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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Amended Meeting Notes

Date:	Tuesday, December 13, 2022
Time:	12:00 – 5:15 p.m.
Location:	Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:
Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs ("UCCS"), and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder ("CU Boulder")

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Kori Donaldson, AVP for Budget, Planning, and Capital and ex officio member of the DRB
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker
Emily Parker, Sr. Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Office of the VP for Budget & Finance

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

12:00 – 12:30 p.m. **Study Session – Board Only**

Cary Weatherford, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Facilities and Campus Development, at the CU Denver campus, provided an update to the DRB regarding the College of Engineering, Design and Computing project on the CU Denver campus. Project is temporarily paused while the campus examines the overall cost and funding model.

12:30 – 2:15 p.m. **UCCS Campus Master Plan – *UCCS***
Update: Ideas and Alternatives (Information/Direction)

Architect:
SmithGroup, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Steve Schonberger, Principal, Higher Education Strategist, SmithGroup
Brandon Woodle, Associate Landscape Architect, SmithGroup
Doug Kozma, Vice President, Campus Planning, SmithGroup

UCCS Campus Presenter:
Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design & Construction, and University Architect, Facilities Management

Description: Ideas and Alternatives – Update on progress of 2022 UCCS Campus Master Plan ("CMP")

A/E Presentation

Campus staff and a representative of SmithGroup gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

A. General Comments

The final CMP presentation should include:

- A comparison to the 2012 CMP to highlight:
  - changes to goals and objectives;
  - desired outcomes; and
  - deficits
- A space needs gap analysis
- Cross sections showing grade changes over the length of the campus
- The five- and ten-year project list
  - Include information about potential partnerships or revenue generating opportunities, where relevant
  - Indicate if/how listed projects are tied to enrollment
- Discussion about the opportunities and constraints associated with the surrounding geology
  - Include detail such as historic drainage and erosion patterns
- Detail about existing and desired access, circulation, and parking
  - This will inform the land use pattern.
  - Include a hierarchy of gateways, signage, and circulation for public transit, pedestrians, and emergency and maintenance vehicles
- Land use allocations
  - Conceptually, how the land uses are illustrated, including adjacencies, is really important
- Sustainability objectives that address: Building types, materials and systems; renewable energy sources; building massing and site development; and landscaping
- Information about maintaining the existing building stock

Additional general comments include:

- Even though completion of the full vision of the CMP will take time, include a plan to create great campus spaces at every stage of the plan.

- The CMP is an opportunity to build community across a linear campus.
  - This could be accomplished through a series of interlinked communities – each of which have unique characteristics that distinguish them one from the other.
  - There are great opportunities regarding circulation, edges, open space, and views.

- At the Ent Center, there is a pride of place in terms of the landscape, sculpture, and the arts. Study if there could be a cohesive message like this as one walks through the campus.

- If you look at Ent from Academy up the hill, the cross-section shows natural areas with art that create a soft transition into the campus. It is a great background for arts and entertainment and was very well done.

B. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The west campus Live + Learn + Play concept is preferred.

- The DRB agrees with the change from the 2012 CMP to focus development away from the east campus and toward the central and west campuses, including plans to:
  - Consolidate the School of Nursing and the College of Education into spaces on the west campus and central campus, respectively, large enough to house each program
    - Consolidating the nursing program to the west campus will allow for an already renowned program to expand even further.
    - Locating the nursing program near the Hybl building and the athletics programs, along with the city's connection to the Olympics, will enhance the existing medical care programs.
    - Consider moving the VAPA2 building north so it is closer to the Ent Center, opening up space for additional health-related academic uses.
  - Move non-academic functions such as facilities and administration into University Hall on east campus

- Establish a hierarchy to campus entrances and create a primary gateway entrance at the central campus.
  - Identify the central entry as the main entry in the CMP (graphically)
  - Retain the view corridors of Pikes Peak as a driver during the planning process
  - The central campus quad plan is a great addition to the campus experience

- The landscape and the natural setting brings students to the campus
  - Should this be thought of a campus identity and experience on its own?
  - The campus architecture should reflect this same sense of place.
  - Strive to heighten the feeling of being nestled in the natural landscape.
  - Look at echo zones at the landscape edges.
  - Focus irrigated turf areas only in active spaces where needed, and increase the amount of space allocated to natural landscaping.

