



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

## University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, December 14, 2017  
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

**DRB members present:** Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters; Cheri Gerou (ex officio); 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 8:35 a.m.

### **8:30 – 10:00 a.m. Work Session – Board Only**

The Board met to briefly review administrative and legislative items with Ms. Gerou after which, the Board briefly discussed the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

### **10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Baseball Diamond Restroom Building – CU Colorado Springs Design Development (Action Required)**

Architects:

DLR Group, Denver and Colorado Springs, Colorado

Presenter:

JaDee Harsma, AIA, GGP, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Associate,  
DLR Group, Colorado Springs, Colorado

UCCS Campus Presenters:

Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Construction & Planning,  
University Architect, UCCS Campus Planning &  
Facilities Management

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

Others Present:

Gary Reynolds, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration  
Kent Marsh, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning  
and Facilities Management, Facilities Services

Description:

Design Development (“DD”) Review and Approval for a  
Restroom Building at the Baseball Diamond (“BD”) at the  
UCCS Campus

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

The Board introduced themselves to Mr. Marsh, recently hired to take Mr. Reynolds place at the UCCS campus upon Mr. Reynolds’ retirement. Mr. Marsh briefly reviewed his background for the Board.

A. Background Context:

Ms. Harsma briefly presented the status of the Restroom Building Project on the Baseball Diamond currently under construction on the UCCS campus. She reviewed the following regarding the building of the first restroom building (“Phase I”):

- Site plan;
- Restroom building plan;
- Roof and reflected ceiling plans;
- Lighting cut sheet showing proposed lighting fixtures;
- Building section;
- Overall and building elevations; and
- 3D view illustrations and various renderings.

She also reviewed the following documents regarding Phase II:

- Site plan;
- Roof and reflected ceiling plans;
- Overall and building elevations; and
- 3D view illustrations and various renderings.

Campus brick precedents and samples were also presented.

Ms. Fox and Ms. Harsma discussed the timing, funding, and construction of the second restroom building (“Phase II”) in the future once funding has been obtained. Ms. Harsma and Mr. Cummings also reviewed details related to the proposed site improvements, which meet existing campus standards. The design of the restrooms, the canopy, heating and air ventilation, sustainability and daylighting, and the roof plan were discussed.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board expressed agreement with the proposal for Phase I. However, the Board did not wish to approve Phase II at this time. Additionally, the Board provided the following input regarding both phases of the restroom building:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Budget permitting, in order to light the signage on the building, consider installing ground lighting fixtures during Phase I, if possible.

Architecture and Design:

- Investigate the design of both phases of the building in order to break the horizontal plane of the 90' length of the building in plan proposed for both phases including the idea of bending phase 2 to better follow the contours;
- In order to help with phased construction of masonry, there was a recommendation to stock enough brick in the first phase to build out the second phase; and
- Taking budget constraints into consideration, consider revisiting the design of the canopy in order to develop a stronger gathering spot for shading and protection from the elements for individuals attending functions at the baseball field.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Review the placement of the Solatubes in order to improve their alignment and organization within the building;
- Consider articulating the ceiling so the lighting from the Solatubes can be distributed to the desired locations inside the building; and
- Because the roof design presented for Phase I has not considered the installation of future photovoltaic units due to the placement of the Solatubes, consider more strategic options regarding the future design for Phase II so sustainable functions can be incorporated into the design of the building.

Mr. Olgay expressed an opinion that the design of the restroom building has missed an opportunity by not reflecting parts of the campus and engaging the Colorado environment and geographical location within the design of the building such as taking advantage of fresh air ventilation, daylighting, and natural methods of heating the building. He felt that the design should be more emblematic of the campus and of the state by engaging with its surroundings, Pulpit Rock being one of the most iconic and beautiful places on campus. The experiences of being in the building and of coming up to the building, etc., could be included within the design of the building which could include features which can cut energy use and which can make the space more pleasant, all of which the available budget should be able to accommodate.

