University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date: Friday, June 8, 2018
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Location: Presidents Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); and Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus ("CU Colorado Springs").

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 8:05 a.m.

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center – CU Colorado Springs (the "Hybl Center")**
Conceptual Design Workshop (Action Required)

Architects/Designers/Project Team:
- RTA Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado
- HOK, Designers, St. Louis, Missouri
- Thomas + Thomas Planning, Urban Design + Landscape Architecture, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colorado
- JE Dunn Construction, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
- Stuart Coppedge, Principal, RTA Architects
- Eli Hoisington, Design Principal, HOK
- Jeffrey Davis, Regional Leader of Planning, Landscape Architect, HOK

CU Colorado Springs Campus Presenter:
- Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design & Construction, and University Architect, Facilities Management

Others Present:
- Peter Tronnier, Design/Build Manager, JE Dunn Construction

Description:

104,000 GSF, three to 4 story building, located off of North Nevada Avenue, between the Ent Center for the Arts and the Lane Center for Academic Health Sciences Buildings.

New building to be located on North Nevada Avenue for clinics, academics, and research to create an interprofessional approach to develop future healthcare providers.

Conceptual Design submittal continued from May 16, 2018

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Background Context:

Carolyn Fox:

- Team has made astounding progress in last couple weeks.
- Team had previously "nailed" the site and circulation.
- Work shown on architecture and landscape is thrilling.
- They made a 4-hour presentation to Chancellor and Deans and they were very enthusiastic and thrilled.

Mike Winters:

- Very pleased with progress they have made both architecturally and with the site. Package looks really good.

Design Team Recap/Presentation:

Stuart Coppedge:
Discussed academic and private sector aspects of the project:

Goals:

- Presenting distinct identity for Penrose St. Francis / architecture, landscaping and site need to reflect user wayfinding and purpose of building.
- Intuitive understanding of the building must be provided for public/clients and first-time users.
- Landscaping balances out the knoll on the site and blends with purpose of building, fire lane, drainage.
- Sustainability strategies.

Site Strategies:

- Shifting of building massing which shows opening between building and Lane Center.
- Readjustment of parking.
- Orientation of Building.
- Solar orientation.
- Balancing massing with Ent Center.
- Sense of drop-off and really clear path to patient parking.
- Handicap parking spaces are still over what code requires.

- Corner entrance of building provides strong sense of identity.
- Intuitively - you know where you are going and where you are parking.
- No head-in parking as you approach the building for drop-off.
- Strong student entrance that comes in from east side.
- Balance and equal importance of Penrose St. Francis and UCCS student entrances.
- Define pedestrian way to make it obvious as to where you are going.
- Plaza type areas at certain points to provide a since of upgrade in experience with seating.
- Provide seating areas that engage with the knoll.
- Native – low water landscaping.

Eli Hoisington:
Site Strategies Cont'd:

- Key spaces focused on with Landscape.
- Clinical facility entry sequence and arrival experience.
- Student entry sequence and arrival that engages the knoll.
- New "room" that is created by the interface between the building and the knoll.
- Attitude of taking the east side of the building as seriously and rigorously as the west side.
- Balancing the landscape around the building.
- Placing buffers and greenspace where they really need to be…
- Elegant drive into facility with green space along the way with control points where needed.
- Fire lane works but planned so it does not look like a fire lane.

Jeff Davis:
Landscape Architectural and Site Development Strategies:

Make the experience on the site of getting to the front door as safely as possible.

Ideas of connectivity:

- How people move to, from and around the building and how to express these larger views.
- Want focused sense of arrival by scripting and choreographing how we move to and from building.
- Entry drive - strive to create a more bucolic sense dedicated to the patient's arrival.
- Separate parking from the arrival at the front door.
- At time of events at Ent Center with heavy traffic, one can drive directly south to exit.
- DRB suggested an integrated walk from north parking lot to Hybl facility.
- Landscape at islands are primarily native plants and decomposed granite.
- Large campus type of landscape moments; Ent Center and at the knoll.
- North side of knoll at café entrance creates a pseudo amphitheater at edge of knoll.
- Reviewed storm water retention and retention ponds and plant typology discussed in its relation to Ent Center.
- Cognizant that project is within micro-region for landscape species selection.

