



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

## University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019  
Time: 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.  
Location: Presidents Conference Room, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver,  
or by Zoom Meeting/Conference Call

**DRB members present:** Don Brandes, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio).  
**Not present:** Sarah Brown, Victor Olgay, and Bill Haverly.

**Others in attendance not otherwise noted:**

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 1:00 p.m.

**1:00 – 1:15 p.m. Work Session – Board Only**

The Board briefly discussed the item on the agenda.

**1:15 – 3:00 p.m. Engineering Center – ECAE ECNT Renovations – CU Boulder  
Continuation of Conceptual Design (Action Required)**

Architects:

Anderson Mason Dale Architects, Denver, Colorado  
Dig Studio, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Presenter(s):

Andrew Nielsen, FAIA- Principal, AndersonMasonDale  
Gretchen Wilson, ASLA, PLA, LEED, AP, Principal  
Partner, Dig Studio

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Others Present:

John Everin, AIA, AndersonMasonDale  
Stephen Showalter, Architect, AndersonMasonDale  
Chris Brueckner, ASLA PLA, Dig Studio

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,  
Facilities Planning

Chris Sachs, Project Manager Capital, Facilities Design and Construction

Cherie Summers, Assistant Dean of Administration, College of Engineering and Applied Science

Description: Continuation of Conceptual Design submittal for a renovation of the former aerospace (ECAE) and north tower (ECNT) wings of the Engineering Center for the College of Engineering and Applied Science for research labs, offices, and student service spaces, continued from September 13, 2019.

### **A/E Presentation:**

Client's Preferred Option: Concept A

Andy Nielson presented updates on the project:

- Key Project Intent Priorities:
  - An interior renovation for reuse of space for research for the College
  - To improve occupant health and wellness by adding more natural light and views and by improving interior circulation and wayfinding
  - Improve the east entrance to address ADA, site circulation, and the new program functions of this entrance
- Proposed treatment of landscape on the north façade responds to new, differentiated fenestration pattern
- Proposed enhancement of the visual connection to the north between the Discovery Learning Center ("DLC") and the original Engineering Center ("EC"). Realignment potential is limited by existence of a major stormwater inlet.
- Solutions for pedestrian access from Colorado Avenue to east entry are tempered by a landscape buffer desired to mitigate the impact of intense traffic on Colorado Avenue
- Narrowed sidewalk and centralized seating area proposed along north sidewalk with the potential to serve future mobility hub
- Vertical windows at lower level (in lieu of square in several locations) improve the potential for exterior landscape to enhance the lower level placemaking
- Design team feels horizontality of the building as well as the asymmetry of the building are important to inform the new design

Input from client following last Design Review Board Concept Design Review:

- Explore an "expanded project sitework" area as noted on Page 8

- Adjust the conceptual planning and design concepts to budget constraints
- Try, as much as practical, to maintain parking numbers in the lot to the west of the building

**DRB Comments:**

**A. Site & Landscape Architecture:**

- DRB feels that Page 21 is a good organizing element of the site and landscape, but it needs further design detail in the areas of:
  - The realignment of the entry drive.
  - Further site planning of the entryway plaza.
  - Potential of incorporating an overhead canopy shade fixture.
  - More detailed site details for steps, retaining and seat walls, speciality pavements, site improvement materials, planting and lighting.
- DRB's preference is not to move the drive east 20'-0" as proposed, and to resolve a safe access drive width to accommodate delivery and campus traffic.
- DRB questions why the sidewalk on the east side of the building is no longer a part of the north side of the parking lot. Perhaps the sidewalk on the south side of the parking lot could be moved to the parking lot side to provide a walkway from the parking lot which would lead directly into the building (as shown on page 21).
- DRB questions the need for a dedicated bike sidewalk; otherwise, perhaps the green area could be extended. Further, if the green area was brought more towards the curb, perhaps the concrete area could be more up against the building.
- The proposed walkway between the DLC and the EC is desired.
- DRB appreciates the preliminary concept of the curved walls coming from Colorado Avenue but feels more exploration should be done with the hardscape.
- DRB does not have a good feel as to what the seat walls along Colorado or how much they would actually be used.

