the best species of trees to plant.
  - Limber pines don't work well in paved areas in our climate because they need more water. A ponderosa pine or an Austrian pine would survive better. Other choices of conifers are also available.
  - Specimen catalpa trees aren't readily available here, so another species of specimen tree should be selected.
- Include more ornamental trees, such as crabapples, because they mature more quickly than other deciduous shade trees and will provide good shade.

#### Hardscape:

- Study reducing the height of the stone wall from 18" to 15" in order to reduce the cost of the landscaping, possibly using any savings to increase the number of trees.
- Consider using sand-finish concrete in paved areas currently defined as exposed aggregate concrete.
  - Due to the freeze/thaw conditions in the area, exposed aggregate finish does not wear as well as sand-finish.
- For DD, include more detail on the following landscaping elements:
  - Permeable pavers and concrete pavement, including color, finishes, paver size, placement, patterning, etc., and include samples.
  - Signage and lighting components.
    - Include where signs will be located, specific details of the signs for each location, etc.;
    - Include similar details for all lighting applications, including building and landscape lighting. Provide detail about the directionality of the lights. Reference the Boulder lighting guidelines for night sky limitations.
  - Railings, fencing, windows, etc.
    - Provide color choice, materiality, styling, and samples.

#### **C. Architecture**

- The massing studies are good and complimentary to the project. The building has improved as a result of the massing studies that have been completed.
- The façade studies with the articulations shown are also quite good.
- For DD, include more detail on the following architectural elements:
  - Windows and frames, including materiality and color;
  - Shade structures and overhang components, including materiality, color, shape and style, and how they attach to the building.
- Study the fenestration pattern in the northeast wing.
  - The windows in this wing feel more institutional, more square, and not as residentially proportioned as some of the other wings.
  - Even though this fenestration is likely responding to the bedroom type, consider ways to make this wing more cohesive with the rest of the building.

- Also study the 7.5 feet high brick wall along the northeast façade as you enter the site from the north.
  - Add scale to the wall in future renderings by, for example, adding lockers along the wall.
  - As is, the wall appears intimidating from a pedestrian scale.
- The color of the brick is one of the most important decisions to be finalized.
  - Residence One is such a large building, the color, mix, and saturation of the brick needs to be correct.
  - Explore subtle ways of making the brick colors tonally different.
  - The precedent-setting nature of this project will impact other new projects in the area, including the Residence Two project.
  - What are the references, rationale, and decision-making process used in determining the color of the brick?
- If included in the final project, the bike storage will need a critical level of detail at DD for it to be approved.

### **DRB Action**

Mike Winters moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for Residence One, including the comments noted above, with the understanding that a pre-Design Development workshop will be scheduled to preview the Design Development (“DD”) submittal and the resolution to the issues that have been discussed. Chris Shears seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**11:00 a.m. – 12:50 p.m.**

**Residence Two – CU Boulder  
Pre-Design and Pre-Concept Design Workshop  
(Information/Direction)**

Architects:

HDR, Inc.  
William Rawn Associates Architects, Inc. (“WRA”)

Presenters:

Cliff Gayley, Design Principal, WRA  
Christopher Kleingartner, Principal, HDR  
Erik Tellander, Associate Design Principal, WRA

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d’Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Others Present:

Kent Freed, HDR

CU Boulder Campus or Other CU Representatives Present:

Daniel Gette, Student Affairs  
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning  
Sarah Kieffer, Facilities Planning  
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planning  
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planning

Description:

Pre-Design Submittal and Pre-Concept Design Workshop for Residence Two, a new 350-bed student housing project in the North Boulder Creek neighborhood.

## **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. Comments were shared with the design team during this exploration. The following represents a few of the summary comments made by the DRB at the end of the meeting.

### **A. General Comments**

- The pre-design package was really good.
- Concept Design (“CD”) is the most important level of review completed by the DRB, which is why holding this workshop is so helpful and so important to the DRB.
- DRB appreciates being able to interact and engage with the 3D model, which helps it understand the project and will help the project move forward to future levels of review.
- It is unfortunate that the university will have to wait years to add the Terrace Green component because it’s a really important link between the new buildings and the overall campus.

### **B. Energy and Sustainability**

- The sustainability and resiliency aspects of the submittal, along with the wellness aspects, are really interesting. The DRB looks forward to the progression of this in the design.
- The DRB enjoyed the sustainability approach within the narrative. This level of thinking regarding the regenerative approach is intriguing. It would be interesting to see if explicitly social and ecological equity aspects could be included.
- Tom Hootman recommended a book entitled, “*Architectures of Spacial Justice*” by Dana Cuff, published in April 2023, to encourage an investigation of possible precedents and thoughts regarding inequities and to possibly set goals that could fundamentally influence big moves made in the project design and integrating site design and ecologies, especially given the opportunities present at the site.

### **C. Site & Landscape Architecture**

- Breaking down the scale of the buildings as suggested by the design team is a good approach and inevitably, something that will mix well with this area.

- The DRB feels more comfortable with one building rather than the compartmentalized, three-building elements.
  - One building flows better with a more organic site edge and also works better from a sustainability aspect to have an east-west access orientation rather than a north-south access orientation.
  - The layout of one building for Residence Two would more closely connect with the layout of Residence One.
- The primary spatial movement will be along 19<sup>th</sup> Street, so it is good that the project will affect the streetscape edge along 19<sup>th</sup> Street in the early stages.

