



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

## University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, June 15, 2017  
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.  
Location: Village View Conference Room #200, Village Center Dining and Community Commons, Williams Village, Boulder, Colorado

**DRB members present:** Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters; Teresa Osborne (ex officio); Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus (“CU Boulder”); and André Vite, AIA, campus DRB member for the Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”) (by phone).

**Others in attendance not otherwise noted:**

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:15 a.m., at which time the Board held a private work session as noted below.

### **9:00 – 10:00 Work Session – Board Only**

The Board met in a private session to discuss the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting as well as discussing a few updates pending or completed projects on the CU Boulder campus.

The Board also expressed its appreciation to Ms. Osborne for all of her work over the past few years supporting the Board as she is preparing for her upcoming retirement from the University. She thanked the Board for their comments. She noted that at the Board meeting in July, her replacement would be accompanying her and that the July meeting would be her last meeting.

Additionally, the Board noted that Ms. Brown will serve as the Board representative on the rating and review team for the Request of Qualifications for Architectural/Engineering/Consulting Services for the proposed Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine and Behavioral Health project on the CU Anschutz campus.

### **9:00 - 10:30**

#### **Williams Village East Residence Hall – CU Boulder**

Architects: Whiting-Turner Contracting, Denver, Colorado;  
alm2s, Fort Collins, Colorado, design principals/local architects; KWK Architects, St. Louis, Missouri, lead design architects; Bruce Hendee, Roger Sherman, BHA Design Inc., Fort Collins, Colorado, landscape architects

Presenters: Brad Massey, Principal, alm2s, architects, Fort Collins  
Bruce Hendee, Landscape Architect, BHA Design Inc.  
Paul Wuennenberg, Principal, KWK Architects  
Roger Sherman, BHA Design Inc.

*CU Boulder Campus Presenters:*

Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,  
Facilities Planning  
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,  
Design and Construction

*Others Present:*

Heather Heiland, Whiting-Turner Contracting  
Chad Kosinski, alm2s architects  
Javier Esteban, KWK Architects

*Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:*

Amy Beckstrom, Executive Director, Housing and Dining Services  
Paula Bland, Director, Residence Life, Housing and Dining  
Steve Hecht, Assistant Director, Design and Project Mgmt.,  
Housing and Dining  
Heidi Roge, Project Manager, Housing and Dining  
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning  
Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning  
Ida Mae Isaac, Capital Planning Strategist, Facilities Planning  
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning  
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,  
Facilities Planning  
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description: Design Development (“DD”) Review and Approval

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

Mr. Goodhew began the presentation by asking the individuals present for the meeting to introduce themselves, after which Mr. Massey provided an update regarding the status of the Williams Village East project (“Will Vill East”). He reviewed the project schedule and noted that the first bid package for underground utilities was close to being issued and that the budget is still on track.

Mr. Hendee then thanked the Board for the challenges they presented to the design team throughout the review process. He indicated that the input from the Board had been very helpful and that the resulting improvements to the original site design were a product of this input. He reviewed some of the changes made to the project since the schematic design submission was approved in April 2017, including, but not limited to:

- Simplification of the east gateway;
- Refinements to the northwest corner pedestrian walkway;

- Additional details to the north entry courtyard and corresponding elevations;
- Modifications to the south courtyard, including the interaction between the walkway and the promenade;
- Refinements made to the landscaping and planting plan and plant selection; and the
- Inclusion of a paving materials plan.

Mr. Wuennenberg then reviewed a number of architectural renderings drawn to illustrate views of the building from various points surrounding the site and which also show modifications made to Will Vill East since the last Board meeting, including:

- Modifications to the roof of the great room, including the addition of a series of translucent skylights and recessing the roof back from the mass adjacent to it;
- Simplification of the dark brick recesses that had formerly existed between the windows;
- Modifications to the south courtyard;
- Articulation of the windows at the top of the wall below the gable of the roof on the east side responding to the floor plan;
- Simplification of parts of the façade located on the north side, particularly related to some of the windows and the transit stop/service area; and
- Modifications to the design of the windows and glass areas, depending upon the location, including the addition of a curtain wall system and using vertical or spandrel vertical panels.

