



1800 Grant Street, Suite 800
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 860-5600
Fax: (303) 860-5640

University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of January 9, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, January 9, 2014, University of Colorado Boulder, Folsom Field, President's Suite (768 & 769).

DRB members present were: Victor Olgyay, Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, Candy Roberts and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

Study Session – CU-Boulder, Environmental Design Building – Window Replacement (1:00 – 1:45)

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt

Individuals Present: Phil Simpson, Wayne Northcutt, John Kamprath, Bill Ward

Description: Introduction/Concept Phase

Phil Simpson

- Deferred maintenance project to improve sustainability and performance of building
- ENVD building is the worst performing building on campus
- Windows to be replaced on third floor with budget of \$500,000
- In the 1930s the third floor was added; in the 1950s the mansard extension was constructed
- Currently over-glazed with no chance of thermal comfort
- No classes scheduled on third floor in the summer
- Foam injected into roof cavity spaces and using thermal camera to confirm thermal seal
- Most windows on other buildings on 18th Street are punched
- Difficult for students to function in poor temperatures
- Option A reflects a glazing scheme; Option B reflects a punched opening scheme
- Skylights are not within the scope of this plan
- Project would commence beginning of spring semester with demo in May 2014
- Asked for feedback on materiality - masonry?, stucco?
- Consent item, with approval, not a lot of review

Candy Roberts

- DRB Requests a workshop format soon

- Wayne Northcutt noted that the first floor does not suffer from the same high reflectivity issues
- Asked what the long-term plan for the ENVD building is
- Should not match glazing type of first floor
- Rhythm of windows makes sense
- Materiality of third floor should be different “animal”
- Horizontals as opposed to 3x3 cube
- With modern look, it frees you to design something better, head in different directions
- Concern about darkened lines in drawings and asked what they were. Answer: Pipe columns at exterior
- Circle back next month

Victor Olgvay

- Asked for specifications on windows – shading coefficient, window glazing
- More information required on windows and metal frame to better understand performance
- Confirm that third floor windows are within scope of project
- Asked about the budget for the project
- Would like to see all four elevations

Teresa Osborne

- Mentioned that funds won't be available until late May

Don Brandes

- Asked what is the state of the ENVD program.
- Offered a motion to table project to next month with the following conditions:
 - Provide all four elevations
 - Energy model to justify the specifications
 - Materiality
 - How windows operate

Rick Epstein

- Phil Simpson confirmed that the new windows would be aluminum
- Wayne Northcutt indicated that the windows would be operable (awning).
- Never going to match up with the lower floors, let it be a little different, metal like, thin and light
- Frees you from trying to match the first and second floors

Wayne Northcutt

- Square openings
- ENVD building not a 50-year building and it is not a popular building
- State of the ENVD program is poor with decreased enrollments
- PPG Product, low-e glazing on inside and outside to match, but would rather pull off existing film on first floor
- Budget is \$500,000

John Kamprath

- Could make fiberglass work better
- Thermal readings reflect high amount of heat loss
- There are lead time issues with window frame material
- Asked if the thickness of fiber glass is too much

Brandes' motion was moved and seconded. The motion is to table approval of the Environmental Design (ENVD) Building Window Replacement until the following four (4) items can be prepared and reviewed by the DRB:

1. Preparation of four elevations of the ENVD Building clearly showing roof and window placement.
2. Preparation of an energy audit for the building, using the proposed windows.
3. Preparation of a material palette showing building materials, window materials and finishes.
4. Preparation of details regarding existing window coverings (film coating), location and specification of fixed windows and operatable windows.

Study Session – CU-Boulder, Athletics Complex and Grounds/IPF (2:00 – 3:00)

Presenter(s): Phil Simpson

Individuals Present: Phil Simpson, Wayne Northcutt, John Kamprath, Bill Ward

Description: Discussion

Phil Simpson

- CU athletics complex (football focused) - \$110 million of \$137 million total budget, although many sports will benefit. (i.e., track and field lockers)
- Six components to project:
 1. Addition of fourth floor (already approved by DRB)
 2. Football training facility (\$83 million, large, four-story building)
 3. Dal Ward moves to new facility in order to be renovated (basement renovation)
 4. Franklin Field (new indoor practice facility to be built)
 5. Realignment of roads to maximize parking (timing unknown)
 6. Relocate Grounds/IPF building
 - Looked at a site at 28th and Regent Auto Park
 - 17,000 SF Butler Building
 - Has to be located on main campus
 - Only place this building can go
 - Low profile location
 - 60' x 180'
 - \$5,000,000
 - Half IPF, half grounds facility
 - Precast panels with sandstone inserts
- Field level will contain locker rooms; first floor will have end zone club box seats; second floor will have academic and training table
- Roof top level (terrace) not built out and will remain open
- South end zone retail operations (i.e., book store, coffee shop)
- Cited issues with revenue-generating tenants in a general use building
- 18% of building is academic
- Complete by August 2015
- RFQ has been issued
- Requires DRB to move things through quickly
- With the political nature and attention this project will get, DRB cannot be in a position to say no
- We do not have opportunity to go back
- April approval, June Schematic Design approval, October Design Development approval
- Asked if Grounds/IPF building should be a design/build process.
- Fence between pond and building
- Storage bins as a solution for materials
- There will need to be semi-truck deliveries to this building twice per year

