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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 4:15 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); Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus ("CU Colorado Springs"), 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:
Laura Allred, interior design graduate student and guest of the Board
Isaac Hartman, recent architecture undergraduate student from University of Colorado Denver and guest of the Board
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 8:10 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly discuss the items on this day's agenda and administrative matters prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health – CU Anschutz Medical Campus (the "CCPM&BH Project")**
Pre-Schematic Design Workshop (Information/Direction Only)

Architects:
AndersonMasonDale Architects, Denver, Colorado
ZGF Architects, 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

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz
Other CU Anschutz Campus Representatives Present:
Suzann Ruedeman, Director of Facilities & Planning, Dean's Office, School of Medicine

Others Present:
Joey Carrasquillo, AIA, Associate Designer, AndersonMasonDale
Bob Packard, Associate AIA/Pincipal-in-Charge, ZGF Architects
Dan Loosbrock, PE, Senior Director, CAA ICON
Greg Dorolek, PLA, ASLA, Principal, Wenk Associates
Eric Pearse, ASLA, Associate, Wenk Associates
Kristina Thomsen, Architect, ZGF Architects

Description:
Pre-Schematic Design workshop regarding new 391K SF interdisciplinary facility

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Baptista reviewed the status of the CCPM&BH Project as of the end of the last meeting with the Board:

- Design team will return to the Board for a Schematic Design submittal at its meeting in June 2018

Mr. Baptista, Mr. Dorolek, Mr. Pfeiffer, Mr. Carrasquillo, and Mr. Vite then presented or spoke to current plans for various elements proposed for the CCPM&BH Project including:

- concept designs
- functional stacking
- massing
- floor plans
- atrium development
- vertical circulation within the building
- building façade/skin options
- pedestrian and vehicular circulation
- various schemes for site development including:
  - landscapes
  - street scapes
  - connections with the art walk.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board expressed appreciation to the design team for a job well done. The massing studies and the sculptural aspects of the building are very powerful and iconic and the opportunities being created with the atrium and outside could activate the whole area. The Board indicated that it looked forward to receiving the Schematic Design ("SD") submittal.

During the workshop, the Board shared the following comments, concerns, and suggestions:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Preference expressed for porch and lawn landscape option Scheme B on south side of building in conjunction with the art walk:

  - Consider options to eliminate or change desire line crossing the grassy knoll moving toward south area of entry to the building.

- Review pinch point between north edge of lawn and south edge of plaza:
  - The sidewalk and alignment may be pinched in terms of directing pedestrian traffic

- Continue to study and include within Schmatic Design (SD) submission further cross-sections and details regarding grading, elevations, drainage, pavements, lighting, fixtures and furnishings, streetscapes, and how the site and landscape will be used horizontally and vertically. Specifically, study the type, spacing and effect of the proposed plant materials that help to achieve the planning and design concept.

- Demonstrate a convincing SD visual analysis of walk-through/relationships between the landscaping on south side and the existing building(s) on the south exploring potential solutions to creating a "collobarative space". Look at parking lot edge and continued E/W access

- Regarding landscaping spaces:
  - Identify the variety of intimate and found spaces that are unique and special.
  - The openness to entry and other areas on south side will be just as important visually as found spaces
  - Enhancing visual qualities and simplifying landscaping may be more in balance with the sculptural aspects of the building

- Continue to study and explore ideal pedestrian circulation, movement, and perspective, especially regarding drop off, gathering spaces, other traffic areas, and north/south connections

- Review requirements of Police Department, ensure future parking structure and access are adequate and appropriate

<u>Architecture</u>:

- Consider balancing quiet and intense architectural expressions so each has a special quality and appears to be intentional and helps to emphasize the other

- Study the sculptural design of the building while contemplating skin options for the façade:
  - The wrap skin option is generally preferred; a lighter and simpler approach which emphasizes rather than competes with sculptural design may be better
  - Study sculptural building design; determine if horizontal shifts still make sense when compared to cladding schemes; one element may take priority over the other

- Investigate options related to moving the entry on south side further east so it aligns more with proposed pedestrian pathways/circulation

- Study the cantilevered area on south side:
  - May be overwhelming and opposing

  - May be more successful if angle was half the size and less dramatic
  - V-columns may be too heavy for proposed pedestrian space
  - More slender columns may help scale and pedestrian viewpoint
  - Determine purpose of this element, is it an extension or does it want its own volume
  - Determine if horizontality reflected in the design can continue through the south side
  - Embrace sculptural quality of building without overly complicating it

- Determine the relationship the building wants to have with RC2, is there a color contrast, is RC2 simply in the background, etc.

