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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date:	Tuesday, September 14, 2021
Time:	10:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Location:	Dwire Hall, Haehn Conference Room 204, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, 1420 Austin Bluffs Parkway, Colorado Springs, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:
Don Brandes, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus ("UCCS"), and Jered Minter, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus ("CU Denver"). Sarah Brown was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
d'Andre Willis, incoming campus architect, University of Colorado Boulder
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 10:05 a.m.

10:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. **Tour, Lunch, and Work Session – Board Only**

The DRB began their day with a tour of various locations on the UCCS campus with Carolyn Fox. After the tour, during a break for lunch, the DRB reviewed administrative matters and the items on the agenda and then convened the public portion of the meeting.

1:30 – 3:00 p.m. **Anschutz Engineering Center – *UCCS***
Pre-Design (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers:
OZ Architecture, Denver, Colorado
Wenk Associates, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
David Schafer, Principal, LEED-AP, NCARB, OZ Architecture
Justin Gerze, Senior Associate, Project Manager, OZ Architecture
Kelsey Madden, Project Architect, OZ Architecture

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

Others Present (via Teams):
Greg Dorolek, PLA, ASLA, Principal, Co-President, Wenk Associates, Inc.

Other UCCS Campus Representatives Present:
Kent Marsh, Associate Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning & Facilities Management
Mariness Falcon, Project Manager-Construction, Facilities Services

Description: Pre-Design submittal for a new three-story, 24,000-SF annex to the existing Engineering Building, for the purpose of increasing academic programs.

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 1 – UCCS Anschutz Engineering Center - 09-14-2021]

DRB Comments and Action

Action is not required for a Pre-Design submittal. The DRB provided the following direction:

- Expand and further explain the non-negotiable site conditions, including any commitments made to the donor, the college dean, students, and the community.

- Provide more than one option (in terms of massing and architecture) in the Conceptual Design submittal.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The DRB agrees that the two (2) preferred project sites are exceptionally difficult to develop and pose significant challenges, including grading, utility infrastructure, the Tree of Peace, and certain non-negotiable site conditions required by the donor or campus leadership.
    - The DRB also agrees that Site 1, aka the Gap Site, between the Engineering and Applied Science Building ("EAS") and the University Center, is the best option and has the greatest chance of success. The DRB suggests that in lieu of further analyzing Site 2, all future planning efforts should be focused on Site 1.
        - Site 1 will provide a better opportunity for program development.
        - Site 1 will be more visible, is in the heart of the campus, and solves many of the challenges related to building access.

- Concerns with Site 2 include:
  - Crossing Mountain Lion Way (as required with Site 2) is not a viable option from a pedestrian, safety, service, or maintenance perspective.
  - Developing Site 2 would not set a good precedent in terms of building on the other side of Mountain Lion Way.
  - From a geological standpoint, developing and maintaining a building on Site 2 is not a good option because of the slope, potential erosion, and concerns with drainage.
  - Site 2 is on the back side of the campus: a building on the site would not be as visible to the rest of campus as a building on Site 2, and the views from Site 2 would be more service-oriented.

- In lieu of analyzing Site 2, the DRB suggests building a 3D model at a scale large enough to show the true relationship of the project building to the EAS, the University Center, and the topography of the site.

- Continue to work with staff to develop different Site 1 concepts; show architectural massing alternatives based on the tree location or relocation and the relationship with the existing buildings, infrastructure, grading, drainage, utilities, etc.

- Obtain an accurate site survey to verify the elevation difference between the Campus Spine and Mountain Lion Way.

- Regarding the Tree of Peace ("the tree") and the tribal weapons buried beneath the tree:
  - The tree is paramount to the direction of the project in terms of building placement.
  - Engage a independent professional arborist to study the effect of leaving the tree in place during construction.
    - What will be required to protect the tree during all phases of construction?
    - How will leaving the tree in place impact the project cost? (Consult Greg Dorolek on this point as well.)
    - How will construction impact the overall health of the tree?
    - How will the new building impact the long-term health of the tree?
      - The tree will be below grade with retaining walls and shaded by the three- to four-story building surrounding it.
      - The soil will likely be compacted.
      - The site may not be able to accommodate the root system of a mature Douglas Fir.
      - It may take two to five years following construction before the tree is visibly unhealthy.
    - If the tree survives construction, what ongoing care will be required to maintain its health?
  - The arborist should also discuss and evaluate the possible relocation of the tree (and the sacred objects buried beneath):
    - Can the tree be safely relocated using a using a mechanical spade?
    - Could the tree thrive in a location off the Campus Spine with improved sunlight and amended soil?
    - What is the likelihood the tree would survive relocation?
    - What amendments would be needed to ensure the tree thrives?