Candy Roberts

- Asked how tall new training facility will be
- Asked what the level of the outdoor fields would be. Answer: Same as they are now
- Consider moving current proposed location of indoor practice facility further east to maximize use of the site
- Asked what the floor-to-floor heights would be
- Consider a bridge from football training to Dal Ward
- Asked if DRB can attend design meetings
- Come up with a Folsom Field process where DRB is participating in design meetings
- Architecture teams teaming up
- Visual Arts design at UCCS as potential model for this project, one contract
- Define DRB role in design team meetings
- Asked if Grounds/IPF building is an official approval item
- There will be a flat roof with mechanical units
- Provide planning options for future expansion; both programs will eventually need to expand
- Location is fantastic, hidden
- We need to see the expanded version as well
- There should be screening for staging as well
- The end that faces pond should have a better resolution
- Asked what will be stored at perimeter of building
- Asked if the building needs sandstone inserts everywhere; consider value engineering
- Consider higher parapets to better hide mechanical units
- Needs an entry with beautiful door and patio

Victor Olgyay

- Asked how many square feet for new facility
- Builder waiting on design team
- Think about the process and make things run smoother
- There is a nice detention pond and space that needs to be respected
- This is a simple building that can be done elegantly so it will be worth keeping

Bill Ward

- Asked what can feasibly be done by August 2015
- Asked what an architectural design team can do by August 2015
- Still time to adjust RFQ
- Currently only two or three architectural firms that can complete a project like this
- Give firms the freedom to come up with solutions
- Bridging idea

Teresa Osborne

- Subject to legislative review
- Need help to find solutions quickly

Rick Epstein

- In the past it has been very difficult for design team to keep up
- Asked how we design a process that works for this aggressive timeline
- Is it worth using multiple architecture firms?
- Design/Build may be easier
- If the process is too fast then DRB and the university can be in a position where no one liked the design but had to say "yes" to keep the project moving.

Don Brandes

Athletics Complex

- Suggested that the selection of consultants, project schedule, planning and design process, review and approval by both the DRB and the Boulder Campus Planning Commission (BCPC), and the final approval of improvements would require a different process based on the projected completion schedule of August, 2015.
- Suggested that DRB Chairman Roberts and the DRB Members would provide to the Boulder Campus facility staff an outline of how the DRB can effectively assist in the process of selecting the design team(s), general contractor and others to prepare plans, drawings and cost estimates. This outline would necessarily deviate from the standard submittal, review and approval process for a capital improvement project and would require the immediate involvement of one or more DRB members to participate in the consultant selection process, submittal requirements, and DRB review and approval process.
- Suggested the concept of “Bridging” for the project. Whereby a Design Criteria Consultant (DCC). The DCC specifies the project’s functional and aesthetic performance requirements but leaves the details of construction technology to the General Contractor. (Please see The Design Build Bridging Method – Part 1, 2008 Drewry Simmon Vornehm, LLP)
- Suggested that there is a variety of consultants with current and reliable information regarding the framework plan for the Athletics Complex, but few AE firms with the capacity and talent to execute a set of plans and drawings given the schedule. Suggested that the DRB and Boulder Campus facility staff discuss the selection criteria, process and expectations for a design/build or “bridging” approach.
- Suggested that the effort may require one or more DRB members to participate in the process to maintain communications and ensure continuity.
- Commented that the scope, schedule, and process require more thought and consideration prior to the selection and retention of AE consultants and General Contractors. Expressed concern that we will be inviting outside professionals into a “planning, design and construction” process that has not been clearly agreed to and understood by the DRB and others.

Don Brandes

Maintenance Building

- Suggested that a “Site Plan” be prepared for the project area showing the property limits, building, parking, future building expansion, storage and other site improvements.
- Suggested that the project fencing, security lighting and landscape improvements be integrated.
- Suggested that the architectural elevations and roof details be modified to shield views of the mechanical and HVAC.
- Suggested further architectural study regarding the extent of building materials (Stone), windows, service/garage operations and access.

Rick Epstein

- Review sustainable approaches, such as solar, with perforated panels to draw air through (transpired solar collector).
- Asked if there could be a high bay space for a fully day lit building.

- Concerned about visibility from pedestrian path and U.S. 36. Need to analyze visibility and then come up with appropriate screening.