Eli Hoisington:
Architecture Strategies – General:

- Clinical planning of interior drives the architecture.
- Tactical interior space links outdoor clinic space.
- Mechanical moved to four.
- Clinical is on one.
- Educational is on two.
- Entry moved to single consolidated entry point.
- Second floor is a mixing pot of academic, café and larger seminar rooms and lecture hall.
- Major laboratory space is on three with anatomy lab and cadaver storage.
- Heating/cooling system was discussed in terms of strategy of massing of building.
- Conceptual thermal modeling of project was encouraged by DRB.

Architectural Massing – Options:

Three architectural studies were done – collaborative in the mixing pot.

- Option one – land form base with interesting machine above.
- Option two – building has two sides of it – express the collaborative in vertical sections.
- Option three – portray the building in a sectional strategy.
- All options are 60/40 (building solid to glass).

Architectural Massing – Chosen Solution:

Of the three options – option three meets client's needs due to:

- Performance space becomes a room with a roof – with larger roof that connects it to the sky.
    - Underneath frame it allows a control of the netting.
- Highly transparent two-story with folded architectural drape.
- Moments of verticality that stitch the building together at two entrances.
- Moved away from the curvilinear towards the angularity.
- This option honors the interior program with the programming and transparency ground floor clinical running track.
- Shows the dynamic nature of the stairway from the exterior performance space connecting to the columns and leading to the front entry first floor.
- DRB requested further exploration the notch in architectural drape between face of wall of building and roof of exterior performance space.
- Exploration is still continuing as to detailing of roofing edge and its thinness in relation to the dynamic nature of the building.
- North elevation shows the vertical stitching of the building in its view of the two entrances.
- DRB suggested an exploration of an interior stair from clinic entry which is visible from the exterior as it climbs diagonally through the building.

Sustainability and Energy Model:

Eli Hoisington:

- Conceptual modeling of energy has just begun.
- Have goals set, have done all that is mindful of goals set.

- V3 LEED is format – feel good about overall strategy to Gold.
- Under V4 LEED – project is tracking strongly into Silver.
- Under FITWELL – the building does have the bones to track well if the University chooses to pursue.

DRB Comments:

A. Site and Landscape Architecture:

- North edge along detention pond needs development
- Detention pond is the foreground to building – needs to be considered.
- NW entry plaza need "consideration" as to providing scale/shade.
- North plaza at east end of building alnd all along the south – should explore having the landscape plaza area be less formal and more representative of the natural landscape of the campus.
- Make entry plaza a positive space – not just left over from circulation.
- Make plaza at student entry and inside corner have more identity – not just circulation.
- Extend knoll to eastern plan through steps/amphitheater.
- Elimination of parking at the main entry drive and providing a dedicated drop-off at the front door is a stonger direct route which defined the entry plaza and help buffer the views to Nevada.
- The entry plaza at the east and the outdoor café at the south help integrate the building into the knoll.
- The amphitheater steps as a terminus from the north and the at grade acess to the knoll at the west work well.
- Removing the three parking spaces to the east edge of the plaza is desired.
- The fire lane has been well integrated into the plan by combining the use of concrete and decomposed granite which provides a better pedestrian scale.
- The detention area needs to be integrated into the overall landscape concept:
    - How is it detailed to not be just a left over hole at the front of the building?
    - Can be simple native plant materials as a transition from formal landscaping to contrasting nature.
- The detention area:
    - It should be engaged with the plaza.
    - It could be the inverse of the "knoll" (reverse topography and vegetation), landscaped to describe the moisture ecotone of the place, or perhaps reference the native/ manicured contrast concept evident at ENT across the street.
    - This should not be considered as a cost issue, but rather as a design issue. Existing design elements such as sidewalks, walls, etc must relate to the detention basin, the design response can be simple native plant materials as a transition from formal landscaping to contrasting nature.