**B. Architecture:**

DRB prefers Option A for architectural studies:

- Explore the option of adding some type of canopy at the east entrance, it would want to be kept simple, but from a practical standpoint it may make sense to have a little bit of a cover at the entrance; visually the canopy would be a marker for the building entrance.
- DRB very much appreciates the diagrammatic approach as shown on page 36 of the submittal.
- The Option A is a big improvement over previous submittal.
- DRB likes the way the corridor expressions have been articulated.

- DRB likes the addition of the stone to the north elevation rather than the pure concrete in the collaboration area.
- If budget requires some value engineering, perhaps the consultant should consider leaving the window configuration on the right side of the elevation that is in the corridor. The DRB likes the proposed change to the elevation, but it may not be a priority if budget is a concern.
- The medallions of the stone within the face of the architecture has really organized that face of the building.

### C. Sustainability and Energy (from Victor Olgyay):

- Slide 21: Area well to be removed: Perhaps “renovate” to still allow light to lower level lab spaces? (Also, note daylight emphasis on slide 27.)
- Slide 72: Two thoughts:
  - 1) Be more explicit on the demand flexibility approach (as indicated in the diagram with blue circles). Is there a sense of the relative importance of say, the flatter profile provided by efficiency, as compared to thermal storage or controls? Which approach (or combination of approaches) provides the best return on investment?
  - 2) Decreasing emissions from grid electricity is also “time dependent” over day and season, the emissions intensity changes. Therefore, this flexibility strategy should include emissions as well as cost. (See <https://www.watttime.org/>).
- Slide 70: Will there really be skylights as per the diagram? Interesting – perhaps consider using the existing engineering building “sawtooth” form for top lighting.
- Slide 69: Thank you for this plan diagram – concept looks rational and effective. I think I can imagine where vertical stacks are and exhaust/fresh air intakes are, as well, but would be good to add a section diagram.
- Slide 66: Do we know the type of labs/fume hoods to be programmed? Will they be able to include heat recovery, or will that be only for the general HVAC? Is there any consideration of using some radiant conditioning in areas that are ventilation dominated so we are not exhausting all our conditioned air?
- Slide 71: DRB looks forward to further development of the materials concepts beyond reducing waste and using recycled materials (i.e. comparison of EPDs and consideration of lower embodied carbon material products).

### DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the Engineering Center ECAE ECNT Renovations based on the comments noted above and to move the project forward to Schematic Design. Mike Winters seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.



## University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Friday, October 25, 2019  
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.  
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

**DRB members present:** Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgyay, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus (“CU Colorado Springs”), and André Vite, campus DRB member for the CU Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”).

**Others in attendance not otherwise noted:**

Cheri Gerou, former Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB  
Kori Donaldson, incoming Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB  
Jered Minter, Campus Architect, CU Denver  
Cary Weatherford, Director of Institutional Planning, CU Denver  
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 9:15 a.m.

**9:00 – 10:00 a.m. Work Session – Board and Guests Only**

The Board discussed administrative items and reviewed the items on the agenda after which Kori Donaldson, the newly hired senior director of capital assets for the CU System office, and Jered Minter, the new campus architect for the University of Colorado Denver campus, were introduced to the DRB.

**10:15 – 11:15 a.m. Branding and Wayfinding Signage – CU Anschutz Medical Campus Schematic Design and Design Development (Action Required)**

Architects/Consultants:

ArtHouse Design, Denver, Colorado  
Karsh Hagan, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Martin Gregg, Principal, ArtHouse Design  
Beth Rosa, Arthouse Design

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

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

Others Present:

Jered Minter, Campus Architect, CU Denver  
Cary Weatherford, Director of Institutional Planning,  
CU Denver

Other Campus Representatives Present:

Lauren Berlamino, Account Director, Karsh Hagan  
Ben Bowman, Construction Manager, CU Anschutz Medical  
Campus  
Jennifer Merchant, Creative Brand Manager, Communications,  
CU Anschutz Medical Campus

Description:

Continuation of Conceptual Design submittal regarding  
monumental signage for the CU Anschutz Medical Campus,  
continued from August 9, 2019

**A/E Presentation:**

- Representatives from ArtHouse Design presented the submittal, and André Vite responded to specific questions regarding the monumental signage and proposed locations.
- André noted that the actual monumental and tertiary signage and associated lighting included within this submittal had been approved in June 2018 and had already been built.
- Only the graphics and text on these signs needed DRB consideration at this time.
- Ben Bowman addressed questions regarding the completion schedule.

**DRB Comments:**

- DRB was in agreement to the proposed signage package and agreed that approval should include Schematic Design and Design Development approval as well.

