

University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023
Time: 7:45 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.
Location: Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street,
Denver, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:

Mike Winters, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Laurel Raines, Chris Shears, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Fawn Behrens-Smith, newly hired campus architect and DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus, joined the meeting at 8:45 a.m.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Kori Donaldson, AVP of Budget, Finance, and Capital and ex officio member of the DRB
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB notetaker
Emily Parker, Sr. Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Office of the VP for Budget & Finance

Mike Winters, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 7:50 a.m.

7:45 – 8:45 a.m. Study Session – Board Only

The DRB reviewed administrative matters and items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

8:55 – 10:55 a.m. Residence Two – CU Boulder Concept Design (Action Requested)

Architects/Consultants:

HDR, Inc.
William Rawn Associates Architects, Inc. ("WRA")
Swinerton Incorporated

Presenters:

Cliff Gayley, Design Principal, WRA
Christopher Kleingartner, Principal, HDR
Tony Mazzeo, Landscape Architecture Studio Lead, HDR
Erik Tellander, Associate Design Principal, WRA

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect,
Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Others Present:
Ilze Shook, Swinerton

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Daniel Gette, Student Affairs
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Sarah Kieffer, Facilities Planning
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planning
Lisa Ouwerkerk, Housing Facilities Services

Description:
Concept Design (“CD”) submittal for Residence Two, a new 350-bed student housing project in the North Boulder Creek neighborhood.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in [Attachment 1 – CU Boulder Residence Two](#) on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

After the end of the presentation, the DRB reviewed a 3D project model.

DRB Comments

A. General

- The DRB stated its hope that the forthcoming pricing will be within the parameters of what was presented at the meeting.

B. Energy and Sustainability

- Good approach. Continue developing the metrics, strategies, and integration.

C. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Study ways to move the north middle building to the south (closer to the east building) in order to reduce the paseo gap. This will provide more space for trash collection and shorten the bridge connection. It will also increase the amount of space at the “pinch point” where the upper corner of the north middle building meets the street.
 - The DRB noted that the campus and design team are still waiting for a decision from the City of Boulder about the floodway.
 - Can the trash collection area be better integrated and made more accessible?
- Continue to develop and study courtyard concepts, including the micro-forest.
 - Look at ways to shade the terrace.
 - Consider adding some kind of sun structure to shade various parts of the courtyard.
- Study 19th Street and ways to reduce the width of the street.
 - The DRB likes the idea of engaging with Terrace Green if space is available.
- Also study the east side of the building.
 - There were terraces on the model but not on the diagram.

D. Architecture

No comments provided.

DRB Action

Sarah Brown moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for Residence Two, including the comments noted above. Tom Hootman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The DRB asked that it be notified about the result of the forthcoming pricing and about the city's floodway decision.

Prior to beginning the next item on the agenda, members of the DRB and Fawn Behrens-Smith exchanged brief introductions.

11:05 a.m. – 1:05 p.m.

Residence One – CU Boulder Design Development (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

Anderson Mason Dale Architects (“AMD”)
Bohlin Cywinski Jackson Architects (“BCJ”)
James Corner Field Operations
Noresco
Kiewit

Presenters:

Megan Keogh, Associate Sustainability Consultant, Noresco
Daniel Lee, Principal, BCJ
Karli Molter, Senior Associate, Field Operations
Andrew Nielsen, Principal, AMD
Valerie Presley, Project Coordinator, AMD
James Zarske, Director of Sustainability Services, Noresco

Others Present:

Luc Bamberger, AMD (via Zoom)
Tom Breslin, BCJ (via Zoom)
Michael Brumley, Kiewit
Nicholas Del Castillo, BCJ (via Zoom)
Tina Faust, BCJ (via Zoom)
Thomas Kirk, BCJ (via Zoom)
Anthony Pregiato, BCJ (via Zoom)

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Daniel Gette, Student Affairs
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Patricia McNally-Leef, Housing Facilities Services (via Zoom)
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planning
Edward von Bleichert, Facilities Management Sustainability
d’Andre Willis, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Description:

Design Development (“DD”) submittal for Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek neighborhood, including design alternatives and preferred design direction.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in Attachment 2 – CU Boulder Residence One on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

At the beginning of the meeting, the group met outside to review brick samples and various mock-ups. Attachment A, prepared by AMD, reflects the comments and direction provided during this discussion. The DRB asked the team to return to a future meeting and show the next phase of brick mock-ups based on the day’s discussion.