B. Architectural:

- For the concept design phase this is a great package.
- Love the way the program works and the way the architecture expresses that program
    - The way the building relates to the knoll.
    - The way the performance space relates to the building.

- The relationship with Lane Building which relates but Hybl is a much more dynamic building.
- Verticality of the Hybl building next to the long horizontal of Lane creates a nice play between the two buildings.
- Likes the north elevation and the verticality of the fenestration.
- The idea of concept of embracing the whole building with one drape, but experientially – seeing the big wall (as you approach from the south) it seems it needs to be broken up somehow.
    - Concerned that they roof edge might become too thick when engineered.
    - Is the folded roof forcing itself on the architecture?
- Performance roof is very dynamic but perhaps it wants to slice into the building and maybe you play with that slicing elsewhere on the building.
- Horizontality of the building on the west view makes the building seem monumental – it seems long.
    - Is the folded roof/draped roof too much of a bill board or too trendy?
    - Should the folded roof be broken where it makes sense?
- Does not favor the verticality of the front entry – perhaps the landscape plays into the entry.
- Perhaps the folded plate needs more perforations in it that speak to the fenestrations.
- The interior monumental stair could be stretched so the landing at the 2nd floor might have a better connection visually to the south plaza.
- Exploration of 3 architectural concepts is appreciated as part of the design decision-making process.
- Seeing a simple parti diagram and then the architrual interpretation is helpful
    - Option 1:
        - Too office-like.
        - The massing is detached rather than integrated.
        - Curves with rectangles do not produce a cohesive whole.
        - Tactical is not well integrated.
    - Option 2:
        - Facades are too simple and massive.
        - The reason for splitting the building into different pieces does not seem to relate to building function.
        - Entry is not strong enough – south side is not inviting.
    - Option 3:
        - Buildling works well as a gateway bookend to complement the Ent Center as a campus entry off Nevada onto Eagle Rock which having its own identity.
        - Strong entries at both east and west.
        - Tactical is fully integrated into the building massing.
        - Composition of building materials of brick plus metal panels works well.
        - Need to see building in it"s site context with Lane & Ent.
        - Preferred option.
- Design has merged planning option 4 with massing option 2 which has allowed the tactical space to be placed on the low roof to the south:
    - Integrating to the building roof is a positive move.
- Integrating the tactical space onto the mechanical penhouse into the overall building mass is a positive.

- Creating the monumental stairs on the west side provides a pedestrian loop around the building which can be used by patients as part of PT exposes the use of the building.
- Most buildings require perforations and fenestrations on a façade wall – the fact that you have very different elevations as you go around the building is actually a strength to this solid wall.
- The materiality gets beyond the concept stage and the concept of the metal with the brick is a strong combination on the building.
- Putting the building in context so that you can see it with Lane and the Ent Center – one of the things this building does well:
    - This building has to balance itself off against Ent and not just be another Lane (mass of brick on the corner).
    - It has to have enough articulation and power to create a book-end gateway to that entry into the campus.