- Investigate north side of building regarding connection with parking garage, how people will move around and connect to the building, what will the volume of people be doing, can design on the north be made a little more interesting, should the entries to the building be modified, etc.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Review goals for sustainability and energy in terms of metrics and performance; determine if they should be revised and how they will continue to inform the architecture of the building and the landscape architecture

- Regarding proposed skin/cladding options:
  - Consider how the skin and façade interact with each other in terms of shading, light redirection, providing for interior program needs, and exterior environmental impacts
  - Review skin/cladding applications on south façade where shading options and performance would be preferable but where proposed options reveal the most glass

:

- Study daylighting from atrium space to adjacent program spaces:
  - Design may benefit from inverted pyramid regarding placement of walls, using more solid walls near the top of the atrium with clerestory/small windows, reflective surfaces on upper walls and more glassy, translucent walls on lowers levels, all which will allow more more light into adjacent spaces on each floor
  - Graduate the opacity and transfer of light through/from interior walls while studying overall space in atrium design
  - Design of skylight in atrium will be critical and should be coordinated with program needs for plant light, etc.

- Study the building in terms of climatic conditions, how these conditions may differ from one space to another; determine: 1) how mechanical systems and thermal zoning strategies can change to take advantage of different conditions and leverage various zones, 2) if program locations can be integrated with these strategies to obtain optimum conditions, and 3) can natural ventiliation be utilized?

General:

- Review, and adjust if needed, the overall project design principles and goals; refer back to them as studies noted above are completed

- For the SD submittal:
  - Using diagrams and sections, demonstrate how proposed landscaping extends east into and connects with the art walk, the quad, and to the west continuing the art walk as a study in circulation patterns and scale regarding proposed landscaping scheme
  - Include section cut through 19th Street

No formal action for this item was required.

11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. **CU Denver Business School Infill Renovation - CU Denver Schematic Design** (Action Required)

Architects:
Stantec, Inc., Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Dominick Weilminster, AIA, Principal/Board Member, Project Designer, Stantec

CU Denver Campus Presenter:
Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver Campus

Other Campus Representatives Present:
Sharon Anthony, Engineering/Architecture Project Manager, CU Denver
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:
Angelia Cowgill, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Associate, Architect, RNL Design/Stantec, Project Architect

Description:
Schematic Design submittal for the Business School Phase II Renovation (Infill) including the construction of a new, three-story structure where the existing courtyard is currently located

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Prior to beginning the presentation, Mr. Weatherford provided an update to the Board regarding other CU Denver campus matters unrelated to the agenda item.

Regarding the Infill project:

- The gift agreement with the donor had been signed
- The schedule includes a Design Development submission by August 2018
- A general opening in late fall 2019
- An academic opening for the spring 2020 semester
- JE Dunn was selected as the general contractor.

Mr. Weilminster reviewed:

- Existing conditions
- Proposed plans and programming for the first and second floors
- Mechanical space on the third floor
- Access including emergency and service vehicle access
- Pedestrian connections
- Improvements within the alley
- Proposed façade and entry enhancements
- Proposed lighting
- A section cut through the infill space
- Materials
- Potential signage options
- Various illustrations

He also highlighted updates made to the design since the Conceptual Design submittal.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board shared the following comments after the presentation:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Continue to study and develop the alleyway entrance - it appears less important than the infill piece; it is difficult to see where entrance actually is, once you are down the alley
- Study the need for more architectural cues that the entry is a little further down the alley
- Consider a blade sign on the alley column
- Examine view from 15th street – down the alley – eyebrow fin or signage along one of the columns at corner

Architecture:

- Consider an overhead door at egress door at alley from event space to avoid confusion as to which door is entry that could be seen from 15th Street
- Alleviate need for second ramp
- Explore column placement to adjust dimension for entry
- Study elevation – bring brick into the glass area on the alley to further define the entry at alley (may be out of scope)

Ms. Brown moved for approval of the Schematic Design submittal with the conditions listed below to be shown at Design Development:

