



University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2018
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: Fifth Floor Conference Rooms, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, CO

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Victor Olgyay; Chris Shears, Mike 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:

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 8:45 a.m.

8:30 – 9:30 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

The Board met to briefly to discuss the item on the agenda for this date prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:30 - 11:00 a.m. CU Denver Business School Infill Renovation - CU Denver Design Development (Action Required)

Architects:

Stantec, Inc., Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

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

Ryan McDonald, Project Architect, Stantec

Angelia Cowgill, Project Architect, Stantec

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning,
CU Denver Campus

Other Campus Representatives Present:

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

Description:

Design Development (“DD”) 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

A/E Presentation:

Cary Weatherford provided a quick overview of the CU Denver Business School building and this project. Dominick Weilminster, Angelia Cowgill, and Ryan McDonald reviewed various portions of the DD submission.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Evaluate the lighting in the alley alcove that will wash the exterior brick wall. Ideally, the linear light fixture will wash the face of the textured brick.
- Consider developing an art mural at the corner of 15th and the alley, working with the College of Arts and Media, Larimer Associates, and Urban Villages.
- Re-consider the design of the alley bollards to withstand the traffic and heavy alley activity and use. The light levels and temperature within the bollards should be balanced with the linear alcove light source above.
- Signage: Finalize the Signage. Consider a blade sign or other signage types that will allow visibility from the 15th Street.
- Consider adding a hose bib to the alley for clean up. (This was not discussed, but it is a good idea.)

B. Architecture:

- Confirm that the auditorium area will not utilize fixed seating and explore the possibility of providing more fenestration and open glass area along the alley.
- Consider that the air intake vertical grille could be revised to a dark bronze.
- Consider using light at the 15th street entrance to the alley to help identify the entrance. Unify with similar design approach.
- Study alley entry in terms of the placement of the column(s), the two steps, and the glass. Consider reversing the door location with the fixed panel to help clarify entry location.

- Study details at exterior columns:
 - base detail needs consideration with regard to maintenance and durability
 - attention should be paid to constructability of kick-plates and base areas
 - consider having backing behind the metal panel cladding the column for durability
- Consider adding a vision glass panel at the south end of the event space. The width of the vision glass panel should be the same width as the upper reveal.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Stantec is a signatory to the Architecture 2030 Challenge. Insure the energy performance of this project meets this performance commitment.

It was agreed that the University Project Planner (Cary Weatherford) will coordinate with DRB and the design consultants in demonstrating final resolution of the items noted above. Either Cary Weatherford or representative of Stantec will come back to DRB to report on resolution of the items.

DRB Action:

Victor Olgay moved to approve the Design Development submittal incorporating the comments as noted above with the understanding that, at a later date, the items listed above will be reviewed by the DRB. Sarah Brown seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. 19th Street Pedestrian Bridge – CU Boulder Design Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers:

Loris and Associates, Inc., Engineering Consultant,
Superior, Colorado

BHA Design, Inc., Landscape Architects, Fort Collins,
Colorado

Presenters:

Jason Messaros, Landscape Architect, Project Manager,
BHA Design, Inc.

Dan Beltzer, P.E., Associate, Loris and Associates, 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

Description:
Design workshop for pedestrian path connecting North of
Boulder Creek to Main Campus at 19th Street

A/E Presentation:

Richelle Reilly provided a brief history regarding the project. Jason Messaros and Dan Beltzer presented an updated project package for the workshop.

The intent of the meeting is to discuss major issues of the project so that the design team can move forward with a Schematic Design submittal to be presented to the DRB at a later date.