#### **D. Architecture**

No summary comments regarding the architecture were included in these notes.

#### **DRB Action**

No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above during the model exploration.

At the pre-Concept Design workshop, consider:

- Reviewing an additional massing study at a different scale.
- Studying green spaces on campus to determine which spaces are used the most and why some spaces are used more than others.
- Providing vignettes of the massing to get a more complete vision of the scaling of the building and the surrounding environments.

**1:30 – 3:00 p.m.**

#### **Old Main Structural Repairs – *CU Boulder* Schematic Design (Action Requested)**

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

CSHQA

Wenk Associates Landscape Architects

Robert Silman Associates Structural Engineers, DPC

Atkinson-Noland & Associates, Inc.

Presenters:

Danielle Weaver, Architect, CSHQA

John Maulin, Architect, CSHQA

Kaitlin Bernal, Associate Landscape Architect, Wenk Associates, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

David Bryne, Jr., Facilities Planning

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning

Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Description:

Schematic Design ("SD") submittal for project at Old Main including structural masonry repairs, foundation repairs and drainage, window repairs, and site improvements in/along Pleasant Street (rescheduled from June 2023).

## **A/E Presentation**

The presenters 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**

- Continue to study the grading and drainage issues to balance creating slopes away from the building with the locations of the existing sidewalks.
- Due to its higher water requirement, consider replacing the purple-leaf wintercreeper shrub with an autumn amber sumac which requires less water and, as such, may be better near to the building.
- Think about reducing or modifying the number of eastern redbud trees planted in the same location.
  - The proposed location on the south side of the building will likely encourage good growth for the redbuds.
- Explore 1) scaling back the medallion at the north of the building and 2) using stone in the center of the medallion and surrounding it on both sides with sand-finish concrete.

### **B. Architecture**

- Upon removal of the spiral staircases, the preferred option for removing the doors and replacing them with new windows, which is also preferred by the DRB, is one of the largest visual improvements to the building.
- If possible, move forward now with Meco shades for all windows since the new window glass will not be tinted.
- The DRB requested that the design team bring glass samples to the next meeting.

### **C. Energy and Sustainability**

- When waterproofing the foundation, investigate if insulation could be added along with the drainage board and waterproofing to increase the energy efficiency of the improvements planned for the building.
- Also investigate if it makes sense to add additional insulation in the attic space around the roof trusses while working on the truss that needs repair.
- Once new windows are installed and repointing in the building is completed, consider conducting a blower door test in order to identify and additional needed improvements to the building envelope.



## DRB Action

Sarah Brown moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for the Old Main Structural Repairs, including the comments noted above. Chris Shears seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The DRB requested that the campus let the board know when decisions are finalized regarding approved deductive and add alternates, prior to presenting the Design Development submittal in September.

**3:10 – 4:40 p.m.**

### **Stadium – Replace South Scoreboard in Folsom Field – CU Boulder Concept Design (Action Requested)**

Architects:

Populous Architecture

Presenters:

Ryan Sellinghausen, Sr. Associate, Architect, Populous  
Erik Cain, Daktronics

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

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

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

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

Description:

Concept Design (“CD”) 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

- Explore whether the existing trees should be relocated as part of the landscape design.

### B. Architecture

- Explore various options regarding the width of the structure and location of the columns in plan.
  - The DRB would prefer the slimmest board possible while retaining the functionality and structural strength necessary for safely securing the board and ribbon. Investigate ways to reduce the profile of the board and supporting structures.

- Can the structure be built so it is totally independent of the building?
  - Can the size of the columns be reduced?
  - Study whether the columns can be located so that the video screen ties to the plane of the outer edge of the stadium.
  - For the base of the columns, the DRB prefers a solid steel base that is not integrated with a stone wrap.
  - Study the detail of the connection of the columns to the video structure and consider if a similar detail to the ribbon connection makes sense to tie the systems together.
- For the Schematic Design submittal, show:
    - Options for the support structure for the board and the ribbon;
    - Sections of the profile of the structure from the top of the board to the base of the columns with the stadium profile intact;
    - Details of the base of the columns including how the columns are mounted into the ground;
    - Details of both the top and bottom of the board structure;
    - Precedent images and precise details regarding the vinyl wrap on the back side of the ribbon;
    - Details regarding whether there will be video screens on the south side of the board and if so, will there be one screen or two.
  - In the plan view, show the columns coming down to the ground. The DRB would like to review circulation patterns.
  - Determine and show studies regarding the colors and materiality for all non-video portions of the board and structure.
    - Using a screened background in the image makes it difficult to see how the materials integrate into the existing building.
    - Determine if something other than true black can be used for the color—perhaps use a dark charcoal, or study if green or blue can be added to the true black.
      - True black can fade or turn chalky over time.
    - Ensure that all colors used are within the branding board standards.
  - Explore the presentation of the CU Buffalo logo on the back side of the board.
    - Can it be illuminated and/or backlit?
    - Can it be recessed?
  - Study the structure to reduce gaps and eliminate areas that create a temptation for students to climbing or birds to nest.

### **C. Energy and Sustainability**

- Continue to study ways to make the board as energy efficient as possible.
  - Review details for passive ventilation at the top and bottom of the board.

### **DRB Action**

Jody Beck moved to approve the Concept Design submittal for the CU Boulder Stadium South Scoreboard, including the comments noted above. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

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