DRB Comments

A. General Comments

- The DRB stated its concern that pricing could lead to value engineering and asked to review any substantial changes to the building’s aesthetic that results from budgetary constraints.

B. Energy and Sustainability

- Good update on the energy modeling and the progress made is appreciated, considering the higher density occupancy and full commercial kitchen.
- The brick selection will be a highly visible, signature component of the building’s sustainability story.
- Confirm that the e-value is provided for the window assembly.
- Continue to convert “maybes” to “yesses” in the checklist in order to achieve LEED Gold.

C. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Maintain footer depth below frost line.
- Review if plantings along pathways are salt tolerant.
- Look at potential pedestrian pathways from the location of bike parking to ensure that pedestrians won’t cut across the planting beds.

From a site standpoint, some of the following could be potential value engineering opportunities:

- Perennial plant spacing could be increased to a minimum of 15 to 18 inches between plants, which would be more cost-effective.
- Precast steps at the theater space could be changed to concrete.

D. Architecture

- Review the soldier course brick treatment at the corner detail where the non-90 degree corner column is located.
- Study the meeting room and how to solve the sun shading issue. Consider potentially:
 - Reducing the height of the glass;
 - Adding frit;
 - Adding an internal light shelf; and
 - Looking at a different glass with a different shading coefficient.
 - Williams Village East has a similar condition.

DRB Action

Chris Shears moved to approve the Design Development submittal for Residence One, contingent upon the comments noted above. Jody Beck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Chemistry and Applied Math Building – CU Boulder Schematic Design Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects/Consultants:

ZGF
James Corner Field Operations
Group 14 Engineering
Whiting-Turner Contracting Company

Presenters:

Braulio Baptista, Design Partner, ZGF
Justin Brooks, Lead Designer, ZGF
Arathi Gowda, Principal, Sustainability, ZGF
Lauren McNeill, Group 14 Engineering (via Zoom)
Karli Molter, Senior Associate, Field Operations
Ryan Velasco, Principal, Sustainability, ZGF

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect,
Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Others Present:

Heather Heiland, Whiting-Turner Contracting Company
Drew Dahm, Whiting-Turner Contracting Company

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

David Byrne, Jr., Facilities Planning
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Stacy Gauthier, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planning
Chris Sachs, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Zach Tupper, Academic Resources

Description:

Schematic Design workshop for a new 147,000 GSF
Chemistry and Applied Mathematics (CHAP) academic/
research building on the Business Field (a 4-acre
recreational field on Main Campus).

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in [Attachment 3 – CU Boulder Chemistry and Applied Math Building](#) on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

DRB Comments

A. Energy and Sustainability

- The sustainability package, including the graphics and how the various elements have been communicated, was very well done.

B. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Eliminating the oval and the remote terrace park are both improvements.
- The bosque at the entry is a nice addition.
- Consider adjusting the alignment of the path in the northeast corner so it meets Regent Drive closer to the end of the building, creating more usable lawn space.
- The shaded areas against the building and the terrace spaces on the northwest side of the building feel inviting.
 - The terrace updates to the landscaping plan are more integrated with the building.
 - Continue to work on accessibility for the middle terrace including the possibility of making a secondary path connection to the middle terrace.