Ms. Fox indicated that they would review the cost benefit analysis and return on investment of potential sustainability options in order to determine if any of the ideas suggested by Mr. Olgyay could be incorporated into the building's design.

Mr. Brandes moved for approval for design development for Phase I. Regarding the future development of Phase II or other future phases, he noted:

Return to the Board for review and approval of future phases and improvements, taking into consideration the items listed above. Additionally, consider ordering the combined volume of brick for both phases I and II so the it will be consistent for both phases.

Ms. Brown seconded the motion which was approved with a majority vote. Mr. Olgyay abstained from voting on the motion.

#### Discussion Regarding Item Not Included on the Agenda:

##### A. Background Context:

Prior to leaving the meeting, as an information item only, Ms. Fox described for the Board a potential project concerning the building of a "small scene shop" (approximately 3,000 SF) near the Ent Center. The inclusion of a scene shop within the Ent Center project had been removed due to budget constraints. Programmatically, there is a need for it now, and it could be built now utilizing funds remaining in the budget after the completion of the Ent Center. The same design team will be involved in this project as was responsible for the design of the Ent Center.

##### B. DRB Comments:

The Board discussed the potential location and features of the scene shop as well as a potential schedule for Board review and approval. The Board indicated that it would consider a combined Pre-Design review and Conceptual Design review early in 2018. Preliminarily, the Board shared the following comments:

#### Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Please discuss the proposed improvements in relationship to the overall micro-master plan that had been previously completed and how the plan changed programmatically;
- Carefully study and consider the site planning and visual implications of the new building including entries and access; and
- Determine if there could be opportunities to berm up the landscaping on the west side of the scene shop building in order to minimize the view of the building as much as possible.

Architecture and Design:

- Minimize the sight lines (building height) and ensure that the views from the dance studio in the Ent Center are not blocked; and
- Ensure that the building design is subservient to the Ent Center building in terms of the vernacular and that it will blend into the design of the Ent Center and other potential buildings that may be built in the complex in the future.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Comprehensively consider sustainability issues including optimizing the insulation levels, the placement of windows, daylighting, ventilation, mechanical systems, PV, etc., in the design of the building.

General Comments:

- Consider clearly articulating goals at the Conceptual Design stage, for Landscape, Architectural, and Sustainability issues, including, for example, what is the purpose of the building, is it related to the larger Ent Center building, is it less visible, subservient, or part of the composition, what are the sight lines, what is the proposed energy use intensity, what are other germane sustainability issues, etc., so these goals can help guide the design as it moves forward.

It was also noted that Ms. Brown will be recusing herself from future Board discussions or action regarding this matter since her firm is the firm of record.

**11:15 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.      Aerospace – North Wing Addition, College of Engineering –  
CU Boulder  
Informational Update (Information Only)**

Architects:

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

Presenters:

Jennifer Cordes, Principal, Hord Coplan Macht  
Kent Freed, Principal, PLOT Project, LLC  
Anthony Mazzeo, Principal, PLOT Project, LLC

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities  
Management

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,  
Design and Construction  
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,

Facilities Planning  
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,  
Facilities Planning  
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning  
Rachel Stonecypher, Project Manager, Planning and  
Construction, Facilities Management

Others Present:

Cade Hammers, Designer II, Hord Coplan Macht

Description:

Information workshop to review progress toward Conceptual Design submittal for an addition to recently approved building for the Aerospace Engineering Program currently under construction

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

A. Background Context:

Ms. Cordes indicated that the design team has moved forward with initial concepts for the Addition to the north wing of the Aerospace Engineering Sciences ("AES") Building after which Mr. Freed and Mr. Mazzeo reviewed a number of the options regarding the placement of the porous landscape detention ("PLD") storm water drainage channels flowing through the rover and flight fields north of the AES Building and the potential landscaping and plaza options adjacent to the Addition based upon feedback provided by the Board at a meeting held in late November 2017.