Mr. Sherman and Mr. Massey discussed various analyses and considerations regarding sustainability, mechanical systems, energy conservation, water use reduction, and shading studies. In response to an inquiry by Mr. Olgay, Mr. Sherman and Mr. Massey elaborated on the strategies planned for improving sustainability and energy efficiency, including, but not necessarily limited to:

- Installing a photovoltaic system on roof;
- Integrating details of thermal breaks with ledger angles, etc.;
- Using fiberglass frames on all of the punched openings;
- Installing energy recovery ventilation units in the attics in order to capture exhaust which can be used to pre-heat incoming fresh air;
- Installing low flow (1.25 gpm) flush toilets;
- Installing urinals in designated common area restrooms;
- Using hydronics for heating and cooling with horizontal fan coils in the student rooms with highest performing ECM motors available; and
- Educating residents regarding sustainability, conservation, and changing behaviors utilizing on-site educational tools, competitions, and submetering the wings of the building.

Mr. Sherman and Mr. Massey also noted that a final energy performance model has not yet been completed. At this time, a desired goal is approximately 55 EUI. Although the design team is focusing on reducing water and energy use and educating the occupants, they are continuing to review the building envelopes and possible additional improvements in order to obtain a more sustainable project. Mr. Olgay strongly encouraged the team to reevaluate the application of a drain water heat recovery system which is typically extremely cost effective in dormitories because of the high volume of shower use.

Ms. Beckstrom, Ms. Bland, and Mr. Hecht spoke briefly indicating that the efforts of the design and planning teams were very much appreciated and that Housing and Dining Services believes that Will Vill East will bring value to the community and will serve the needs of the current students and the student population for years to come. The value brought to the project by the Board was also noted and appreciated.

The Board also expressed its appreciation to the design, planning and facilities teams for their work on the project and their cooperation through the Board's planning and review process. The Board complimented the current designs for the courtyards, indicating that they work well together and complement each other, as does the overall materiality and scale of the project.

Additionally, the Board made the following comments regarding the DD submittal:

Site and Landscaping:

- Regarding the north entry courtyard:
  - place the signage so it is in front of the bioswale planter and integrate the signage element, the bioswale planter, and seat-height walls surrounding the planter into one simple structural element at the front of the north courtyard;
  - reduce the height of the columns slightly, and increase the depth of the capstone, and use brick for the columns so they match columns at other entryways instead of the stone finish;
- Regarding the circular area in the southwest corner of the west side pedestrian path planned for a sycamore tree surrounded by a seat-height wall, consider adding accent lighting within the circle to support what could be a strong pedestrian sense of place;
- Concerning steps on the far east side, determine if they are required for ADA access, and, if not, they could become a trip hazard; explore modifying the grading of the area so that the steps could be removed;
- Concerning the site lighting plan:
  - Review how the lighting has been placed and whether or not it is sufficiently lighting pathways, entrances, etc., and if such placement is reinforcing the desired behaviors of these areas; and
  - Review the special lighting planned for the north courtyard and south sun porch to ensure that the lighting is adequate for the planned use and that the color temperatures are on the warmer side and that they match other similar areas within the Williams Village neighborhood.
  - Review the lighting on the south path and come up with a consistent approach with the lighting on one side of the path.

Architecture and Design:

- Revise the exterior niches at the south wall of the Great Room and make them less deep so that they do not become trash collectors;
- Replace the Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete Panels at the vertical window elements with an insulated aluminum panel to match the vertical panels at the center of the building.

- Regarding the upper windows on the north side where brick has been inserted between the two planes of glass, replace the brick with spandrel or metal panels, and, if metal, consider using a slightly different color in order to achieve the same vertical appearance within the windows but with a subtle two-tone affect.
- Remove the Kalwall skylights from the Great Room. Replace with a shed roof clerestory facing south with vertical glass. This will improve daylighting/visible light transmission and insulative qualities, provide views of the sky to the students in the Great Room, allow direct sunlight to activate the space below, provide a longer life than the Kalwall and help define smaller scale spaces within the Great Room; provide a roof overhang on these clerestory windows to optimize summer shading but allow for direct solar gain;
- In order to reduce glare from the rooftop over the Great Room and improve the coordination with the rest of the building, consider changing the color from the lighter beige to a tan color; use metal roof for the sloped clerestory roof described above; and
- Regarding the canopy roof over the south entry and the window immediately to the east of the entryway, consider modifying the design slightly so that the bottom of the roof has a smoother interaction with the top of the window.