- Evaluate mechanical screen – adjustments may need to be made
- Study reveal between the existing building and the addition; having reveal and expansion joint cover be made all of metal panel
- Consider glass that would be better performing; examine the architecture and the performance level of the curtain wall at alley – study glass options of different material – frit glass may not be optimal
- Evaluate entry into building off the alley; consider alternate option of entry into the building from the north so it is visible from 15th Street.
- Examine material at corner and how it turns the corner from alley to street – can expression of new infill have a subtle expression on 15th Street.
- Explore lighting concepts that are more integrated on the building. Scallops of light at alley entrance wall do not enhance architecture – consider a linear fixture

Mr. Brandes seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

1:30 - 2:00 p.m. **Business School Phase 2 Renovation Exterior Door Signage - CU Denver**
Conceptual Design (Action Required)

Architects:
RNL Design/Stantec, Inc., Architects, Denver, Colorado

CU Denver Campus Presenter:
Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning,
CU Denver Campus

Description:
Additional signage to two main façades of Business School, Lawrence and 15th Streets, per agreement with donor

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Discussion was held to explain CU Denver's campus signage committee. Members of this committee include Jeff Ekstrom, Andre Vite, Cary Weatherford, Andrea Wagner, and Jim Nelson. Guidelines for the proposed signaged to recognize the donor, Jake Jabs, were prepared to be consistent and align with the existing door signage for JP Morgan.

B. DRB Comments:

Ms. Brown moved to approve the signage as submitted, shown in the package on pages 5 and 8. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which was unanimously approved. It was noted that the final signage for the alley would be submitted in August 2018.

2:15 – 4:15 p.m. **William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center – CU Colorado Springs**
Conceptual Design (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

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

Other Colorado Springs Campus Representatives Present:
Kent Marsh, Associate Vice Chancellor Campus Planning & Facilities Management

Others Present:
Peter Tronnier, Design/Build Manager, JE Dunn Construction
Jim Houk, MLA, PLA, President, Thomas + Thomas

Description:
Conceptual Design submittal regarding a new building to be located on North Nevada Avenue for clinics, academics, and research to create an interprofessional approach to develop future healthcare providers

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Fox began the presentation by reviewing the current status of the William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center project ("Hybl Center" or "Project"). Mr. Coppedge reviewed the changes made to the Hybl Center since the last meeting.

Mr. Hoisington reviewed various elements of four site strategies, including pros and cons, site analysis, circulation and access, and opportunities and challenges regarding massing and landscaping. Mr. Houk provided additional information regarding potential landscaping options. Stormwater detention, intuitive wayfinding, site sections, materiality, volume and geometry, entrances and openings, datum lines, preliminary elevation studies, programming, maximum buildable area, footprint and stacking, next steps, sustainability goals, and comparisons to central campus features and elements were also discussed.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board discussed the options reviewed during the presentation and the study models presented, and shared the following comments:

- Detailed site cross-sections, elevations, 3D modeling and visual studies should be included in the schematic desing (SD) package for the entire site that clearly demonstates the groudplanes, changes in elevation, on-site and off-site views, landscape improvements and the desire site design.

- Refine and detail with graphic notation the final "site improvement plan" showing all parking, access, landscape, walkways, signage, drainage areas and other related site and landscape improvements.

- Develop various exhibits or illustrations that express the architectural components that have been discussed in terms of massing, particularly for the site development and their relationship to the site and landscape inmprovements.

- The Board expressed gratitude for the A/E firm and CU Campus Architectual team to begin to resolve a series of very difficult and confined site conditions into the beginning of a remarkable concept.

- Mr. Winters, FAIA and DRB Member will continue to work with UCCS staff and the AE team to help refine the conceptual submittal into a formal concept design that can serve as the basis for more detailed schematic design.

Mr. Brandes moved to table this item until Friday, June 8, 2018 to continue to refine and improve the Conceptual Design submittal. He noted that the team has done a tremendous job in resolving several site and programming issues and appears to be working very well with the University technical staff.

For the next meeting, the team should focus on refining and improving upon Concept 4 with building massing of Option 2. The site development, circulation, and parking for this option all embrace a strong direction. For the resubmittal of the Conceptual Design package, the team should focus on two additional elements in addition to the items listed above:

Architecture:

- Refine and better illustrate the architectural vernacular character of the building. The exterior relationships need to be further refined and illustrated to accommodate the development program.

- Better refine and document the building programming so that it more easily relates to the architecture in terms of the entry way and the building materials.

