



University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Friday, March 13, 2020
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Location: Fifth Floor Conference Rooms, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB and Campus Members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgyay, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (“UCCS”). Cheri Gerou, DRB member, was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Kori Donaldson, Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:30 a.m.

8:45 – 9:45 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

Kori Donaldson indicated that a contract for services with Cheri Gerou had been executed in early March and that as of the date of the contract, she was an official member of the DRB with voting privileges.

Other administrative and scheduling matters were discussed prior to reviewing the items on the agenda. Also discussed was the need to modify the preferred submittal format to include an executive summary, a narrative description of the energy and sustainability information provided in a submittal, and project models illustrating a planned project in context with its surroundings.

9:45 – 10:30 a.m. Update on Sustainability and Deferred Maintenance Strategic Planning Group

Presenter:

Kori Donaldson, Senior Director of Capital Construction and Planning, CU System

Others Present:

Emily Parker, Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Budget and Finance, CU System

Staff Presentation:

CU System Administration staff described one component of an ongoing strategic planning process that has been underway since the summer of 2019. A detailed presentation can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 1 – DM and Sustain Strategic Planning Draft DRB - 03-13-2020]

DRB Comments:

No formal action regarding this item was required. The Board shared the following comments:

Regarding funding deferred maintenance:

- Consider as part of any project setting aside a certain percentage of the cost of construction on an annualized basis for maintenance of a facility;
- Investigate using operational savings to fund capital projects, setting up a revolving fund, and generating income for this purpose;
- Study the use of additional user fees;
- Funding maintenance costs with historic buildings is an issue all over the country, not just at CU.

Regarding energy:

- In measuring absolute energy as well as proportional energy, consider that a building can be more efficient and have a higher EUI because it is more heavily utilized but overall, there can still be a reduction in the amount of energy being used in that building or on that campus;
- Think about greenhouse gas reductions and switching energy sources from fossil fuel to electrification;
- Consider how energy is purchased. The time of day an energy purchase is made can significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions and perhaps also reduce the cost;
- Also consider that buildings with load flexibility or energy storage may allow the campus to buy electricity at a lower carbon intensity, which may be an inexpensive way to drive emissions down on the campuses for little cost.

The DRB thanked the staff for their presentation and indicated that they look forward to further updates.

10:30 – 11:30 a.m. Update on Strategic Facilities Visioning Project – CU Boulder Campus

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

David Kang, Vice Chancellor for Infrastructure and Sustainability and Chief Facilities Officer
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Planning, Design and Construction
Ida Mae Isaac, Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Infrastructure and Sustainability/I&S Strategist

Staff Presentation:

CU Boulder staff described and discussed the strategic facilities visioning project on the Boulder campus. The project was undertaken in order to prepare for the upcoming 2020-2021 campus master planning project. A detailed presentation can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 2 – UCB Strategic Facilities Visioning DRB - 03-13-2020]

DRB Comments:

No formal action regarding this item was required. The Board shared the following comments:

Regarding the resiliency framework:

- Ensure that it is tied into a larger set of issues, costs, values, etc.;
- Determine how much resiliency is worth in different areas;
- How do the findings of the resiliency framework get employed to a maximum benefit from an energy and a human investment perspective;
- Think about it in terms of building flexibility, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and that there is a definite connection between resiliency, energy, and pollution;
- Ensure, where possible, that all of these values are built into the final metric.

The DRB thanked the staff for the presentation and also suggested that at least one member of the DRB participate in the selection committee for the consultant who will assist with the campus master planning process, in addition to having one DRB member serve on the executive committee as indicated by the staff.

11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. North Nevada Avenue Corridor Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan – UCCS Schematic Design/Design Development (Action Requested)

Architect:

Davis Partnership Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenter:

Collin McDougall, Director of Wayfinding and Experiential Design, Davis Partnership Architects

UCCS Campus Presenter:

Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design & Construction, and University Architect, Facilities Management

Description: Combined Schematic Design/Design Development submittal regarding the signage plan for the North Nevada Avenue Corridor Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan, including ground signage for the Hybl and Cybersecurity Buildings

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 3 – UCCS N Nevada Signage Master Plan - 03-13-2020]

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- The horizontal ribs proposed at the base of the signs assumes the signs will be placed in a non-landscaped area without irrigation or plants. In lieu of adding the ribs, ensure the placement of the signs:
 - in protected areas;
 - directly on the ground plan (on micropiles); for example, that will keep irrigation from spraying on them, etc.; or
 - if this isn't the case, provide an 18- to 24-inch concrete base to structurally protect the signs so there isn't any discoloration from irrigation, plant materials, rocks, etc.

B. Architecture:

- Study a mock up showing the perforations to ensure the material selection produces the desired result:

- Perforations are often more open than expected, so this should be studied so the desired size of the perforations can be validated.
- Investigate how close pedestrians may get to the signs while determining the desired size of the perforations as a finer mesh may be required if pedestrians might get within an arms length of the signs.
- Consider eliminating the horizontal ribs and increasing the gauge of the metal of the base slightly to protect the base and provide a buffer against wear.
- Regarding lighting within the signs:
 - Work with the fabricator to ensure that during night viewing the various lit components don't obscure the legibility of the lit text and ensure the lit components don't compete with each other.
 - For the directional signage shown on page X-7, #AA.3-04, ensure the lighting for all directional elements is lit more than everything else on the sign so that the directional elements stand out.
 - Investigate keeping the same material for the letters and the strip and develop a strategy for the brightness of the sign by varying the lighting output to create the correct, consistent color temperature.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

No comments were made regarding sustainability and energy.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve the Schematic Design/Design Development submittal package for the North Nevada Avenue Corridor Wayfinding and Signage Master Plan, recognizing the comments provided by the DRB. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

The DRB requested that once the design for the median signage is ready and has been reviewed by the City of Colorado Springs and by the fire department, this design be brought to the board for review. If the median signage is within or close to the same family, only one level of review as a consent/review/approval item may be necessary.