#### Sustainability and Energy:

- In addition to the sustainability and energy strategies noted earlier, reconsider utilizing a drain water heat recovery system as it may be possible to do so cost effectively given the potential pay back on the initial investment.

Additionally, the Board discussed the planned add alternates with those present at the meeting and encouraged the snow melt system for the north side not be included as an add alternate but rather that it be included, if possible, within the project scope due to the anticipated high levels of pedestrian traffic resulting from the transit stop, parking lot, etc., along the north side of the building.

Mr. Brandes moved approval of the Design Development submittal for Will Vill East, contingent upon the consultants working with the University staff in resolving and addressing the notes and comments that have been discussed by the Board at this meeting and which are reflected within the meeting notes above. Mr. Olgay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Upon completion of the first agenda item, the Board took a brief break for lunch.

**12:30 – 2:00**

#### **Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – CU Boulder**

Architect: Gensler Architectural Design/Consultants, Denver, Colorado  
Civitas Landscape Architecture, Denver, Colorado

Presenters: Jon Gambrill, Managing Director, Principal, Gensler  
Brian Vitale, Design Director, Gensler

Scott Wightman, Project Manager/Primary Contact, Gensler  
Kyle Hopkins, Project Manager/Landscape Project  
Designer, Civitas  
Robin Norcross, Project Director/Landscape Project  
Designer, Civitas

**CU Boulder Campus**

**Presenters:** Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning  
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,  
Facilities Planning

**Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:**

Stephanie Gillin, Assistant Dean of Leeds School of Business  
Keane Ray, Project Manager, Facilities Planning  
Jennifer Gerke, Associate Professor, Library Administration  
Doug Smith, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering and  
Applied Science  
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,  
Facilities Planning  
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

**Description:** Introduction (Program Phase) for an addition and renovation project for the north end of the Koelbel Building for academic space for both the College of Engineering and the School of Business at the CU Boulder campus.

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

Ms. Becker began the presentation by providing a history of the Koelbel Building (“Koelbel”) and the current status of Koelbel and the Leeds School of Business (“Business”). She noted that Business has been operating at capacity and, in 2015, they estimated that, due to increasing enrollment, they will need an approximate 120,000 GSF, which would be double the size of Koelbel. Facilities Planning has been reviewing the space needs and what options might be possible in order to address immediate needs, including the possibility of reconfiguring and renovating current space, and building a small addition onto Koelbel. Space that is currently being utilized by the library within Koelbel was identified as an area which could be renovated.

Additionally, at the same time, the College of Engineering and Applied Science was exploring the idea of adding a 200-seat auditorium to the Engineering Building complex (collectively, “Engineering”).

The deans of Business, Engineering and the Business Library and Facilities Planning staff discussed the needs of all three programs and the idea of a joint project among all three programs was developed, resulting in an approximate 30,000 GSF expansion project and an additional 10,000 GSF renovation project. In total, this project will include the renovation of certain spaces within Koelbel, an expansion of the north end of Koelbel near Engineering, and the creation of a 200-seat auditorium for Engineering. The immediate and short-term needs of Business, including the creation of additional classroom and faculty office space, an innovation and entrepreneurship hub; renovated space needs for the library function; and the addition of

the auditorium for Engineering will be addressed, and the connection between Business and Engineering will be strengthened.

Ms. Gillin discussed the needs of Business noted above and indicated that funding for the project is being sought through private sources.

All of the representatives from Gensler and Civitas, noted above, then participated in reviewing various stages of the proposed expansion, including:

- A summary of the project goals and visions expressed by departmental leadership for the academic areas involved within the project;
- Potential external energy nodes affecting and impacted by the project;
- Project objectives, issues, challenges, and opportunities;
- Improved opportunities for learning, studying, working and library spaces;
- Potential opportunities for collaborative efforts between Business, Engineering and the Library;
- Potential benefits for all students on campus;
- Preliminary site inventory and analysis, including circulation pathways for bicycles, cars, buses, and pedestrians; existing tree canopy surrounding the project area, landscape typologies and a potential landscape palette, topography and preliminary sections showing the relationships between the Koelbel and Engineering Buildings, micro climate of the proposed project area, views, utilities, service access areas, and emergency pathways; and
- Site specific and campus integration and areas of influence.

The Board suggested that due to the movement of selected Engineering programs to East Campus that East Campus be included in any discussions whereby campus integration, areas of influence, etc., are analyzed.