C. Architecture

- The DRB acknowledges that the design team was presented with the difficult challenge of a constrained site and large program — the outcome of which is a large building compared with the surrounding context.
 - The design team has made progress breaking down the massing of the building.
 - The fact that the building stands alone makes it appear even larger.
 - Approaching the building from the south is better, but approaching it from the north from Regent Drive is more problematic.
 - Breaking down the large elements into secondary articulations helps. Look at how the north end can emulate the south end.
 - Part of the challenge and difficulty of the site is how to design a building that feels like it is not totally divorced from the rest of the campus.
 - The design team still needs to find a way to tie the building design back to the main campus vernacular.
 - Study balancing the massing, scale, and articulation; the roof shapes; materiality and color; and the façade composition — including the mechanical systems and the light well — to find opportunities to create a building massing that compliments the vernacular of the main campus.
 - Determine if the tone or texture of the selected building materials can serve to further break down the scaling of the building.
- The verticality and repetitive nature of the façade seems too rigorous.
 - Study ways to add more contrast between the planes. Include studying a horizontal stratification.
- Study the roof forms.
 - Review how the mechanical equipment will be installed and how it will impact the façade.
 - Determine the likelihood the installing PV in the future. This may inform the decision regarding the preferred roof form.
 - Do all of the roof forms need to be the same or could there be a combination of roof forms?

- Study ways to add variety in the height, scale, size, and shape of the roof — within the campus context.

DRB Action

No formal action was required. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above based on the workshop discussion.

3:55 – 5:20 p.m.

MC2 & NBC1 Parking Garages – CU Boulder Concept Design Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects/Consultants:

Anderson Mason Dale Architects
Wenk Associates Landscape Architects
Haselden Construction
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Presenters:

John Graham, Principal, AMD
Ben Blanchard, Principal, AMD
Greg Dorolek, Principal Partner, Wenk Associates
Ben Henderson, Kimley-Horn (via Zoom)

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Amy Kirtland, Assistant Director of Planning, Facilities
Planning

Others Present:

Todd Dill, Haselden Construction

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Jacob Jackson, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
Tom McGann, Parking Services
Josh Porosky, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
d'Andre Willis, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Description:

Concept Design workshop for two new parking garages, one at the main campus and one at the North Boulder Creek neighborhood.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in [Attachment 4 – CU Boulder MC2 & NBC1 Parking Garages](#) on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

DRB Comments

A. Energy and Sustainability

- The DRB supports the addition of add alternates for the installation of PV as discussed, if possible. Overall, the project has an excellent approach to sustainability.

B. Site & Landscape Architecture and C. Architecture

MC2 Garage

- The DRB supports the proposed modifications of vehicular ingress/egress for the MC2/Regent Garages.
- Retaining a 40' setback with landscaping along Colorado Avenue is preferred.
- Retaining an approximate 100' setback along Regent Drive to allow for a future liner building next to the garage building, including approximately 40' for a landscape buffer, is also preferred.
 - Reserve space for the liner building if it isn't possible to build it at the same time as the garage.
 - Look into pushing the liner building a little bit to the west to create a gap between the garage and the liner building, providing for a larger footprint and more flexibility for the liner building.
- Natural ventilation for air circulation and lighting is preferred, to the extent possible.
- The treatment of the facades and edges of the building will be important due to the height of the building.
 - Investigate if the east end of the sixth floor of a six-floor garage building could be shortened to cascade the height of the building down to the fifth and subsequent floors to ground level.
- Study the best location for the elevators for circulation and users of the building.

NBC1 Garage

- Ensure that the ADA spaces are accessible from Athens Street.
- The DRB supports preserving the catalpa tree in the southeast corner of the site.
- Consider locating retail space under the first floor in order to add space along the north edge of the site and create space between the building and the sidewalk at Marine Street.
- The DRB prefers a 40' setback along 17th Street.
- Study the east edge pedestrian-level landscaping improvements as previously discussed with Richelle Goedert.
- Add a roof as an add alternate.
- The southeast corner would be the primary vertical circulation that would tie back into Residence Two.
- Study the southwest corner — can it respond and tie into the shape of the west building mass of Residence Two?