- Option 3 is clearly the design the team prefers. They haven't given the other two concepts the same amount of thought so that it's easy to choose the nicer one because the other ones aren't done to that same level of exploration. We would prefer you provide three valid options.
- The building (option 3) is a road-side attraction – it's an icon - that can be understood at 40 mph – that is it's strength.
- In reality, the view from the south is not going to be seen or experienced that much due to the approach of the road and placement of the building.
- The roof wants to free itself from the masses underneath it (as shown in the concept diagram) – if the roof didn't follow the masses underneath it – if it was more free – it would have more animation as a concept.
- It is a positive feature that the building has different facades - it is really interesting, and should respond to the environment, as well as the interior program needs.
- Thin line of the roof is not very visible – but the concept is the floating roof – this needs to be architecturally resolved.
- More views such as Sketch-up would be helpful.
- Look at dimensions of roof and leading edge – plus dimensions of bends – too trendy?
- Look at materiality of roof element:
    - Is it more scrim-like?
    - Translucent?
    - Have depth?
- If "gutter" was 4x as wide:
    - It would not be a gutter
    - It would be freer, more autonomous life
- Encourage the team to go back to goals and review goals – landscape and architecture and make sure you are true to them and if not, change the architecture or change the goal?
- North elevation: how to give it more definition.
- Entry: vertical volume needs definition – more human scale.
- Entry stair at clinical to be linear vs. switchback to make connection to café stronger.

C. Sustainability and Energy Model:

We are lacking a “concept” on how to approach Hybl as a high performance building. We should have a concept level energy model to inform the architectural design.

- What are the design elements to be optimized? Some ideas could be:
    - Optimize passive design: According to the energy targets on page 80, heating accounts for 47% of the building energy use, however the building is shown as designed with the majority of the fenestration facing north, as if space cooling is the largest issue (it is indicated as 10% of the total load). The building should be designed to reduce the building loads.
    - Organize the program spaces so the building operates without fighting itself. For example, if indeed there are spaces that generate a lot of heat, and the building is heating load dominated, locate those spaces so they are central to thermal needs. Conversly if the building is cooling load dominated as may be expected, those heat geretating spaces should be able to directly vent to the exterior.
    - If the building currently calls for simutainious heating and cooling, this is an issue to be designed out. If it cannot be for some reason, then consider a strategy that includes moving heat from the locations calling for cooling to the areas requiring heating (the strategy used at the Byron Rodgers building). This strategy is often optimized using hydronic thermal storage systems.
    - Consider zoning the building so areas of like needs are grouped, and their systems optimized. For example offices may be able to have operable windows, but not if located near vent hoods that have negative pressure requirements.
    - Consider using “borrowed” make up air from adjacent spaces for any lab hood needs.
    - Identify which windows can and should be operable, and design for that now.
    - Have a ventilation strategy – for natural ventilation as mentioned above, but also mechanical. Fan power (driven by duct static pressure) is often a significant avoidable load. Making allowance now for larger ducts, and a layout with fewer bends will reduce both capital and operating costs.
    - Could we employ something better than a VAV system? Perhaps consider studying options with an LCCA.
    - Integrate the mechanical ventilation strategy with the structural system. Often the ceiling heigt is determined by the combination of the biggest duct and the biggest beam – and the ceiling is dropped below that. Consider a system that coordinates these two big systems so ceiling plenum spaces are minimized, and ceiling height can be increased to provide better distribution of daylight.
    - Identify which rooms should have high ceilings for daylight distribution and which should not.
    - Have shading for heat gain control and daylighting concepts tuned for the different building orientations, and integrate these into the envelope design.
    - Energy intensive building equipment (such as the MRI machines) should be identified and tracked now. There are suprisingly good options for efficient hospital equipment (see Stanford in addition to Labs 21) that make a difference.
    - How would renewable energy be included in the building envelope? Is there a concept?

  - It is unclear what the “National Average” kBtu/sqft/yr baseline refered to here is – CBECS? If so, that number will be much lower in a few months. Also, the 2007 lighting power density (LPD) number is much too high. LED light were not common in 2007. The listed LPD baseline 1.14 w/sqft, and should be closer to a 0.5w/sqft target Similarly, LEED v3 is almost 10 years old, and is a weak target.
- Very good to see the AIA DDX 2030 numbers listed and being used to track against The 32 EUI number listed is a appropriate target for 2018. As a 4 story building with that EUI it could be on site net zero energy, if that target is designed towards now,Getting to low EUI numbers is a matter of coordinating and integrating some the key sustainability concepts with the architecture. Building sustainability concepts into the design will get the project to meet these goals.