The use of the recreation field east of Koelbel was also discussed. Ms. Reilly indicated that, in addition to other occasional events, the field is primarily programmed by the Recreational Center and is the only field on campus that can accommodate rugby.

The next steps regarding planning for the project and the complex potential programming needs were reviewed with the Board.

The Board had the following recommendations for the development of the project:

- The design team should not let the physical design get in front of the programming;
- The programming should be reviewed and analyzed further;
- At the next submittal, the team should have a broader but also more specific approach to the building programming, including why this proposed solution is the right answer to the problem, needs, and opportunities at hand; and what the broader aspects of influence, innovation and driving forces might be;
- Given the complexity of the surrounding buildings, analyze the specific architectural references and context that may influence this project;
- The design team should also consider the micro master plan for this project and how future phases may influence the building placement and approach;
- Consider the “innovation” goals for the project and how this can be integrated into the project approach more explicitly; think “outside of the box” and consider how issues

such as sustainability, design, programming, etc., may influence this project to express innovation in new ways for the University;

- Document and understand the floor plans for both Business and Engineering to see how this project can help address current and potential issues and how this new addition can integrate these buildings.

The Board suggested that when the project is brought back before the Board for the Conceptual Design submittal, the team should plan to share with the Board the “journey” and process of the design, not simply the final solution, and bring to the Board the choices, concepts, alternative conceptual relationships and scenarios, etc., which have been explored and are being reviewed by the team and with the University. The Board re-emphasized the difficult challenge this project presents to the design team: the two distinctly different architectural styles of the Engineering and Koelbel buildings, the fact that the floor levels of the two buildings do not align, and fitting the 30,000 sf program in the limited space between the two buildings while maintaining the main east/west pedestrian access to the campus from the parking at Regent Drive. Given these complexities, a workshop with the Board was discussed as an option to consider before the Concept Design submittal.

This agenda item was for information only and required no action by the Board.

**2:15 - 3:15**

**Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health –  
CU Anschutz Medical Campus**

Architects: To be determined

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional  
Planning, CU Anschutz (by phone)

Description: Informational presentation regarding a proposed 390,000  
GSF facility on the CU Anschutz Campus

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

Mr. Vite provided an update regarding the current status of the proposed new facility for the Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health (“CCPM & BH”) to be located on the CU Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”). Since this project was last brought to the Board as an informational item, Behavioral Health has been added to the programming and the Center building is no longer proposed to be an addition to Academic Office Building 1 but has moved to a different location just west of Research Tower 2 and has increased in size from approximately 220,000 SF to approximately 390,000 SF. It will include 33 units as well as instructional classrooms, labs, and auxiliary functions such as exhibit and event facilities.

Mr. Vite noted that Mr. Winters’ firm, Fentress, was contracted to perform the peer review of the RFQ for design services for the project. Although Fentress is planning to bid on the project, because they are already performing the peer review, it was determined that it was not necessary for Mr. Winters to recuse himself from this discussion.



Additionally, as noted earlier, the Board confirmed that, depending upon the meeting schedule, Ms. Brown agreed to be the Board representative on the rating and review team for the Request for Qualifications for Architectural/Engineering/Consulting Services ("RFQ") for the project. Mr. Vite reviewed the RFQ process required by the State of Colorado which will apply to the RFQ for the CCPM&BH.

Mr. Vite reviewed the anticipated project and funding schedules, noting that final occupancy of the building is planned for December 2020. Programmatically, the project is not anticipated to change much, although specific details regarding the space needs and plans within individual programs might change. He noted that the project is awaiting approval by the Board of Regents at a meeting being held on this date.

Responses to the RFQ are due on June 23. Interviews with the top firms will be held on July 7 with a selection to be made by mid-July. Mr. Vite anticipated that a contract with the selected firm will be signed by mid-August.

The Request for Proposal for the Construction Manager/General Contractor should be released the week of this meeting. It is anticipated that the pre-design meeting before the Board will be scheduled for its October or November 2017 meeting.

This agenda item was for information only as pre-design and required no action by the Board.

Prior to adjournment, the Board discussed the proposed Business and Engineering Schools Expansion Project. The Board expressed a desire to walk through both buildings. The Board also suggested that the Board hold a workshop with the design team prior to submitting the project for pre-design review.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.