DRB was informed that path behind Student Recreation Center connecting the east termination of bridge to the area close to Clare Small is no longer included in the project. The stairs connecting to the bridge to Clare Small area were deemed more important.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Study aspects or elements of the site that could be enhanced (tree species, plantings, drainage) that would support or encourage the natural landscape and habitat (bird watching, drainage, native vegetation, visual connections, etc.).
- Refer to the approved 23rd Street Bridge Schematic Design package for the extent of detail and notation such as but not limited to:
 - Scaled site plans for north, south, and overlook landing areas
 - Layout and grading plans
 - Walls, walks, steps, pavements, fixtures, furnishings, materials, and preliminary construction details
 - Planting plans and details
 - Site lighting and fixtures
 - Cross-sections, elevations, and visual aids to the design
- Verify adequate vertical clearance with the trail at the north crossing.
- Provide design info regarding the new maintenance bridge.

B. Architecture:

- Detail the handrails of the rounded and “preferred” image provided at the DRB meeting on September 12; its connection to the bridge structure, and the intergrated lighting details.
- Provide and illustrate various lighting alternatives – perhaps for three (3) distinct areas (trail, overlooks, stairs).
- Consider the railing as a continuous top handrail that is curved – top rail to be curvilinear and not segmented.
- Consider vertical $\frac{3}{4}$ ” to 1” vertical pickets and double flat stock posts.
- Explore designing the bridge rail components as “light and airy” as possible while still maintaining structural and safety considerations.
- Study how the railings and decking can avoid appearing as “straight segments” and rather reinforce the “sinuous” nature of the bridge.
- Study the materiality, control joints, and the desired bridge surface.
- Details of the foundation of the bridge supports should be studied. Provide info on the locations and define the different types of multiple pier configurations.
- Consider making special moments at the entrance of the bridge and at the various overlooks.
- Explore levels of details at schematic in terms of:
 - Bridge
 - Walls
 - Walks
 - Materiality
 - Scoring patterns for the decking
 - Cross Sections should be created for:
 - Railings
 - Landings
 - Overlooks
 - Various conditions where the bridge meets the grades
 - Evaluate each of the overlooks – there are opportunities, particularly over Boulder Creek
 - The curvilinear image or the tubular steel that was shown and proposed alignment is favored
- Continue to design and refine the stair alignment and construction details to be more connected to the main trail alignment. The DRB would like to see more study on how the stairs could be more sinous and curvilinear.
- Please more clearly clarify the steamline interaction so that is more highly visualized and detailed.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Team is encouraged to look at the EPD specifications of both concrete mixes and adjust the design to improve the environmental performance by 5%.
 - Provide EPD sheets for both precast and CIP concrete – consider how to reduce “tPE” and “GWP” by 5% over current baseline specifications.

DRB Action:

Beyond the comments noted above, no formal action was taken by the DRB at this workshop.

1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

Imig Building Addition, College of Music – CU Boulder Design Development (Action Requested)

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:

Jeremy Brunel, Project Designer, Pfeiffer Partners
Alberto Cavallero, AIA, LEED AP, Pfeiffer Partners
Susannah Drake, FASLA, AIA, Principal, DLANDStudio
Lesley Perez, Landscape Architect, DLANDStudio

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/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
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning
Rachel Stonecypher, Project Manager-Capital, Facilities
Planning

Description:

Design Development (“DD”) submittal for addition to existing
Imig Building for the College of Music

A/E Presentation:

Amy Kirtland provided an update regarding the status of the project. Alberto Cavallero, Jeremy Brunel, Suzannah Drake, and Lesley Perez presented the package for this DD submittal.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

No comments.

B. Architecture:

- The main entry does not feel resolved.
- Regarding portico head detail, consider using stone instead of limestone at the secondary portico arches.
- DRB is requesting further study of main entry as reflected in DRB meeting minutes since May of 2018.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Progressing nicely, exceeding original energy goals.
- Consider interior design and material selection to reduce mechanical RH loads.
- Daylighting analysis shows detrimental direct sun in several spaces. Consider interior design (such as lightshelves) to allow the use of daylight while resolving the direct glare.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve the Design Development submittal with the single condition that within the next week, the consultants would return to the DRB via conference call/GoTo Meeting with conceptual schematic elevation studies of the front west entry. These drawings (sketches and cross-sections) do not have to be detailed, but the intent of the DRB is to resolve the alignment at the front entry of the building with the arcaded entry façade. Victor Olgay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

DRB commented that the Design Development submittal is a great package with attention to site, landscape – attention to detail. DRB's intent is not to delay or confound the constructability of the project – the DRB simply feels there is an outstanding issue with the entry offset from the entry façade. The DRB meeting notes over the past several months document and reflect the “entry” issue as being ongoing and unresolved.