- The Lane Center should not be the standard for architecture.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Focus on preparing a more thoughtful and comprehensive site systems and landscape design in terms of the overall character zones that are being designed and identified. The pathway systems, landscape treatment – how the site connects and relates to the knoll, ENT Center and other adjacent land uses.

- UCCS Architectural staff has very good conceptual and schematic design submittal packages that can be shared with you in terms of what the DRB is expecting to review.

Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously approved.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date:	Friday, May 18, 2018
Time:	9:30 a.m. – 2:45 p.m.
Location:	Sievers Conference Room, #S228, SEEC Building, 4001 Discovery Drive, Boulder, Colorado

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"), 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:
Isaac Hartman, recent architecture undergraduate student from University of Colorado Denver and guest of the Board
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 8:10 a.m.

9:30 – 10:30 a.m. **Work Session – Board Only**

The Board met to briefly discuss the items on this day's agenda and administrative matters prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. **Imig Building Addition, College of Music – CU Boulder**
Schematic Design (Action Required)

Architects/Engineers/Contractors:
Pfeiffer Partners Architects, New York, New York
DLANDStudio Architecture, Brooklyn, New York
Group 14 Engineering, Denver, Colorado
Adolfson & Peterson Construction, Aurora, Colorado

Presenters:
Alberto Cavallero, AIA, LEED AP, Pfeiffer Partners
Susannah Drake, FASLA, AIA, Principal, DLANDStudio
Jeremy Brunel, Project Designer, Pfeiffer Partners

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Lesley Perez, Designer, DLANDStudio
Anthony Durst, Preconstruction Manager, Adolfson & Peterson Construction

Taylor Roberts, Building Performance Engineer, Group 14 Engineering
David Sorenson, Estimator, Adolfson & Peterson Construction

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Ida Mae Isaac, Capital Planning Strategist, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Rachel Stonecypher, Project Manager, Planning and Construction, Facilities Management

Description:
Schematic Design ("SD") submittal for addition to existing Imig Building for the College of Music

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Kirtland began the presentation by noting that the last time this project was brought before the Board was in December 2017 for a Conceptual Design ("CD") submittal. Since then, budget, scale, and programming have all been reduced:

- Total project and soft costs are currently budgeted at $57 million.
- Gross square footage, previously proposed for 73,000 SF, is now approximately 58,000 SF.

Mr. Cavallero, Ms. Drake, and Mr. Brunel reviewed:

- overall site analysis
- base project scope
- existing site utilities
- massing studies
- 18th Street alignment
- primary window views
- sun capture and daylighting plans
- variances in the building design since December
- program blocking and stacking
- a study of the entrance location, floor plans, and east/west and north/south sections.

Ms. Drake and Ms. Perez also reviewed site and landscape information:

- including character of adjacent areas
- existing circulation
- proposed changes to the landscape design
- character zones and circulation

- connections
- various landscape designs, sections, and illustrations
- permeable paving patterns and hardscape plans
- placemaking
- various planting plans
- lighting
- and topography and utilities.

Mr. Roberts reviewed sustainability and energy elements including:

- various shading studies
- wind studies
- sustainability and LEED goals
- daylighting goals and strategies
- and energy goals and standards.

Also discussed were proposed potential materials and details, fenestration precedents, articulation details, potential window and portico expressions, and a project recap including various illustrations and elevations.

B. DRB Comments:

After reviewing questions concerning the submittal with the Board, Mr. Brandes moved for approval of the Schematic Design submittal with the following conditions:

General:

- Require that Architecural and Engineering (AE) team come back to the DRB Board for an "interim work session" prior to Design Development ("DD") submittal to further articulate, illustrate refine, and resolve the issues outlined below. Mr. Brandes noted that this Pre-Design Development work session would be necessary and mandatory prior to making a formal Design Development submittal.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Mr. Brandes noted that the the SD submittal regarding the site and landscape architecture is a comprehensive and well composed packet.

- While the site and landscape architectural submittal is outstanding – Mr. Brandes encouraged the the AE firm to continue to work with CU staff in terms of the refining plant material pallets, pavement details, landscape and site fixtures and furnishings, lighting and other site improvements that may be affected by changes to the architecture.