DRB Action

No formal action was required. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above and below based on the workshop discussion.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

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

**AndersonMasonDale
Architects**

CONFERENCE RECORD

Date: 25 October 2023
Project #: 22-063_CU_Boulder_Residence_One
Project: CU Boulder Residence One

Subject: CU Residence One – DRB DD Approval Meeting
Date/Location: Zoom, 25 October 2023

Author: Valerie Presley
Distribution: Attendees, file

Note: Action items are noted in below in red.

01.1 Supporting Information:

01.1.1 Brick (Discussion):

- 01.1.1.1 The DRB was interested in seeing mockups with a mix of textured and smooth brick.
- 01.1.1.2 Tom Hootman (DRB) preferred manufacturers with EPDs:
 - 01.1.1.2.1 Awarding based on EPD / sensitivity to carbon issues encouraged more manufacturers to take greater care and pursue EPD documentation.
- 01.1.1.3 Dan Gette (CU Boulder) felt all-grain blends were not contemporary enough for the new neighborhood. Smooth textures created a more modern effect.
- 01.1.1.4 d'Andre Willis (CU Boulder) shared the following comments:
 - 01.1.1.4.1 She preferred the darker palette in a tighter blend – she did not want to pursue a “popcorn effect.”
 - 01.1.1.4.2 Hue variation in the same tonal range was preferred.
 - 01.1.1.4.3 DW was also interested to see a blend of smooth and grain textures.
- 01.1.1.5 Daniel Lee (BCJ) preferred the reddish hues with lighter hints (i.e., the Summit blend including Morning Sage / buff tones).
- 01.1.1.6 Quality, Cost, Carbon:
 - 01.1.1.6.1 Standard versus Exceptional Quality
 - 01.1.1.6.2 Summit was Face Brick Standard which would require an additional 10% to be purchased to replace cracked brick that would arrive to site. Standard brick increases waste and cost by 10%.
 - 01.1.1.6.3 General Shale, Cloud Ceramics, and GlenGery were all of Face Brick Exceptional quality.
 - 01.1.1.6.4 The decision was made to pursue local brick only. General Shale and Summit were the same in

terms of cost (Kiewit confirmed), so cost was not a factor between them.

01.1.1.6.5 General Shale offered the project the same pricing as Summit, with the following additional benefits: EPD, exceptional quality, and closer shipping to Boulder.

01.1.1.6.6 The direction was to pursue General Shale as the manufacturer over Summit for these reasons.

01.1.1.7 **Brick – Next Steps:**

01.1.1.8 The Design Team would pursue the following mockups for the next brick review from General Shale:

01.1.1.8.1 Both the darker palette preferred by DW, and the lighter palette preferred by DL.

01.1.1.8.2 Blends in those color families with the following textures to be created for the next round:

01.1.1.8.2.1 All Smooth

01.1.1.8.2.2 All Grain

01.1.1.8.2.3 Mixed

01.1.1.8.3 Larger mockups to be created on-site when appropriate.

01.1.1.9 **Brick – Presentation:**

01.1.1.10 Renderings with the lighter toned three-brick blend from Summit were shown.

01.1.1.10.1 The Design Team showed corner treatments that did not require special brick shapes (which would incur a premium).

01.1.1.10.2 Some corners were 90-degrees in the conventional manner, others were not.

01.1.1.10.3 The DRB expressed some concern with the unconventional corner condition being shown.

01.1.1.11 **Exterior Articulation:** The brick patterning shown (vertical and horizontal) was strongly supported by the DRB. The angled character to portions of the facade was also well liked.

01.1.1.11.1 A reduction to the angled faces was a VE option, which concerned the DRB.

01.1.1.11.2 The board expressed that Residence One was a “big building that needed to read as residential.”

01.1.1.11.3 The facade as currently shown was successful in breaking down the scale, communicating residential, and not reading as institutional.

01.1.1.11.4 The DRB hoped that elements of exterior articulation as shown would remain through VE.

This represents Anderson Mason Dale’s understanding of the major points of discussion of the conference. If you have any additions or corrections, please notify this office promptly.