Upon completion of the last item on the agenda, the Board briefly discussed the items heard during the day. There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, September 13, 2018
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, CO

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Victor Olgyay; Chris Shears, Mike 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:

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 8:15 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly to discuss the item on the agenda for this date prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:00 – 11:30 a.m. UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital – Anschutz Inpatient Pavilion Tower 3 Expansion – *CU Anschutz Medical Campus* Conceptual Design for Site and Landscape Architecture; Schematic Design for Architecture (Action Required)

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
Kevin Jayne, PE, LEED AP, Affiliated Engineers, Inc.
Jeremy Powell, Landscape Architect, Kimley-Horn

Others Present:

Chris Barnwell, AIA, Leed AP, Director of Design, Altus

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

Terri Carrothers, Chief Financial Officer, CU Anschutz
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional
Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Description:

Conceptual Design ("CD") for site and landscape
architecture and Schematic Design ("SD") for architecture
and sustainability/energy submittal for new UHealth
University of Colorado Hospital expansion project consisting
primarily of a new inpatient bed tower and associated
amenities to support planned inpatient services growth

A/E Presentation:

Sean Menogan provided a brief update regarding the status of the project. Sheila Elijah-Barnwell, Jeremy Powell, Tushar Gupta, and Kevin Jayne presented the CD and SD submittals as noted above.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Continue to refine and design the Patient/Visitor Plaza area, pedestrian connections from parking areas to the entry, and the location and size of patient/visitor plaza areas.
- Consider less emphasis on the pedestrian connection to the north along the east side of the garage since the 5' walk is defined as adequate. Focus on the pedestrian spaces to the south of Tower 3 and the connections to the surface parking and parking structure.
- Simplify and edit overall hardscape, landscape materials, and elements.
- Coordinate all site planning and landscape architecture plans, drawings, cross-sections, visual studies, and construction details with the project architects.
- Refer to other University of Colorado planning and design DRB schematic and design development submittals to reference the extent of planning and design detail that is required for review and approval.

B. Architecture:

- Coordinate with the landscape architects on pedestrian connections, pavement details, areas of entry, gathering, and drop-off.
- Concern was expressed that perhaps the materials don't want to match as closely as proposed – perhaps through fading of materials, etc.
- Entry needs to be resolved as far as a clear reading of drop off and entry.
- Details need to be complete including exit doors – coordination of exterior and interior architecture needs to be refined.
- There is no clear sense of design on the north side of the building.
- Continue to refine and detail architectural 3-D modeling that combines both site/landscape improvements with the architectural massing.
- Coordinate the Sketch Up Model with the Revit Model.
- Develop the vestibule in the south stair and coordinate with the elevations and adjacent landscaped areas.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Energy loads need to be modeled and incorporated to catch up with architecture at DD. This work should to be completed asap to inform the architectural design.
- If heating is indeed a dominant load, consider more significant envelope insulation measure – may drive down mechanical equipment requirements.
- Identify all process loads. Individual pieces of equipment can be optimized, i.e., kitchens can move from a 250 EUI to a 100 EUI through careful equipment specifications and controls. Similar results can be achieved with medical laboratory equipment.
- Overall concern that since landscape and sustainability are not in sync with architecture that perhaps lost opportunities are experienced where one discipline can impact the other through design. Should work for better integrated design.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved approval of the site and landscape architecture Conceptual Design submittal with the comments noted above. Mike Winters seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Don Brandes also moved approval of the architecture for the Schematic Design submittal with the comments noted above. Sarah Brown seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

**11:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m. William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center – CU
Colorado Springs (the “Hybl Center”)
Design Development (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
Jeffrey Davis, Regional Leader of Planning and Landscape
Architecture, HOK
Eli Hoisington, AIA, LEED AP, Design Principal, 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:

Design Development (“DD”) submittal regarding a new
building located on North Nevada Avenue for clinics,
academics, and research to create an interprofessional
approach to develop future healthcare providers.