D. General Comments:

Don Brandes:
- Appreciate level of detail – excellent job.
- Architectural and landscape is great.
- Programming and massing is achieved.

Motion:

Mr. Brandes moved for approval of the Conceptual Design submittal for the William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center. Mr. Olgyay seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.
- Bulleted Meeting Notes to follow

Prior to submittal of the Schematic Design packet a GO TO Meeting is scheduled for June 19th from 2 pm to 4 pm to review progress prior to the July DRB schematic submittal. The intent of the Go To Meeting is to focus on articulating and further refining comments on architectural façade, roofing and fenestration in addition to addressing the DRB Comments.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date:	Thursday, June 14, 2018
Time:	8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location:	First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, and AndersonMasonDale Architects, 3198 Speer Blvd., Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay, Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio), and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus ("CU Denver") and the CU Anschutz Medical Campus ("CU Anschutz").

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 8:47 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly review scheduling matters with Ms. Gerou and to discuss the items on the agendas for this date prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

10:00 – 11:00 a.m. **CU Anschutz Medical Campus Monumental Signage – CU Anschutz Medical Campus**
Consent Agenda (Action Required)

Architects:
Dig Studio, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
William Vitek, FASLA, PLA, Principal, Dig Studio

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:
Chris Brueckner, ASLA, PLA, LEED AP, Associate, Landscape Architect, Dig Studio

Other CU Anschutz Representatives Present:
Ben Bohmann, Architect/Engineer Project Manager, CU Center/ CU Anschutz

Description:

Tertiary monumental signage at four new locations consistent with signage package approved in 2015 for installation upon land owned by the VA but was never installed

A/E Presentation:

Bill Vitek, RLA presented monumental signage package for CU Anschutz Medical Campus to be installed at four new locations.

DRB Comments:

- Lighting should match the coloration of the existing lighting on the other monument signs.
- Study optics and make sure the lighting is at the current technologies.

DRB Action:

Motion made by Mike Winters to Approve all phases of monumental signage with consideration to the DRB comments made above. Motion and vote unanimously approved.

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Colonel's Row Marcus Institute for Brain Health Institute – CU Anschutz Medical Campus**
Action Required

Architects:

DAO Architecture, Westminster, Colorado

Presenters:

Dan Orecchio, RA, NCARB, DAO Architecture

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

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

Description:

Renovation of ~5,364 GSF of existing residential space on the CU Anschutz Medical Campus including minor repairs and upgrades to the exterior such as replacing or repairing existing windows, door hardware, roof and roof tiles, stucco, and the addition of two ADA compliant access ramps that will be covered by a new roof

A/E Presentation:

Dan Orecchio, RA, NCARB presented the Colonel's Row Exterior Renovation submittal.

DRB Comments:

- Concerned with the detail at the intersection of new and old roof.
- Concerned with the confusion and destruction of the existing historic house.
- The proposed roof will drastically limit the amount of quality of daylight into the interior spaces.
- Roof will diminish the visibility and sight lines out of the bedroom & study on the ground floor.
- Roof should be removed.
- Consider and study one ramp, joined porch element with no roof.
- Consider one ramp (on the side), consider connecting the two porches with one ADA path.
- Consider no roof at front entry.
- Study plantings and planter and their incorporation of conceptual studies.
- Energy Analysis – optimize natural ventilation, windows, insulation, etc.
- Consider adding accent lighting and accessibility lighting.
- Consider eliminating handrails by lowering slope of ramp by eliminating steps.

DRB Action:

Motion made by Sarah Brown to Table any action and requested that the A/E return to the DRB with further studies that address the DRB comments listed above. Motion and vote unanimously approved.