Architecture and Design:

- Explore linearity of 220' building face and massing along Wardenburg:
    - Review opportunities to break up linearity of massing on both lower streetscape and upper levels

  - Consider cutting back soffit edge of lower roofline where intimate seating/garden room areas are located on south side of building
  - Study ways to break up massing and potentially add rhythym to upper level of the roof
  - Evaluate what roof lines and massing will look like from a distance to determine successful application
  - Rectify the floor plans with the elevations

- Continue to work on details of fenestration and articulation for all windows, including casement, sizing, placement, materiality, etc.

- Evaluate ways to connect the building to the plaza including articulatuion of portico and entryway; current design for portico does not successfully identify the entrance, so determine how it and/or the entryway can be improved

- Explore materiality in terms of all call outs and associated detailing and joinery, all of which will be thoroughly reviewed and assessed for DD-level submission

- Consider "masterplan" of addition in center section of IMIG and how it affects this new addition.

Energy and Sustainability

- Continue to update and revise the daylighting and energy opportunities for the building in relationship to the project goals and objectives.
- Daylighting and energy analysis should inform the design

The motion was seconded by Mr. Olgyay, and unanimously passed.

12:30 – 1:30 p.m. **UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital – Anschutz Inpatient Pavilion Tower 3 Expansion – CU Anschutz Medical Campus**
Pre-Design Introduction (Information Only)

Architects/Engineers:
Altus Architectural Studios, Denver, Colorado; architect of record; programming & planning, coordination & document development
EYP Architecture & Engineering, Denver, Colorado; lead exterior design, programming & planning, standards expert
Affiliated Engineers, Inc., Denver, Colorado; MEP design, low voltage, lighting design
Martin & Martin, Lakewood, Colorado; civil and structural engineering
Kimley-Horn, Denver, Colorado; landscape architecture

Presenters:

Sean Menogan, Vice President, Facilities, Design and Construction, UCHealth
Sheila Elijah-Barnwell, Ph.D., AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, EDAC, Director of Healthcare, Altus Architectural Studios
Tushar Gupta, AIA, Lead Designer, EYP

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

Description:
Pre-Design presentation for expansion project consisting primarily of a new inpatient bed tower and associated amenities to support planned inpatient services growth

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background and Context

Mr. Menogan and Ms. Elijah-Barnwell reviewed the presentation for the Board. The UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital is seeking to expand inpatient services on the Anschutz Medical Campus to include:

- Inpatient medical/surgical and progressive care
- Inpatient intensive care
- Surgical services including operating rooms, post-anesthesia care unit, and sterile processing

Physical expansion is envisioned as:
- An 11-story (plus basement) patient tower addition to the existing hospital
- Located to support optimal operational flow and efficiency of inpatient service
- Approximately 584,300 SF including shelled space for future fit-up as patient volumes dictate
- Reconfiguration of second level elevated pedestrian connector between Leprino, Hospital and Employee Garage Buildings

B. DRB Comments:

The Board shared the following comments with the AE team in terms of what the expectations are for the Conceptual Design submittal:

General:

- Evaluate what lessons you have learned from the previous tower, construction and occupancy. Share with the DRB “lessons learned” and design relationships that you would like to improve upon.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- At the concept level share with the DRB Board your thought process regarding the site in terms of consttarints, opportuntiites, adjacencies, and other factors that will influence your site and architectural design.
- Involve the landscape architect early in the planning and design process.

Architecture:

- Study the articulation and materiality of the building; how are the towers "married" in terms of skin of the buildings

- Identify what happens at the ground floor plane:
  - what is the experience of the user
  - what is happening at the ground floor level
  - will they create a plaza/pedestrian space on the south side of the tower
  - what is the interaction between those passing by

Sustainability and Energy:

- Study the orientation of the site in terms of solar

- Investigate "Lessons Learned" from last tower to improve performance of proposed project

- What are the thoughts on sustainability, such as:
  - the net-zero aspects
  - what are the true goals that the team wants to achieve
  - what metrics will be used for measuring success

- Discuss the integrated thought pattern of the project in terms of site, building, and sustainability

Refer to the Campus Architect for other Conceptual Design submittals that illustrate the level of planning and design that is desired by the DRB. No other action regarding this item was required by the Board.

