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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2021
Time: 8:00 – 2:45 p.m.
Location: Zoom Meeting

DRB and Campus Members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgyay, Chris Shears, Richelle Reilly, interim campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"), and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus ("CU Anschutz"). Mike Winters and Cheri Gerou were unable to join the meeting due to scheduling conflicts.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Kori Donaldson, Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB
Tom Hootman, incoming DRB board member
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 8:03 a.m.

8:00 – 9:30 a.m. **Work Session – Board Only**

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

9:30 – 11:30 a.m. **Campus Master Plan 2021 Update – *CU Boulder***
Presentation (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers:
Sasaki Associates, Inc., Boston, MA

Presenters:
Tyler Patrick, AICP, Managing Principal, Sasaki Associates, Inc.
Caroline Braga, ASLA, PLA, Landscape Principal, Sasaki Associates, Inc.
Romil Sheth, Design Principal, Sasaki Associates, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
Amy Kirtland, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design and Construction, Facilities Management
Ida Mae Isaac, Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Infrastructure and Sustainability/I&S Strategist
David Kang, Vice Chancellor for Infrastructure and Sustainability and Chief Facilities Officer
Richelle Reilly, Interim Campus Architect and Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Lindsay Schumacher, AICP, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description:
Final presentation on progress of CU Boulder's Campus Master Plan ("CMP") update.

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 – Boulder Campus Master Plan Update - 06-15-2021]

DRB General Comments

- The DRB will use the CMP to review and approve future campus development.
  - Consider how the CMP will guide the quality of space between buildings.
  - Define the standards dictating building heights and distances between buildings.

- Evaluate how the planning areas are categorized. Does North Boulder Creek stand alone as its own planning area?

- The nine design principles presented in the CMP capture the campus direction for the next 10, 15, and 20 years. They are exceptional guiding principles for the University, DRB and potential future developers.
  - The design principles are the perfect level of guidance to ensure the growth and development reflected in the CMP, for example:
    - Design Principle #3, Respect and Reinforce Natural Systems, provides a graphic representation of connectivity; the DRB appreciates how connectivity is highlighted and how the natural systems of Boulder Creek and the riparian ways connect the main campus to east campus as well as east campus to Williams Village.
      - Is there a way to capitalize on that connectivity through the natural systems?
    - Design Principle #6, Respect the Campus Character and Structure, shows scale relationships between the main campus and east campus.
      - Add detail about the character of the main campus. How can future opportunities be studied?

- Consider illustrating and demonstrating how the nine design principles are reflected in each of the planning areas, specifically for:
  - landscape and urban design guidelines;
  - water and storm water management; and
  - the demarcation of passive and active areas.

- Assess possible complications that may result on game day or during other large-scale events with "The Walk."

- Continue to evaluate how Boulder Creek between Folsom and 30th Streets will function:
  - How does the segment of Boulder Creek that runs through east campus connect with the North Boulder Creek neighborhood? The plans show a bikeway. What additional improvements and connectivity is planned?
  - How do the parts of the campus that abut Boulder Creek interact with city-owned parks and trails? Is there an opportunity to jointly develop these resources?

- Research and innovation districts:
  - The carrying capacities listed for research and development – in terms of office and research space – vary greatly between the main campus and east campus. Can the CMP provide additional detail to explain the variation?

- Include information about the city's vision of mobility, bike transportation, and overall connectivity.

- Provide context for how "campus hearts" are designated. Campus hearts do not appear to be established using consistent and well-defined criteria.

- Continue to reference the direction provided by campus visionaries.

- It was helpful to hear about:
  - The study of comparable campuses to determine which ones most strongly relate from a contextual standpoint.
  - The shared street that threads east/west through the North Boulder Creek neighborhood and the shared street that threads through the east campus.
  - The efforts to engage the Boulder community in creating the CMP.
    - Continue to update the DRB with regard to the City's response to the CMP. The City may be concerned about the need for water, utilities, and transportation to support the amount of proposed development reflected in the CMP.

Sustainability:

- Consider incorporating sustainability into the definition of carrying capacity.
  - Carrying capacity can be an ecological way of thinking about the environmental impact of construction.
    - This ecological definition to carrying capacity should be considered when the carrying capacity of a new building or site is determined.
  - A form-based code could be developed (and incorporate into in the CMP) that would guide the size, density, and target EUI in new construction in order to build to a net-zero or very low energy-consumption building.

- The energy infrastructure loops are are detailed in the CMP, but not very well articutated in the Boulder Campus Energy Master Plan (EMP).
  - This aspect of the CMP can support the EMP. The CMP should offer guidance and specific approaches to encourage energy source transition.

- Regarding the sustainability sections of the CMP and the potential roof-top PV, it isn't obvious that building massing and orientation and the way buildings are sited have been taken into consideration.