1:00 – 4:00 p.m. **Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health – CU Anschutz Medical Campus**
Schematic Design Submittal
(held at offices of AndersonMasonDale Architects)

Architects:
AndersonMasonDale Architects, Denver, Colorado
ZGF Architects LLP, Portland, Oregon
Wenk Associates Inc., Landscape Architects, Denver, Colorado
CAA Icon, Owner's Representative, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
David Pfeiffer, AIA, Principal-in-Charge, AndersonMasonDale
Braulio Baptista, Lead Design, ZGF Architects
Greg Dorolek, PLA, ASLA, Principal, Wenk Associates
Chris Flint Chatto, Associate AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Sustainability Project Performance, ZGF Architects

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:
Joey Carrasquillo, AIA, Associate Designer, AndersonMasonDale
Dan Loosbrock, PE, Senior Director, CAA ICON
Bob Packard, Associate AIA/Pincipal-in-Charge, ZGF Architects
Eric Pearse, ASLA, Associate, Wenk Associates
Owen Turnbull, AIA, ZGF Architects
Kirsten Walsh, Project Coordinator, AndersonMasonDale

Other CU Anschutz Representatives Present:
Suzann Ruedeman, Director of Facilities & Planning, School of Medicine

Description:
Schematic Design submittal regarding new 391K SF interdisciplinary facility

A/E Presentation:

Braulio Baptista, AIA presented the project package for Schematic Design.

DRB Comments:

General:
- Currently the project is estimated to be 8% over budget – please make certain that the Design Development ("DD") submittal is in budget.
- Please submit 11x17 print format for DRB members to review.
- A PowerPoint/3D presentation would be easier to see/understand/model than individual project sheets.
- Consider a Pre-Design Development work session with the DRB to confirm planning and design comments and suggestions.

Site & Landscape:
- Consider improving the current visual connection to the service gate area from the art node.
  - Landscape and paving can be options
- Explore deleting the "arrival court" – extend the plaza across Revere to create a formal plaza with formal bosque of trees.
- Study the ground cover at the SW corner of the porch.
- Please provide ability to walk around these exterior spaces in 3D model at next DRB meeting.
- Project has the basis of a great design but will need to further articulate and document the following elements at the DD stage;
  - Grading and Drainage
  - Areas and definition of Landscape Plantings
  - Pavement Materials and Details
  - Walls, walks, curbs and fencing
  - Site cross-sections and elevation studies
  - Site Fixtures and furnishings materials

  - Site and Landscape Lighting
  - Areas reserved for potential Art Placement
- Consider modifying service area.
- Study bringing some materiality inside out.
- Consider plaza element – integrating and making it more unified.
- Evaluate bringing the art node to the end of the plaza area.

Architecture:

- Overall building massing is good.
- The terraces at rooftops carved into the building work well.
- Exterior skin – 4 panel "kit of parts" is a strong idea (unitized panels) which can provide strong performance on each of the 4 compass directions if they are truly customized to achieve reason.
- The atrium needs a full sun study so that the clear glass spaces - which face into the atrium, do not have to have blinds.
  - The interior would be dramatically affected if it becomes a checkerboard of windows with blinds closed.
- At DD, the DRB really needs to understand the materials and the visual effects of the materials of the 4 panels in an overall elevation:
  - i.e. the visual effect of what happens if glass replaces metal panels – this is hard to articulate in drawings so, design team need to define the materials of the outdoor terraces for DD.
- Integrating the mechanical rooftop into the building mass is good.
  - Need to define the roof materials at DD.
- The "shifted mass" overall scheme is intriguing and exciting with the different shifts, carves and lifts.
- The exterior skin and materiality needs to be light, simple and not overly fussy.
- Building & site lighting should be considered and balanced.

- Main Entry:
  - Study easing the orientation slightly "taking on" the splayed/angle of the geometry of the building.

- Bistro Entry:
  - Consider moving the entry to the SW corner to provide "after hours" entry:
    - Be mindful that a vestibule will be required if the Bistro is over 3,000 SF.
    - It would be most desirable to have the entry visable and accessible from Revere Ct./the street.