1:45 – 2:45 p.m. **19th Street Bridge, North of Boulder Creek – CU Boulder Introduction** (Information Only)

Architects/Engineers:
Loris and Associates, Inc., Engineering Consultant, Superior, Colorado
BHA Design, Inc., Landscape Architects, Fort Collins, Colorado

Presenters:
Dan Beltzer, P.E., Associate, Loris and Associates, Inc.
Peter J. Loris, P.E., Principal, Loris and Associates, Inc.
Jason Messaros, Landscape Architect, Project Manager, BHA Design, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Brian Moffitt, Project Manager, Planning, Design & Construction, Facilities Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description:
Introduction regarding new pedestrian path connecting North of Boulder Creek to Main Campus at 19th Street

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background and Context:

Those present for the meeting introduced themselves after which Ms. Reilly briefly described the history of the project:

- Project site is west of the 23rd Street Bridge Crossing recently approved by the Board
- The Boulder campus was awarded a DRCOG Transportation Improvement Grant ("TIP") for the budgeted amount of almost $6M in 2015
    - From this grant, the TIP project will pay approximately 80% of the project cost, and the Boulder campus will pay approximately 20%.

The project schedule:

- Anticipates bringing the Conceptual Design ("CD") submittal before the Board in July 2018
- Complete all construction documents by March 2019
- Begin construction in August 2019
- Complete the project in May 2020.

Mr. Beltzer reviewed the anticipated opportunities and constraints for the project including:

- anticipated flood zone requirements
- engineering requirements
- potential bridge specifications
- terrain challenges
- plant species and natural environment

A number of ash trees infected with ash borer are located within the project site area which will likely need to be removed throughout the construction process. Other considerations were also discussed.

Further items discussed:

- relationship of this trail crossing to the new 23rd Street Bridge Crossing
- potential connections from the 19th Street Crossing to the existing trails

The Board reviewed with the consultants a 3-D simulation of possible trail routes.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board expressed appreciation to the consultants for their presentation. They were pleased that the same team who designed the 23rd Street Bridge Crossing would also be working on this project.

Mr. Brandes indicated that for the Conceptual Design (CD) submittal, the Board would like to see the following elements included and addressed within the submittal:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- **Origin and destination**: Include the pros and cons and details regarding places of departure and arrival for the trail. Provide the DRB with a clear rationale for alternative points of departure and arrival. Begin to discuss the sense of arrival and destination for both in terms of special events, and future capacities once the residential development occurs.

- **Horizontal and Vertical Alignments and Cross-Sections**: Study various alignments between the points of origin and destination nodes. Illustrate the pro's and con's associated with each alignment.

- Consider optional non-ADA connections to provide more options.

- **North and South Landings/Crossing Overlooks/Drop Connections:** Describe and illustrate the north and south landings, overlooks, ground connections, etc.

- Please note that at the Concept level the DRB needs to determine and define a firm direction on the planning and design of the trail prior to proceeding to Schematic Design. Schematic design should begin to refine and articulate an agreed upon direction.

Architecture and Design:

- Detailing regarding widths, overlooks, stairs, railings, structural connections, constructability and connectivitity in terms of columns, visual connections, whether the preferred structural systems will be within the family of what is being done for the 23rd Street Bridge Crossing or if it will be a different structural system, the connectivity to the groundscape, etc. – the Board would like to explore earlier on these items and concepts regarding how and where this trail will be touching, carrying, etc.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Consider ways where options regarding sustainable construction methods and materials may be utilized for this project

- Consider ecosystem services, the area's bird life, if and how the environment for the birds might be improved, and how the project might have a positive impact on the environment

- Provide initital EPD (Environmental Performance Data) for concrete as baseline material to improve on.

General:

- Keep in mind that the CD submittal is the time to test options and that the Board is willing to provide the time needed to perfect this submittal because knowing, understanding, and accepting the concepts and the options presented are valuable tools for the Board necessary in order move the project forward

- The more information that can be inferered at the CD submittal regarding materiality, the railing, lighting, landscape designs, etc., the better it will be for the Board to review the project and get a sense of the character for the project

- This project might be a good opportunity to explore the integration of art work or to fold other options and opporutnities into the process early on so the Board will be able to reflect and evaluate these elements

- At the next submission, bringing a 3D topographic model would be very helpful in terms of providing the Board an opportunity to get a sense of the vertical structures

- The Board also suggested that a site visit prior to the CD submittal would be appropriate.

No other action regarding this item was required by the Board.

After the completion of the final agenda item, the Board reviewed administrative matters with Ms. Gerou. There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.