



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

**University of Colorado Design Review Board
and Research Park Design Review Board
Meeting Notes**

Date: Thursday, April 13, 2017
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Location: 1st Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay (by phone), Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (ex officio), Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus (“UCCS”), and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus (“CU Boulder”).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:05 a.m., at which time the Board held a private work session as noted below.

9:00 – 10:00 Work Session – Board Only

The Board met in a private session to discuss the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting. Additionally, Ms. Osborne provided the Board with an update regarding Senate Bill 267 regarding state-wide Certificates of Participation currently being reviewed at the State Legislature and how it may benefit capital projects at the University. The master planning project for the University of Colorado Denver was also briefly discussed.

10:00 – 12:00 Indoor Practice Facility and Ball Diamond – UCCS

Architect: DLR Group, Denver, Colorado

Presenters: Bob Binder, AIA, REFP, LEED AP, DLR Group
Brian Thomasen, PE, Director of Engineering, Colorado
Region, NV5, Denver, Colorado, civil engineer
David Contag, Landscape Architect, DLR Group

UCCS Campus

Presenter: Gary Reynolds, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration
Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Construction & Planning,
University Architect, UCCS Campus Planning &
Facilities Management

Other UCCS Campus Representatives Present:

Charles Cummings, Design & Construction Project
Manager, UCCS Campus Planning & Construction

Description: Schematic Design (“SD”) Submission for an indoor practice facility (“IPF”) and a baseball diamond (BBD”) at the UCCS Campus

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

After an introduction of the individuals present for the meeting, Mr. Reynolds began the presentation by briefly reviewing the history of the athletics program at UCCS, and the progress of the IPF and BBD project, including funding and the schedule for the project.

The Board requested clarification regarding the overall development concept and what has been included within Phase I and what has been included within Phase II.

Mr. Binder and Mr. Contag then provided an update on the design of the project, including a review of various site plan design options that had been studied since the last meeting with the Board. A slightly modified Site Plan Scheme 2 was generally the option preferred by the design team. Also discussed were potential phasing options for the project which could allow some of the project to be built now (“Phase .5” and “Phase I”) and the remainder to be completed as full build out when additional funding was available (“Phase II”). This discussion included: building and site improvements, landscaping plans, pedestrian circulation and pathways, ADA requirements, site sections and elevations, materiality and color options, viewpoints, lighting, additional energy analyses which need to be completed, grading and soil conditions, and drainage. After the presentation by the design team, the Board took a brief break and discussed the SD submittal with staff.

Mr. Epstein moved to table SD approval until which time the Board receives a clearly delineated Phase I and future phases for SD approval at that time, taking into account comments on the Phase I improvements to be summarized and provided to staff and the design team as soon as possible. Mr. Winters seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

In an effort to maintain the project schedule and to expedite the planning and design process, the Board scheduled a GoTo Meeting on April 24 at 9:00 a.m., with staff and the project team consultant, DLR, to review an updated SD submittal package and a micro master plan for these facilities and to resolve the differences between the SD submittal for “Phase I” and the master plan.

The master plan should be based on the ultimate indoor practice field (IPF) and baseball field (BB) complex and should provide an overall development concept. The master plan can be a simple site plan with notations, but it should include all approximate future building locations for the overall complex. It should also include a list of all future improvements, regardless of the potential phasing or timing of these improvements.

The revised SD submittal package should show Phase I improvements and should incorporate the following recommendations:

Architecture:

IPF:

- The gray fabric is preferable; effort should be made to reduce the IPF interference with the view of Pulpit Rock;
- Explore the inclusion of a gable-shaped roofline with daylight at ridgeline; explore other potential manufacturers for an IPF facility; and
- Explore the site orientation and placement of the IPF to present the best appearance from the UCCS gateway along Nevada Avenue.

Baseball Field:

- Determine if the location of the bullpen should be modified so it is not accessible to the public;
- Determine if the storage building should be included in Phase I;
- Study the drop off and geometry of the plaza; considering the overall design and simplifications, reducing or eliminating embellishments and using only concrete;
- Reduce the number and color or materials specified to increase design consistency;
- Provide daylight and natural ventilation to the restroom building;
- Study the placement and design of the monumental stairway and the entry into the baseball field:
 - Consider the relocation of the entry gate so that it is visible from the parking lot;
 - Consider the orientation of the stairway and make the rise and run more comfortable, less steep, with a measurement for the rise of no more than six inches. Determine if a different alignment from the stairway through the entry gate could be designed to achieve these goals.
 - Explore the entry plaza area to ensure a minimum unobstructed path width at the top of the stairway to a width of perhaps 12', affording a view of the baseball field home plate.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Consider eliminating the overlook plaza on the trail to the IPF and replacing it with a plaza at the IPF;
- Consider making the trail from the parking lot to the IPF a paved/concrete surface with a minimum of 8' in width;
- The entry stairs and retaining walls can be concrete;
- Clearly indicate what site and landscape improvements will be included in Phase I and what site and landscape improvements will be placed in later phases; and
- Provide both horizontal and vertical cross-sections for the proposed site improvements.