- Exterior Skin:
  - As presented with options, it is our understanding that the variation of the panels will be explored responding to the performance metrics.
  - With this, our preference is to have the skin "read" as a more "taunt" solution with minimal articulation.

- Concerns about Exterior Skin:
  - Glare
  - Shade
  - Views

  - 4 Modulars given those attributes on a 360 degree in terms of sun, shade, glare, etc. is high, medium or low in terms of intensity.
  - Is the materiality consistent or does it change? But the glazing and those indexes, will change.

- Additional Questions that need to be addressed at Design Development:
  - The Atrium: what is the natural ventilation strategy? It appears that air is to be exhausted at the top, but where is the fresh air intake? This should be shown.
  - Is there a "passive" or even "semi-passive" method of running the building, or does everything have to be running at all times?
  - What thermal zones are being designated (same question also asked last workshop). Where are there larger temperature variations allowed, and where are the narrower, more critical thermal locations? How does this thermal zoning interface with the proposed mechanical system (which, is also not clearly described).
  - Are their operable windows? Where and how?
  - This building looks like it could be a good candidate for a night flush ventilation strategy. How would this be done, and would it include thermal storage?
  - The Atrium glazing appears to be designed to let more light in at high sun angles (summer) than low, winter sun angles. Is that the design intention?
  - Similarly, the "performance-optimized skin" appears to need optimization. In the four typologies shown, none appear to be sufficient to control glare or heat gain as currently designed. The "kit of parts" method has potential, but the design shown lacks the analytical rigor to perform as described.

Sustainability:

- The building has good massing and many design opportunities to be a sustainable building, however the concepts described have yet to be quantified and expressed at a schematic level of development.
- It is desired that by this time in design, to have believable energy strategies "baked in" to the design, with enough analysis to be assured that they work. For example, it should roughly parallel the level of development of the buildings structural system

DRB Action:

Motion made by Rick Epstein to Approve the Schematic Design submittal indicating that the A/E will submit a Design Development packet that addresses the issues and comments listed above by the DRB. The DRB strongly suggested a "Pre-Design Development Submittal" workshop that clarifies and addresses the issues and comments reflected in meeting notes. Motion and vote unanimously approved.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date:	Friday, June 15, 2018
Time:	8:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Location:	Benson Conference Room #380, Benson Earth Sciences Building, 2200 Colorado Avenue, Boulder Campus

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay, Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio), and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder").

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 8:05 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly review the items on this day's agenda and review other current projects under review by the Board prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:00 – 10:30 a.m. **Ramaley Biology Building Addition – CU Boulder Campus**
Discussion of Project (Information Only)

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
- Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction

Others CU Boulder Representatives Present:
- Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
- Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
- David Kang, Vice Chancellor, Infrastructure and Sustainability
- Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Management
- Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Description:
- Description regarding addition to existing building for the relocation of the Integrative Physiology (IPHY) Program

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

- Based on current and revised construction cost estimates the Ramaley design as conditionally approved for Design Development is over budget.
- The project will be redesigned to comply with the project budget by removing the basement level and exterior courtyard.
- DRB agreed to review the revised and updated Design Development submittal at their August 2018 meeting.

10:30 – 11:30 a.m. **19th Street Pedestrian Crossing Site Visit – CU Boulder Campus**
Information Only

The Board took a tour of the sites near Boulder Creek which may be impacted by the completion of the 19th Street Pedestrian Crossing, after which they took a break for lunch.

DRB Comments:

- Explore connecting the two south arrival landings with an east/west trail along the creek overlook – could be a very strong place along the north edge of the Rec Center.