- Does the CMP identify what a carbon-neutral campus looks like?
  - Explore campus best practices to guide new projects and renovations.
  - The last master plan provided specific guidance to work towards a goal of carbon neutrality. The new CMP should have similar rigor in providing guidelines for future campus development. For example, one of the goals that drove sustainability in the last CMP was the State requirement of LEED gold. That CMP also included LEED gold plus and had extra elements that went beyond LEED gold including energy and water strategies as well as metrics and best practices, things that should be implemented as current strategies.

East Campus:

- Evaluate CMP to address inconsistencies in the illustration/continuity/connectivity of various transit paths and modalities.
  - Is Discovery Drive a pedestrian connection under or across Foothills Parkway?

Williams Village:

- Clarify the connection between the adjoining housing development and student housing (Erie Drive and Caddo Parkway).

DRB Action

The DRB expressed appreciation for the amount of thought and effort that has gone into developing the Boulder campus master plan ("CMP") by the design team and staff. Every CMP presentation the design team has given to the DRB has added more specificity and clarity.

Formal approval by the DRB is not required for this submittal. The DRB will meet with campus staff again to discuss the CMP before it is presented to the Board of Regents for approval.

11:45 a.m. – 12:45 p.m. **Engineering Center – ECAE ECNT Renovations ECME Office Relocation Window Study – *CU Boulder***
Design Development Update (Action Required)

Architect:
Anderson Mason Dale Architects, Denver, Colorado

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Jan Becker, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Interim Campus Architect and Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Description: Update to approved Design Development submittal (January 2020) to add exterior windows to an adjacent wing of the Engineering Center looking.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package, which can be found in the following document on the DRB website:

[Attachment 2 – CU Boulder Eng Ctr ECAE ECNT ECME Window Study 06-15-2021]

DRB General Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

There were no comments regarding this section.

B. Architecture:

- The proposed windows will be a great addition to the building, allowing for a better view of the courtyard and more natural light in the building.

- To the extent possible, match the color of the glass with the existing windows.
  - If the budget permits, consider replacing the glass in the four adjacent, existing windows with the same glass planned for the new windows.
  - If unable to replace the glass in the existing four windows, try to ensure that the new windows don't appear visibly different.
    - Remember that in addition to shading from the large trees in the courtyard, the windows will be shaded by the building itself (the floor above the addition).

- To the extent possible, match the appearance of the concrete used for the new windows to that surrounding the existing windows.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

- The DRB is pleased to know that the new windows will be triple paned with a minimum U-factor.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve as presented the update to the Design Development submittal for the Engineering Center ECAE ECNT Renovations related to the EMC office relocation window study for the addition of four new windows overlooking the courtyard. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1:15 – 2:45 p.m. **UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital Garage 2 Pedestrian Link – *CU Anschutz Medical Campus***
Schematic Design (Action Required)

Architects:
Pact Studios LLC, Denver, Colorado, architectural design

Presenters:
Sheila Elijah-Barnwell, Ph.D., AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, EDAC, Pact Studios
Tanner Draemel, Senior Project Designer, Pact Studios
CU Anschutz Campus Representatives Present:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Anschutz
John White, Director, Design and Construction, UCHealth

Description:
Schematic Design submittal for a pedestrian bridge intended to connect level 3 of the new parking structure on Lot 2 to level 2 of the existing Anschutz Cancer Pavilion.

A/E Presentation:

A submittal package can be found in the following document on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*:

[Attachment 3 – Anschutz Parking Garage Lot 2 Pedestrian Link - 06-15-2021]

DRB Comments

The DRB expressed appreciation for some of the modifications the design team made to the plans ahead of the meeting with regard to the horizontal offset of the bridge.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

No comments were submitted regarding this matter.

B. Architecture:

- Simplify/level the slope of the bridge.
- Resolve how the columns support the truss.
    - Supporting the truss from the bottom is a simpler solution than wrapping the columns around the truss.
- Determine whether structural beams on the north can be moved closer to the garage so the distance from the building more closely matches the distance from the building on the south.
    - Investigate if subterranean utilities are feasible.
- Prepare additional sketches to illustrate the elevations of the existing building, the new garage, and the bridge, including transitions from one space to another.
- Determine whether the window layout works with with the proposed curtain wall system.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

- Be prepared to discuss fretting, sun control, and solar gain at a future meeting.
- Ensure that the bridge is designed as efficiently as possible to reduce any mechanical loads. Additionally, explain whether the bridge can operate without mechanical equipment when it makes sense to do so.

DRB Action

Recognizing that there are structural elements of the bridge design that the design team and the DRB would like to explore further, Don Brandes moved to table approval of the Schematic Design submission until a later date. Chris Shears seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

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