Sustainability and Energy Efficiency:

- Study the energy efficiency of the IPF in order to determine:
 - What the baseline energy usage of the building will be in terms of short-term and long-term operating expense.
 - An optimal energy efficiency goal and measures to achieve the goal.
 - The life cycle cost benefit to the identified energy efficiency measures, such as installing a translucent roof at the ridge of the building to provide daylighting; providing adequate natural ventilation; investigating how to mitigate air leakage;

determining the optimal conductive insulation (R value) to reduce required capital equipment costs.

- Provide energy and water budgets for the restroom building.

Recommended SD submittal package:

The revised SD package should include plans for Phase I budgeted items only:

- Overlot grading;
- Drainage;
- Site and Landscaping;
- Irrigated and non-irrigated areas;
- Lighting; and
- Elevations, plans and sections of any Phase I buildings (IPF, bathrooms, storage, etc.).

The SD package should also include a kit-of-parts, including an annotated listing of:

- Furniture, fixtures and equipment;
- Signage and wayfinding; and
- Improvements to be included in Phase I including fencing.

Upon completion of the first agenda item and a brief break for lunch, the meeting of the Design Review Board was temporarily adjourned and the public portion of the Research Park Design Review Board meeting was called to order at 1:09 p.m.

12:30 - 1:30

Aerospace Engineering Sciences (“AES”) Building – CU Boulder

Architects: Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado, architects
RATIO Architects, Denver, Colorado
PLOT Project, LLC, Denver, Colorado, landscape architects,

Presenters: Chris Boardman, Principal, RATIO Architects

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Wayne Northcutt, Architect – Facilities Planner
Richelle Reilly, Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:

Ro-Tien Lang, Architect, Hord Coplan Macht, Inc.

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Chris Ewing, Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design &
Construction

Description: Pre-Design Development Workshop for New Building on
East Campus

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Boardman began the workshop discussion by reviewing comments made by the Board at the previous meeting regarding this project, held in March 2017, highlighting the items upon which the design team focused its efforts for this workshop. These items included: color of the metals, window design, precedents made by neighboring CU buildings, the stair tower on the north elevation, and daylighting and energy performance studies.

He presented an updated *SketchUp* model of the elevations for all sides of the building. The proposed color for the window frames and sunshades on the building is a gray color called Seawolf. The proposed limestone is still recommended as a light cream color called Indiana, although staff and the design team are studying the possibility of using a precast material for the vertical fins rather than the limestone, and also will look into the possibility of sharpening the edges of the fins. Ms. Brown suggested that if meeting the budget becomes an issue, the design team may want to consider using metal in lieu of the limestone fins, although staff responded that the longevity of limestone or precast would be preferable. The glass and spandrel balconies on the center entry on the south elevation were discussed. Using glass and spandrel together will provide a banded appearance on the balconies. It was also suggested that only glass could be used for these balconies and that the sunshade element on the balconies may not be necessary and could be removed. Additionally, the shape and design of the canopies and the roof were discussed, and it was suggested that the front edges be angled and tightened up slightly more, especially if the edge of the fins are sharpened.

Proposed lighting options and possibilities for building signage were also discussed and will be included with the Design Development (“DD”) submittal. Fixtures and furnishings will be determined and included in the DD submittal. Additionally, proposed changes to the north elevation were reviewed and included updates to the window design and fenestration, and the stair tower.

Mr. Northcutt asked for feedback regarding the site wall to the westbound loading dock regarding the design and the necessity of it, especially concerning potential issues with wind. Staff and the design team will include options for this wall and the loading dock area in the DD submittal.

The programming for the roof was also briefly discussed.

No formal Board action regarding this workshop was required. It is anticipated that the DD submittal will be presented to the Board for review and approval at its meeting in May 2017.

After this agenda item, the public meeting of the Research Park Design Review Board was adjourned and the public portion of the Design Review Board was re-convened at 2:00 p.m.

1:45 - 3:15

Williams Village East Residence Hall – CU Boulder

Architects: Whiting-Turner Contracting Company, Denver, Colorado
alm2s, Fort Collins, Colorado, design principals/local architects
KWK Architects, St. Louis, Missouri, lead design architects
Bruce Hendee, BHA Design Incorporated, Fort Collins,
Colorado, landscape architects

Presenters: Bruce Hendee, Landscape Architect, BHA Design Inc.
Brad Massey, Principal, alm2s, architects, Fort Collins
Paul Wuennenberg, Principal, KWK Architects

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction

Others Present:
Javier Esteban, Principal, KWK Architects
Mark Faul, Whiting-Turner Contracting
Heather Heiland, Whiting-Turner Contracting
Chad Koscinski, Project Architect, alm2s
Rebecca Reel, NORESCO, LLC (by phone)
Roger Sherman, BHA Design Inc.