12:00 – 2:00 p.m. **Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – CU Boulder Campus**
Schematic Design Submittal (Action Required)

Architects:
Gensler Architects, Chicago, Illinois
Civitas Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Craig Vickers, RLA, Civitas
Jon Gambrill, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, Managing Director, Principal, Gensler
Jonas Philipsen, Senior Associate, Design Director, Gensler

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Kyle Hopkins, Landscape Architect, Civitas
Colby Stodden, Senior Project Manager, Haselden Construction
Geoffrey Brooksher, Architect, Gensler

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning

Jennie Gerke, Interim Assistant Dean of Libraries
Carolyn Gleason, Senior Director of Development, Leeds School of Business
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Keane Ray, Project Manager, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Doug Smith, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering and Applied Science

Description:
Schematic Design submittal for an addition and renovation to the Koelbel Building and the Engineering Center for the Leeds School of Business and the College of Engineering and Applied Science

A/E Presentation:

Craig Vickers, RLA presented updated landscape design and site layout. Jonas Philipsen, Gensler, presented architecture and detailing.

DRB Comments:

Site and Landscape:
- Consider adding urban landscape trees/improvements in the west event plaza.
- Relax “pinch point” at base of handicap ramp at west event plaza.
- Consider the east bike parking area – to attempt to make it more of a bike courtyard similar to the area at the west.
- Explore adding plantings at east bike area – similar to the west area.

Architecture:
- West Bridge Elevation/Fenestration:
  - Consider using the same fenestration on the west side as the east side of the bridge. The east side is simpler and relates more closely to the existing Koelbel Building.
  - Concerned about the detail edge of the fin detail at windows on the west side of bridge.

- West Entry Façade/Fenestration:
  - The entry windows seem too monumental and with the lack of mullions – the windows seem to be monolithic.
  - Consider having more mullions and bringing the precast frame forward.
  - Study to avoid the heaviness of the fins shown on the fenestration on the west side of the bridge.

- Auditorium:
    - Consider wall at bridge structure at intersection of auditorium to be concrete (vertical board form) instead of rock.
    - Explore "doghouse" structure at auditorium to be flat roof.
    - Study fenestration at auditorium – possibilities to add more windows.
    - Explore adding an irregular pattern of punched windows with eyebrows similar to the engineering windows to help simplify the façade.
    - Study adding daylight into the lecture hall.

- Underpass:
    - The space seems underwhelming but, could be a very dynamic space – consider the following:
        - Board form concrete columns.
        - Using a smooth plaster ceiling with fry reglets that align with the walls or breaks up the ceiling plan.
        - Up and down lighting on columns and walls in lieu of the "slot" LED lights shown.
        - Utilize the existing interior spaces to illuminate from the interior to the passageway.
        - Explore unifying the "passageway - bridge" to make it a room – organize the space – brighten it up.
        - Study the west façade at the passageway on either side of the main entry element. The east façade of these elements seem more simple and successful.

Sustainability:

- Provide energy model – 25 KBTU/SF is a good goal.
- Explore using operable windows where possible.
- Consider how to elegantly integrate PV – how much can we fit? What is design layout.
- Consider manifesting the sustainable design strategy.

Motion made by Rick Epstein to approve the Schematic Design submittal with conditions and comments noted. Motion and vote unanimously approved.

Conditions - in addition to the DRB Comments listed above:

Landscape:

- Consider reducing small retaining wall at the bottom of the handicap ramp on west event space – open it up and flare it to eliminate pinch point.
- Add more landscaping at bike area on east area.

Façade:

- Stop stone at west façade of auditorium and replace with board form concrete.
- Making the auditorium board formed concrete.
- Anything north of bridge would go to concrete – not stone on both the east and west sides.
- Looking at windows/mullions in those areas including potentially some glass in the auditorium.

Passageway:

- It's a room – treat it as if it has four walls and a ceiling and a floor:
  - Needs a photometric study.
  - Glazing looking into the building – what are you seeing.
  - Materiality of the columns – making them concrete.
  - Experience of innovation – engineering and business.
  - Social pathways need to be determined – explore possibilities.

Fenestration:

- Fenestration on east and west side of the bridge – simplify mullions.
- Entry – look at vertical mullions and recessing windows to create more definition.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.