- Coordinate conversations with the tribal elders about the health of the tree under various construction scenarios, including the possibility of making the tree healthier, more visible, and more accessible from the Campus Spine if it is relocated.
    - The design team could design an appropriate memorial. A new location would allow more space for improved celebrations and gatherings.

- At concept, work with staff on delineating campus and donor wayfinding and signage.

B. Architecture

- Provide detail showing the planned physical connection to the EAS building, including horizontal and physical adjacencies. Include information about the floor plate of EAS.

- The building will be a vertical building. Once the programming is done, it may need to be four floors with a roof deck.

- As the programming is calibrated, it will be helpful to understand any outdoor requirement for programs housed in the building.

- Consider cantilevering the third floor across the Campus Spine (up to 25'). This may be necessary once the programming requirements are fully identified.

- Include ways to see into the building/transparency in the plans

C. Sustainability and Energy

- Define sustainability variables and concepts during Conceptual Design, in order to influence the project in a positive way going forward.

3:00 – 4:30 p.m. **CU Denver Building 4th Floor Roof Deck & Interiors – *CU Denver* Conceptual Design Workshop** (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers:
Handprint Architecture
HDR, Inc.

Presenters:
Tania Salgado, FAIA, Principal, Handprint Architecture

CU Denver Campus Presenter:
Jered Minter, AIA, Campus Architect, CU Denver

Others Present (via Zoom):
Anthony Mazzeo, PLA, Site Design Principal, HDR, Inc.

Other CU Denver Campus Representatives Present (via Zoom):
Ben Bowman, Project Manager, CU Denver

Description: Workshop for Conceptual Design submittal for a renovation of the roof deck and interior space on the 4th floor of the CU Denver Building and adjacent lower unoccupiable roof areas with a primary goal to redevelop the indoor and outdoor spaces into a premier space for University leadership to host events, originally heard on August 17, 2021.

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 2 – CU Denver Building 4th Floor Roof Deck - 09-14-2021]

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Regarding the raised portion of the landscaping in the middle of the deck, consider increasing the size of the steps so students can use them as seating and look west and toward Larimer Square.

B. Architecture

- Discussions occurred regarding planning for alternatives in the event of inclement weather. Clarification of these alternatives may be helpful.

- The expansion of the hallway off of the elevators toward the deck is a great improvement over the current hallway condition.

- The current design of the deck roof wrap is much softer and more whimsical and eliminates the potential conflict of earlier concepts when compared to the style of the building. The DRB likes the overhanging cantilevered roof.

- The DRB recognizes that there is still a need to work through the window reveal cut outs on the side of building.

- The lighting design could easily be carried from the deck down to the street and create visible continuity.

- The DRB liked the idea that the new wrap would emphasize the CU identity of the building.

- Fundamentally, the idea of the wrap and the use of the roof deck and interior spaces won't work unless the journey (visibly, architecturally) begins at the streetscape.

- Study the openness of the mesh component:
    - It may require a high density, perhaps 5% or less, in order to provide shade.

  - A mesh that is staggered or extruded to have a greater depth may provide more shade.
  - The design of the mesh may play with the lighting — the wrap and deck may provide not only great views but also a better and different quality of lighting.
  - The team should study and understand the potential noise generated by wind through mesh.

- In the next submission, include information about the maintenance and durability of the various materials.

C. Sustainability and Energy

No comments were provided in this section.

DRB Action

The DRB was pleased to hear that a meeting with the dean of the College of Architecture and Planning and other is scheduled to discuss the student involvement through Schematic Design.

Cheri Gerou moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the CU Denver 4th Floor Roof Deck and Interiors, taking into consideration the comments noted above. Chris Shears seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

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