A/E Presentation:

Eli Hoisington, Jeffrey Davis, and Stuart Coppedge presented the DD submittal.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Continue to refine site improvement details, such as: lpe decking details, exterior stone and brick connections, and project signage.

B. Architecture:

- Details to be considered:
 - Roof drain detail at entry canopy
 - Detail at the sill of windows on the west side of the building

- The vertical reveal to the south of the entry canopy and how it intersects with the entry canopy

C. Other:

- An updated and revised submittal package will be forwarded to University system office for posting on SharePoint that documents Pre-Design, Conceptual, Schematic, and Design Development submittals.
- On behalf of the University and the DRB, the planning and design process, revisions, modifications, and communications have combined to produce an outstanding project of which the A/E firm and University professional staff should be proud. The DRB will use this project and its submittals as a model for other University projects to illustrate vision, process, detail, and implementation.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve the DD submittal with the comments as noted above. Sarah Brown seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Anschutz Health Sciences Building (formerly known as Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health) – CU Anschutz Medical Campus Design Development Workshop (Information/Direction)

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:

Justin Brooks, Architect, ZGF Architects
Joey Carrasquillo, AIA, Associate Designer, AndersonMasonDale
James Gantz, Architect, ZGF Architects
Dan Loosbrock, PE, Project Manager, Senior Director, CAA ICON
Bob Packard, Associate AIA/Principal-in-Charge, ZGF Architects

Eric Pearse, ASLA, Associate, Wenk Associates
James Taylor, Architect, AndersonMasonDale
Kristina Thomsen, Architect, ZGF Architects

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

Description:
Design Development (“DD”) workshop regarding new 391K
SF interdisciplinary facility

A/E Presentation:

David Pfeiffer, Braulio Baptista, Greg Dorolek, and Chris Chatto presented the project package for the DD workshop. André Vite addressed specific project, site, and campus questions.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Continue to explore the relationship and visual connections of the interior entryways of the building with the exterior spaces.
- Continue to study the site cross-sections from the building through the site.
- Working closely with the project architects, study the placement and details of walls, walkways, column details, lighting, and site furnishings.
- Continue to study and illustrate the project drop-off/pick-up, gathering areas, and pass-through connections along the Art Walk.

B. Architecture:

- Explore a simpler palette of materials and colors on the interior of the building; perhaps a reconsideration should be made as to whether you really want to bring the exterior skin into the interior of the atrium space. It may seem a little distracting and taking away from the backdrop for the wood and the plantings.
- Please provide details of material changes and samples of the materials themselves at DD.
- Increase the connection between the atrium and the art walk.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Team should address the questions from DRB June meeting notes, especially regarding “passive” methods of operating the building.

- Atrium lighting approach works.
- The exterior looks elegant but may not represent a true optimization of the performance of the skin. No quantification of the actual performance (for example, kbtu /hour of solar heat gain through different configurations) was provided, and illustrations appeared to have marginal performance enhancements. The description of the energy optimization of the exterior skin did not include simple improvements such as raising the window sill or changing the glazing specification.
- The team should explore changing the specifications by tuning the glazing façade of the building for each orientation for better performance. This can be done without any visual impact
- It is unclear as to where the project is in terms of the EUI and what are the next moves to be accomplished to improve the performance of the building. Parametric energy analysis should be done to further inform the design.

It was noted that the design team plans to return with full DD package at November DRB meeting.

DRB Action:

Beyond the comments noted above, no formal action was taken by the DRB at this workshop.

Upon completion of the last item on the agenda, the Board briefly discussed the items heard during the day. There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.