Going forward, the DRB also requested that:

- On the site plan, enlarged sections showing the individual locations of the signs be included; and
- Photos of the existing locations also be included.

1:00 – 2:45 p.m.

**UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital Garage 2 – CU Anschutz
Medical Campus
Conceptual Design (Action Required)**

Architects/Engineers:

Pact Studios LLC, Denver, Colorado, architectural design
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Denver, Colorado,
landscape architecture
Martin & Martin Consulting Engineering, Lakewood, Colorado,
civil and structural engineering

Presenters:

Chris Barnwell, AIA, Leed AP, Design Architect, Pact Studios
Tanner Draemel, Senior Project Designer, Pact Studios
Sheila Elijah-Barnwell, Ph.D., AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, EDAC,
Pact Studios
Emily Wilson, PLA, Landscape Architect, Kimley-Horn

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

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

Others Present:

Sean Menogan, Vice President, Facilities, Design and
Construction, UCHHealth
Jeremy Powell, Landscape Architect, Senior Project Manager,
Kimley-Horn

Description:

Schematic Design submittal for a new 1,300 stall outpatient/
visitor parking structure to be designed and built on Lot 2
located east of the Anschutz Outpatient Pavilion (AOP) to
serve the AOP, the Anschutz Cancer Pavilion, and the Sue
Anschutz-Rodgers Eye Center as well as visitors to the
University of Colorado Hospital.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 4 – Anschutz Parking Garage 2 - 03-13-2020]

DRB General Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Study the circulation, stacking, traffic flow, etc. from Aurora Court to the space in front of the Eye Center Parking Lot and leading to the main entrances for the ACP and the AOP;
- Investigate other possible locations for the valet drop off and for the pedestrian pathways crossing the street in front of the ACP and AOP;
- Determine if attempting to save the mature landscape is driving the design and location of the building;
- Explore the landscaping in the area between the garage and the front entrances of the ACP and AOP:
 - Currently designed as an informal, garden-type environment, curvilinear area that is very busy and contributes to the pinch points;
 - Although the curvilinear option presented preserves the mature landscape, it may not be the best option;
 - Examine an urban design with courtyards which would respond more to the geometry of the building;
 - The building is very present with strong lines and massing and may lend itself more to courtyards, with pavement materials, lighting, building lighting, ambient lighting, hierarchical levels of landscaping;
 - Could create a unique design opportunity that relates to the building; and
 - Long term maintenance, access, and circulation can still be achieved.

B. Architecture:

- Study the integration of the corners of the garage;
- Also study the massing and specific location of the building; determine if potential changes could help improve access and circulation issues;
- Consider changes to the location for the elevator core that might improve the pinch point and pedestrian circulation;
- Rather than expressing the floorplates horizontally in the elevations, consider fragmenting the elevations vertically with panels or columns;
 - Currently, the south and east elevations seem weak;
 - Use of brick is merely cosmetic; brick should be used for structural, solid walls that have smaller openings; and
 - Consider eliminating all the brick from at least two elevations and limiting the elevation skin to minimal, one or two for example, materials to make the elevations more cohesive, concise, less confusing.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

- Assess the embodied carbon of the structural systems and develop a plan for the reduction in the embodied carbons in order to take advantage of the opportunity of having a building that is essentially all concrete.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to table to a later date the Schematic Design submittal package for the UCHHealth University of Colorado Hospital Garage 2, requesting that the comments provided by the DRB noted above be taken into consideration to further the design direction so the submittal can be moved from Schematic Design to Design Development. Chris Shears seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

2:45 – 3:30 p.m.

Red Cross Memorial Plaza – *CU Anschutz Medical Campus* Design Development (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers:

Design Workshop, Denver, Colorado

Presenter:

Robb Berg, PLA, CDT, Principal, Design Workshop

CU Anschutz Campus Representatives Present:

Ben Bowman, Construction Manager, CU Anschutz Medical
Campus

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

Description:

Design Development submittal for a new memorial plaza to commemorate the recently demolished Red Cross Building structure as well as its contribution to the community over time.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 5 – Anschutz Red Cross Memorial - 03-13-2020]

DRB General Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Going to the Ryerson steel edge is an acceptable alternative to the curb edging;
- Signage and wayfinding tells the big picture of the story, so these signs should take a priority position in the list of add alternates;
- During the meeting, it was determined that there is soil available on campus that could be used for the infill needed for the berms which may help fund some of the items placed onto the list of add alternates.

B. Architecture:

No comments were provided regarding this subject.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

No comments were provided regarding this subject.

DRB Action:

The DRB indicated that it would be acceptable to have the design consultant work with André Vite to resolve the priority for some of the newly identified add alternates.

Don Brandes moved to approve the Design Development submittal package for the Red Cross Memorial Plaza at the CU Anschutz Medical Campus, recognizing the comments provided by the DRB. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

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