Additionally, a pilot concept of a micro master plan of the area to the north and east of the AES Building was reviewed, and the pedestrian connections, including possible locations of the pedestrian bridge over Skunk Creek were discussed.

Mr. Boardman presented an updated SketchUp model to show the current ideas regarding the building design and massing for the Addition, also based upon prior feedback from the Board. A 3D model of the AES Building and options for the Addition was also prepared and reviewed by the Board.

The Board, planning staff, and the design team discussed options regarding the entries into the Addition, the stairs in the Addition and potential related entry, the fenestration and articulation of the walls of the Addition, how these elements relate to the possible programming inside the Addition, the courtyard to the east of the Addition, potential locations for a bicycle shelter, and the relationship of the courtyard, potential landscaping, and the PLD channels.

B. DRB Comments:

The following items were noted by the Board as areas to investigate moving forward:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Regarding the courtyard:
  - Once the building space plan has been determined, please confirm the east courtyard programming uses and activities; the courtyard design should derive from this better understanding.
- Regarding the flight field, PLD channels, pathways, and connections:
  - Consider a new and more northern location for the pedestrian bridge crossing;
  - Ensure that the future enlargement and location of the PLD is functional and open/spacious, functional, and unconstrained by adjacent or edge uses;
  - Further investigate keeping the PLD channels to the west side of the site, planned to accommodate future and increased storm water needs;
  - PLD channel “strips” should each have a clear edge and not be combined; and
  - Investigate options regarding the walkways and service solutions to the north of the Addition, perhaps making a softer edge with a detached walkway on the north.

Architecture and Design:

- Determine the best overall massing and design for the Addition building, including the prominence of the major entryway and its visibility as you approach from the east;
- Regarding the classroom space on the first floor:
  - Review size and location of the classroom and the associated building design as it relates to the classroom; and
  - Determine the best, most functional fenestration for this area including the appropriate levels of transparency and privacy.
- Review the use of the overhead door and determine its best location based on the massing and other fenestration on the facades;
- Determine the appropriate design, windows, and glazing regarding the stairs in the Addition; and
- The size of the concrete is too small to be used on the face of the building near the east courtyard.

Sustainability and Energy:

(Not specifically addressed beyond items noted above.)

Regarding the areas of concern noted above, the Board indicated that while it will appreciate input from the design team and the team’s consideration of these issues, it also indicated that the team should consider the Board’s comments as general direction and that the team should move forward in these areas according to the team’s best judgment.

The planning and design teams anticipating bringing the Schematic Design submittal before the Board at its regular meeting in January 2018.

12:45 - 2:45 p.m.

**Imig Building Addition, College of Music – CU Boulder  
Conceptual Design (Action Required)**

Architects:

Pfeiffer Architects, New York, New York  
DLAND Studio Architecture, Brooklyn, New York

Presenters:

Alberto Cavallero, AIA, LEED AP, Pfeiffer Architects  
Sonya Julian Lester, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager,  
Pfeiffer Architects  
Susannah Drake, FASLA, AIA, Principal, DLAND Studios  
Josh Price, RLA, DLAND Studios

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

John Davis, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Operations,  
College of Music  
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,  
Facilities Planning  
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,  
Design and Construction  
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities  
Management  
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,  
Facilities Planning  
Robert Shay, Dean, College of Music  
Rachel Stonecypher, Project Manager, Planning and  
Construction, Facilities Management

Description:

Conceptual Design submittal for addition to existing Imig  
Building for the College of Music

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

Ms. Kirtland introduced Mr. Davis and Mr. Shay, representatives from the College of Music. Mr. Cavallero also introduced Ms. Julian Lester from Pfeiffer and Mr. Price from DLAND Studios.

A. Background Context:

Ms. Kirtland noted that Group 14 has been added to the project team as a sustainability consultant and Adolphson Peterson has been added as the general contractor.