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Chris Ewing, Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design &
Construction
Curt Huetson, Director, Facilities Planning and Operations,
Housing Administration
Steven Hecht, Assistant Director, Design and Project
Management, Housing Administration
Richelle Reilly, Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Heidi Roge, Project Manager, Housing and Dining

Description: Workshop for Schematic Design ("SD") Submittal

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Goodhew began the presentation to the Board by providing an update of the progress for the proposed Williams Village East building ("Will Vill East"). He indicated that a public meeting for the neighborhood had been held earlier in the week, which went well. Among other things, comments from the neighborhood indicated appreciation for following the current master plan, stepping down the massing of the proposed Will Vill East as it approached Skunk Creek to the east, the materials, and the design of the building. Approximately 15 to 20 individuals attended the meeting. A second public meeting will be held at some point in the future.

Mr. Massey commented on the changes to the building's design since the last Board meeting, including a focus on the student experience, and he reviewed the current project schedule.

Mr. Wuennenberg presented the design updates in more detail. He reviewed a number of new options regarding the massing. The preferable option, essentially Scheme 9, primarily placed the seven-story section in the center of the building, made the section on the west side six stories, made one section on the east side adjacent to the center section five stories and a

second section on the end of the east side four stories stepping the massing down toward the east.

He also reviewed a number of new options regarding the façade/fenestration for the building, changes to the courtyards and the transit stop, and changes to the great room and the first floor plan.

Mr. Hendee briefly reviewed the current site design plan, including the programming zones, the transit plan, the bicycle parking plan, water use zones, the grading plan, the courtyard and landscape plans for each of the four sides of the building.

Mr. Massey reviewed updates to sustainability studies, including the shadow studies, the current roof plan regarding potential photovoltaic locations, and the current energy model analysis.

The Board indicated that the massing and façade studies had improved since the last time this matter was before the Board, although a few issues with scaling and a few other details still existed. The Board discussed the elevations, façades, and fenestration for each side of the building, including the roofing plan and the proposed PV applications; symmetrical vs. asymmetrical view points; massing and materiality; secondary, pedestrian-level scaling elements such as porticos, porches, fountains, etc., which might help bring down the massiveness of the building; and bicycle storage.

The Board also discussed the landscaping and proposed courtyard areas, noting that the plans for the east garden had developed nicely but that the north and south courtyards both needed additional work.

In an effort to maintain the project schedule and to expedite the planning and design process, Mr. Brandes moved to table SD approval to April 24, 2017, at 9:00 a.m., for a GoTo Meeting to consider SD approval, exploring the following items which will need to be resolved in order to move forward with SD approval:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

Based on comments made during the meeting, continue to explore the site and landscape design for the open space and courtyards surrounding the building. There seems to be a variety of site and landscape forms that do not help to create a unified sense of place. Please explore the site and landscape pattern that is reflected for the Creekside Garden as a potential model that would enhance the entries and exits and help improve the pedestrian scale. Below are some suggestions to consider:

- Evaluate the layout and design of the four (4) court areas: north, south, east and west, and the need to complement one to the other in a similar pattern/placemaking. To date, the West – Creekside Garden area seems to be the most resolved.
- Materiality – please use scaled cross-sections and node area enlargements to better define the overall site improvements, pavements and materials; and
- Plant materials are illustrated on Sheet 43, but there is no reference and scale to understand the Schematic Plan Landscape improvements.

Architecture:

The massing and the façade studies have improved since the last meeting. Recognizing that the floorplate and the floorplan will not change from the current, preferred option, continue to explore:

- The roof design and articulation, using the asymmetrical design and the fenestration of the east elevation as a guide;
- Reducing the monumentality of the building, especially on the north side which is still too symmetrical and too massive;
- Improve the pedestrian-level experience to help resolve the project scale. Review existing Main Campus precedents for how these buildings use scaling elements and how they touch the ground;
- Provide some additional views of the following (these do not need to be full renderings):
 - View from the entry drive at Baseline to the terminus of the “Campus Gateway”
 - Pedestrian-level views of the bicycle parking areas (covered and surface) at both the NE and SE corners of the building;
- Additional studies of the front porch/great room articulation and how it ties into the architecture of the rest of the building;
- Integrate the proposed “PPA” PV as an architectural element. Consider what areas should have a darker roof (hopefully with a good solar exposure) and treat them as such. Also, imagine the PV as continuous fabric; triangular panels are available if desired. Smaller roofs/sunshades can be part of the “kit of parts” that reduces the massive scale of the building. The PV should enhance rather than detract from the building composition.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Please forward the additional documents presented that were not included in the package; for example, the proposed energy budgets and the PV analysis sheets.
- Any additional supporting information, reports and studies, regarding energy, sustainability, and resilience would be welcome. We need to know how this information has shaped the architectural design.

Mr. Epstein seconded the motion to table Schematic Design approval pending the GoToMeeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

Mr. Haverly suggested that the design team work with Mr. Goodhew to determine what items will be required for the Design Development submittal package so that the team can continue to make progress toward the next level of approval to the extent possible while the SD submittal is refined for the meeting on April 24.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.