**DRB Action:**

Don Brandes moved to approve the Conceptual Design, Schematic Design, and Design Development submittal for the monumental and tertiary signage at the CU Anschutz Medical Campus as proposed, noting that the approval is final and that any further review by this Board for this submittal will be unnecessary. Mike Winters seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

**1:30 – 3:30 p.m.**

**Hybl Building Signage – CU Colorado Springs  
Schematic Design (Approval)**

Architect:

RTA Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado

Presenter:

Stuart Coppedge, Principal, RTA Architects

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

Description: Schematic Design submittal regarding exterior building-mounted signage for the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building

### **A/E Presentation:**

Carolyn Fox and Stuart Coppedge presented the submittal for the exterior building-mounted signage for the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building, including:

- Signage requirements for the building:
  - Name of the building, required by donor
  - Tenant partner, Centura Health logomark
  - Campus logomark
- Process of review followed for signage submittal
- Proposed locations and types of required signage, west and east elevations
- Proposed installation and illumination
- Site and circulation considerations
- Signage master planning for Nevada corridor

### **DRB Comments:**

DRB discussed the locations of the signage; signage type and illumination; campus logomark and interlocking CU logo; university branding standards and approval authority; non-complementary precedents for future campus signage; retail appearance of proposed signage; increased effectiveness of potential monument signage; and the detrimental signage package, especially considering the design of the building.

DRB expressed opposition to approving this submittal and requested that the staff and design team pull together other options that may address the concerns of the DRB and still meet the requirements of the other reviewing entities. DRB requested that staff return to the DRB within approximately two or three weeks, considering DRB recommendations for other signage options. DRB signage approval is recommended prior to returning to the other levels of review, to eliminate the need for a future review by the DRB.

### **DRB Summary Comments and Recommendations:**

- As noted by the Campus Architect and Design Consultant, the signage presentation to DRB is very late in review and approval process. The DRB should have the opportunity to review, comment, and provide direction early in the conceptual and preliminary phase of site and building signage without expectation of approval.

- Architectural design of Hybl Building – the DRB spent much time and great effort to influence the character, vernacular, design, and integrity of the building. The proposed signage detracts greatly from the building.
- DRB wants to see a whole package that shows site and building signage:
  - Site signage may help reinforce and relieve some of the building branding issues.
  - More exploration and design options should be provided.
  - What does signage look like at night?
  - What does signage look like from Nevada Avenue--including approach from the north and from the south--visualize what the signage looks like from the road.
- Wayfinding signage on Nevada Avenue and Eagle Rock Road needs to be clarified - site monumentation signage may be the best alternative to the building-mounted signage issues.
- Hierarchy, typology, location, and size of building-mounted signage is excessive and inappropriate – does it have to be logo and text, or just a logo?
- Proposed illumination of signage is inappropriate. Internally illuminated signage has a retail feel. Precedent signage at the ENT Center is halo illuminated, which is a better option.
- Signage on the Curtain Wall glass looks tacked on and is an inappropriate location for signage.
- Language on signage needs to be clarified – does all of it have to be on the building or can some of it be on monumental signage?
- The use of “UCCS University of Colorado Colorado Springs” is redundant and too long.
- The DRB questioned why the ENT Center uses a simple halo illuminated “CU” logo and Hybl is using an internally lit plastic “UCCS” logo. The need for the logo and the text “University of Colorado Colorado Springs” seems redundant and complicated.
- UCCS signage on east side of the building is pedestrian-focused and should not be at the top of the building; it should be located closer to the front door.
- The location of both Donor Signs on the east and west is acceptable. The DRB recommends eliminating all internally lit plastic signs.
- The DRB feels the signage as proposed is setting a negative precedent for future campus signage.
- In the future, signage for all projects will be reviewed and considered at all levels of DRB review, Pre-Design, Conceptual Design, Schematic Design, and Design Development, in order to help integrate the signage design and placements into the overall design concept.

**DRB Action:**

Don Brandes moved to table the Schematic Design submittal for the building signage at the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building for approximately two or three weeks, or until the next regular DRB meeting.



UCCS to work with Branding committee and university to revise submittal based on DRB comments. DRB will review the revisions to the Schematic Design submittal based on above referenced comments and will consider approval of Schematic Design at that time.

Chris Shears seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 12:53 p.m.