Ms. Julian Lester reviewed the status of the Addition (the “Addition”) to the existing Imig Music Building (“Imig”) project since it was last brought before the Board in October 2017. She also reviewed:



- Graphical representation of programming needs;
- Project budget of \$59.6 M consisting of:
  - Building construction \$42.0 million
  - Site/Landscape \$1.5 million
  - Utilities \$1.0 million
  - Soft costs (FFE/other) \$15.1 million
- Project schedule, beginning in August 2017 through occupancy in August 2020.

Mr. Alberto briefly discussed the sustainability and energy control goals for the project and indicated that one of the key items is humidity control required for the stability of keeping instruments in tune. He noted that the design team would be working with Group 14 in order to establish specific goals for the Addition.

Additionally, he reviewed:

- Project goals and scope;
- Overall site analysis and utilities;
- Alignment and affinity analysis;
- Connection to Imig;
- 3-D context analysis, massing studies, program blocking, and stacking;
- Building circulation and entries, existing and proposed;
- Potential floor plans and in situ analysis for the Addition;
- Various building sections and views for the Addition;
- Shadow studies; and
- Building materiality precedents.

Ms. Drake also discussed site and landscape planning including:

- Landscaping and paving material concepts, palettes, and precedents;
- Campus and surrounding area geometries, planes, and vernacular;
- Site overlay showing the Addition;
- Challenges, opportunities, proposals, and street sections regarding 18<sup>th</sup> Street concerning pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular connectivity and access, entrances, and landscaping;
- Similar analyses regarding Wardenburg Drive and Farrand Field; and
- Micro master plan concepts for the area including and surrounding the Addition.

Mr. Alberto presented various renderings of the concepts presented and two potential massing scenarios were reviewed through the use of a 3-D model.

The Board discussed the presentation with planning staff and the team, especially regarding the micro master planning concepts and potential changes to the roadways including Wardenburg Drive and 18<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Haverly and Ms. Reilly noted that in conjunction with this Addition, there were other planned traffic-related studies along with a potential traffic master plan, which may provide multiple opportunities to make changes that will improve the congestion, pedestrian and traffic flow, and safety in these areas. The Board also discussed the proposed massing of the Addition and suggested a few options.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board shared the following comments and direction:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- The planning concepts and the relationship developed on the east side of the Addition with the connection to Imig and along Farrand Field works well architecturally in terms of views, massing, internal and external relationships, site design and landscape architecture, planting, outdoor/indoor fenestration and how obvious and intuitive gathering places and entries have been included;
- Regarding the roadways and the edges of 18<sup>th</sup> Street and Wardenburg Drive:
  - Continue to study additional ways to improve the congestion and chaotic nature of 18<sup>th</sup> Street while allowing the movement of students to remain unimpeded along 18<sup>th</sup> Street without negatively impacting the edges of Imig and the Addition;
  - Consider simplifying and clarifying the landscape on 18<sup>th</sup> Street to make it stronger;
  - Consider how the massing of the existing CASE Building on the opposite corner and the intersection of 18<sup>th</sup> Street and Euclid impacts, informs, and influences the flow of all types of traffic, especially pedestrians and bicycles, to and in front of the Imig including gathering places and the proposed main entrance to Imig/Addition;
  - Continue to study the alignment, walkability and tree placement of the Wardenburg pedestrian plaza including the impact of a four-story building immediately adjacent to that plaza and the pedestrian experience and scale of the building;
  - Review the cross section of these pedestrian connections and roadways in order to reduce congestion and add new gathering/placemaking opportunities; and
  - Consider how the changes to Imig Building influence the master planning of the parking lot to the west including crossing locations.

Architecture and Design:

- Reconsider the design of the main entrance through the Addition by locating opening at the southwest corner of the Addition off of Wardenburg:
  - Explore the programming, adjacencies, and connectivity inside the Addition in order to determine if it could to accommodate such a change;
  - Further analyze the axes and alignments with University Club and Euclid and clarify their role in influencing the design of the project;
  - Study the entry from an integrative landscape perspective and consider adjusting the scale accordingly; including the relationship of the corner plaza to the entry.
  - Consider the impact of the westerly wind regarding the designing and function of the entry;
  - Investigate ways to improve the prominence of the entrance and create a desirable gathering place/plaza without impacting the movement and connectivity of people going in and out of the building; and
  - Consider modifications to the design of the entryway that could eliminate the overhang space above the columns, move the columns back closer to the building, reduce or bring down the massing, change the location of the doors,

while carving out a loggia in order to create the desired negative space and maintaining a visible and obvious entrance; consider how these changes can enhance the pedestrian scale of the building.

- Regarding the massing and design of the building:
  - Consider ways that the massing can be reduced and the pedestrian scale along the edges can be improved;
  - Review the roof design, specifically the broken shed planes vs. simpler, gable components, and determine if the way the roof line separates the masses of the four-story Addition can be reduced;
  - Recognizing that there are multiple programs to be accommodated in the Addition, look for ways to still be respectful of the campus architecture and style while maintaining consistency and a balance in the overall massing and design;
  - Consideration should be given to the Klauder massing patterns, and work to resolve the larger and smaller building masses;
  - Ensure that the design is neither over or under articulated;
  - Use the program massing to provide daylight deep into the building interior; and
  - Further study how music fits into and becomes Imig and how the design of the Addition reflects this.

Sustainability and Energy:

(Outline of LEED goals listed in handouts.)

The Board thanked the team for the presentation after which Mr. Olgyay moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal, taking account the comments that have been made and will be listed in the minutes. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

**3:00 – 4:30 p.m.**

**23<sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge, North of Boulder Creek – CU Boulder  
Conceptual Design (Action Required)**

Architects/Engineers:

Loris and Associates, Inc., Engineering Consultant,  
Superior, Colorado

BHA Design, Inc., Landscape Architects, Fort Collins,  
Colorado

Icon Engineering, Inc., Civil Engineering, Centennial,  
Colorado

Presenters:

Dan Beltzer, P.E., Associate, Loris and Associates, Inc.

Roger Sherman, Landscape Architect, Principal, BHA Design, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Amy Kirtland, Campus Planner for this Project, Facilities  
Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Brian Moffitt, Project Manager, Planning, Design &  
Construction, Facilities Management

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,  
Facilities Planning

Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,  
Design and Construction

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities  
Management

Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,  
Facilities Planning

Description:

Conceptual Design submittal; continued from November  
2017

**Presentation to the Board/Discussion:**

A. Background Context:

The Board thanked the design and planning teams for continuing to work on and returning to finalize the Conceptual Design submittal regarding the 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge Crossing (the “Crossing”).

Ms. Kirtland indicated that the design and planning teams conferred with bicycle planners from the university and two other additional bicycle consultants in order to discuss the interface of bicyclists and pedestrians and to ensure that this Crossing is a safe experience for all users. After these discussions, it was determined that the lenticular design was the preferred pathway and would be the safest option. Refinements to the design and to the landings have been included within the materials being presented to the Board.

Mr. Sherman briefly reviewed the Crossing design as it had last been presented to the Board in late November 2017 and some of the comments shared by the Board at that time. Incorporating these comments, he then presented the current design, elaborating on:

- the design for both landings including the connections with the Buff Walk on the south landing;
- retaining walls located at both ends of the Crossing;
- landscaping and lighting options for the landings;
- tree locations for the landings and the creek below the Crossing;
- connectivity with the Boulder Creek Path; and
- potential options for the paving, railings, and lighting at the landings and for the Crossing itself.

Mr. Beltzer indicated that the current design has been reviewed by the hydrology consultants who have reported that there is “no rise in the corrected, effected model,” and the cost/benefit ratio, while slightly reduced from the previous design, was still above the desired threshold of one. As a result, this Crossing design works conceptually from a floodplain standpoint.

The Board and the planning and design teams discussed the possibility of widening the center of the Crossing in order to incorporate overlook stopping spaces into the design. After discussing this matter, the Board indicated that a simple, lenticular Crossing design without the overlook spaces is preferable and that if there is any funding remaining in the budget, funds should be spent on the detailed material (pavements, railings, lighting, etc.) elements of the Crossing and the landings.

After reviewing an overlay of the Crossing design with the north and south geographical locations on either side of Boulder Creek, the Board agreed that the stairway for the eastern side of the north landing which had been contemplated at previous meetings was no longer needed.

Overall, the Board agreed with the landing locations and the overall alignment as proposed at this meeting and expressed its appreciation to the design and planning teams for the improvements that have been made to the Crossing design and its associated landings.

Mr. Sherman and Mr. Beltzer reviewed potential options and materials for the retaining walls, the railings on the walls at the landings and along the Crossing, the landings themselves, the trusses, piers and pier caps, lighting, and the decking and potential construction of the Crossing.

#### B. DRB Comments:

The Board shared the following comments and/or direction:

##### Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Regarding the north landing:
  - Refine the geometry of the radiuses for the seat and retaining walls to better connect to the site grading and planting concept; and
  - Review the design and geometry of the landscape walls in order to make them more graceful and more connected to the riparian/Boulder Creek connection.
- Regarding the south landing:
  - Consider designing the layout and pavement selection as an extension of the Buff Walk rather than continuing the sunburst medallion design;
  - Make sure there is a “pausing” place at the south landing; and
  - Consider how the railings start and stop and complement the bridge vs. the railings on the Buff Walk.
- Regarding Schematic Design:
  - The layout, grading, cross-sections and details for the landings, walls, railings, landscape, crossing (bridge) pavements, lighting, signage and material palletes will be important at the Schematic Design level of review and approval;

### Architecture and Design:

- Concerning the design for the construction of the Crossing, taking the costs, constructability, structural integrity, ease of maintenance, environmental impact, hydrology and floodplain, and the health, safety, and welfare of the users of the Crossing into consideration, investigate the following suggestions regarding the construction of the Crossing:
  - Explore a range of options regarding the construction design, methods, and materials, including the possibility of using beams instead of trusses and/or a cantilever design for the construction of the Crossing and dropping the bottom of the truss system below the deck;
  - Keep the structural design of the support system and for the railings as light, airy, thin, and unobtrusive as possible so that the Crossing through the trees, for example, is not obvious but is more light, pedestrian-like, simple, and understated, rather than being heavy and industrial;
  - While maintaining the optimal structural integrity, determine the most ideal vertical spacing for the trusses, keeping the span between elements as long as possible in order to encourage the light and airy feeling desired;
  - Wherever possible, use vertical elements in the design rather than diagonal or crossed elements; and
  - Consider the use of mesh instead of pickets for fall protection on the railings, but if pickets must be used for structural integrity, keep the design and dimensionality light, thin, and vertical, and as sympathetic to the existing railing of the Buff Walk as possible.
  
- Investigate options regarding keeping materiality of the decking on the Crossing simple and consistent from one end to the other or changing the materiality between the landings and the Crossing.
  
- Keep the articulation of the construction, regardless of the method, and the railing the same from one end of the Crossing to the other in order to keep them visually consistent;
  
- Study the transition of the painted railing at the south landing and Buff Walk to the design of the new railing of the crossing; and
  
- In addition to considering the cost of the materials, also consider the visual perception of the end result, and work to reduce the environmental impact of the materials used.

### Sustainability and Energy:

(No items discussed at this meeting, but goals discussed at prior meetings should still be considered applicable.)

### General Comments:

- For the Schematic Design submittal, preparing as many cross sections as possible will be helpful for the Board to get sense of the verticality and gradients from either end of the Crossing, particularly as the pathway is climbing the slope.

Mr. Haverly indicated that the planning team will explore these options with the design and engineering consultants in order to determine which options are feasible and should be considered as the project moves forward.

Mr. Brandes moved approval of the Conceptual Design of the 23<sup>rd</sup> street bridge and to move forward with the Schematic Design. Mr. Winters seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.