- In the central campus area, consider terracing the natural landscape, xeriscape, etc., down from the plaza outside of the El Pomar Center to the traffic roundabouts between the proposed Visitor Center and new academic building.
  - Terrace the landscape down as needed to get to the upper and lower levels of the academic building, which would allow access to parking from the proposed Regent Circle extension.

- Adding a Visitor Center to Gateway Hall is a good idea because it is an activated area of campus and because of the view to Pikes Peak.
  - Investigate if the roadway between the proposed Visitor Center and academic building could be reduced without impacting the view corridor.

- Moving the athletic programs into one space on the north end of the west campus is good.
    - Consolidating recreation with residential housing and separating it from athletics makes sense because athletics and recreation behave differently.
    - Athletics doesn't necessary work well with residential housing and with open space recreation for students because of the weekend activities, lighting, parking, etc., needs required for group athletic events.

- Further study the articulation of the plan for the west campus.
    - The scaling of the fieldhouse and the arena is challenging regardless of where they are placed.
        - The location of these two buildings is key to making the area function well.
        - The topography is a challenge because the buildings become more visible as they are moved further up the hill.
        - Investigate burying the fieldhouse into the hillside.
    - Consider creating a parking structure that could be used for both athletic and arts special events at the current proposed site of the arena building.
    - Switching the locations of the arena building and the parking area might be a solution as would grouping the fieldhouse and the arena together so they share parking, making them appear more like one complex rather than two big buildings.
        - The arena building is a big, freestanding building that contextually doesn't belong in the proposed location and would architecturally fit in more with the fieldhouse building.

- Lyda Hill and the Heller Center require a natural setting with opportunities for quiet reflection. Athletics should be separated from these spaces to shield them from traffic, lights, and noise.

- The recommendations for changes to the parking and campus-wide transportation systems make sense.
    - Pursue ways to increase the bicycle safety through the central campus, including the proposed additional roadways for circulation and the addition of bike lanes.
    - Investigate electric bike-sharing programs.
    - Study funding opportunities for the shuttle system.

- Concerning signage, typologies, and wayfinding, the DRB agrees with the potential updates.
    - More automobile directional signage is needed.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- Continue to pursue energy performance contracts, as discussed, in order to identify and increase solar opportunities.

- The DRB appreciated the slide detailing opportunities for solar arrays and PPAs.
    - In addition to working on an energy feasibility study, to actually plan for an energy system is great.

- Some of the sustainability goals have been strengthened, particularly regarding drainage, landscaping, and stormwater management.
    - The integration of surrounding natural areas is important to sustainability and to the campus character and user experience.

- On this campus, the landscape design may be more important than building design.
- The CMP affords an opportunity to create broad goals about landscaping, such as the reduction of turf and how to reflect surrounding natural areas. These goals can be better reflected through a CMP than on a piecemeal project-by-project basis.

DRB Action

Formal action was not required. The DRB believes the consulting team is moving in the right direction. Overall, the plan includes good analysis and clearly communicates campus goals. The DRB looks forward to the next presentation.

2:30 – 4:30 p.m. **Residence One – *CU Boulder***
Conceptual Design (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
Anderson Mason Dale Architects ("AMD")
Bohlin Cywinski Jackson Architects ("BCJ")
James Corner Field Operations

Presenters:
Daniel Lee, Principal, BCJ
Thomas Kirk, Principal, BCJ
Sarah Astheimer, Senior Associate, Field Operations
Karli Molter, Senior Associate, Field Operations
James Zarske, Director of Sustainability Services, Noresco

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Daniel Gette, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Luc Bamberger, Andrew Nielsen, Valerie Presley (AMD)

CU Boulder Campus or Other CU Representatives Present:
David Chadwick, CU Real Estate Services
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Amy Kirkland, Facilities Planning
Patricia McNally-Leef, Housing Facilities Services
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planning
Edward von Bleichert, Facilities Management

Description:
Conceptual Design ("CD") submittal for Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek neighborhood, including site analysis, context, concept 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.*

DRB Comments

A. General Comments

- The models provided were very helpful in terms of showing the massing, the relative height and size, and various locations of the buildings.

B. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Review the primary design criteria included with the parti, specifically regarding the views to the Flatirons since not all rooms in the complex will have this view.
    - Specifying views of the mountains in general might be more appropriate than specifying views of the Flatirons.

- Regarding access and circulation, in order to maintain operations and functionality, the through movement from 19th to 20th Streets is fundamental to the university from a functional, maintenance, and access point of view.
    - It is also needed for porosity because there are students and other pedestrians who will want to walk or bike through the complex.

- Study how the vehicular service drive from 19th to 20th Streets through the site could be enhanced with paving, lighting, landscape, etc. to make the space more than a back-of-house alley way, but rather a shared drive with pedestrians.

- Determine the operational value of the connections when locating the skybridges.
    - The gateways on all of the diagrams are considerable based on the floodplain and the corresponding 7.5' limitations, regardless of the connections.
    - How people walk through the site (between buildings) may be even more important than the entryways to the site.

- The topography on the site provides some character and spatial definition and will create some nice landscaping opportunities.

- It will be interesting to see how the street edges are developed, especially along 20th Street.

C. Architecture

- Explore the modified versions of the Current Scheme combined with the Reduced Skybridges and L North Wing schemes discussed.
    - The variety of the consolidated scheme for three buildings split into two sites makes sense, with the levels of connectivity to be determined and with the building to the north being the tallest.
        - Study other ways to connect the buildings rather than using skybridges.
    - Think about straightening the layout of some of the buildings.

- Study ways to break down the massing from the pedestrian edge, including breaking the current development site into two building sites (perhaps sites 5 and 6), bifurcated by the service road from 19th through to 20th Streets.
    - Can the edges of the buildings be articulated to emphasize the views by adding air and porosity, especially from the southwest corner to the northeast corner?
        - Even though the framed view of the Flatirons from between the buildings at the pedestrian level is dramatic, the benefits of separating the buildings may outweigh the framed view and should be studied.
    - Since there is some level of separation from a vehicular standpoint, could the individual buildings or sites each have a unique architectural vernacular and massing? Do the two sites have to be connected?
        - With one building site, the complex appears larger than if the site is divided.
        - Changing the skybridge connections could allow for greater diversity of the architecture and allow the buildings to be treated independently.
        - Separating the building sites may change how the individual buildings are designed to address the floodplain.
    - If two sites can be developed, determine:
        - the pros and cons of separating the sites;
        - how tall will the buildings be;
        - what level of connectivity will be needed; and
        - the pedestrian level of amenity from an urban design standpoint.

- Investigate ways to improve building access for move in and move out days.

D. Energy and Sustainability

- For schematic design we would like to see a more visionary and impactful sustainability story and the big idea design moves that you plan to integrate into the project

- The energy model and EUI information is a good start for benchmarking the design.
    - Target an EUI below 40, especially if benchmarking against existing buildings.
    - Think more creatively about the sustainability strategies vs. starting with code.
    - Set goals for carbon and embodied carbon.
    - Refer to available benchmarking resources on how to set these goals. Take early measurements so when evaluating the structural systems and concept design, the team will have a good targe. This will provide a more rigor around the goal process.

- Since this will be the first building on campus to track embodied carbon, this should be a key part of the sustainability story.
    - Provide additional detail about how embodied carbon will be tracked in different types of spaces in the building.
        - For example, determine how much is being attributed to apartments, social spaces, and back-of-house spaces so students can see how carbon is budgeted in the building.

- Regarding the skybridges:
    - Are there unidentified opportunities regarding heating and cooling the spaces?
    - Can they be made uber-biophilic?

- Air quality is an important part of the wellness aspect of the building. Think about moving to DOAS systems with heat recovery and decoupling the heating and cooling from this to minimize the CFM and the duct work size.
    - Also think about alternative systems, perhaps other types of DOAS-based systems, that can improve air quality besides the MERV filtration aspect.

DRB Action

The DRB thanked the university staff and the consultant group for the level of effort made on the Pre-Design and the two Conceptual Design packages. The DRB also thanked the team for preparing the model.

Don Brandes made a motion to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for Residence One, including the comments noted above and below. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

- When the team comes back for Schematic Design ("SD"), the intent is to finalize the site plan and configurations, including connectivity, building heights, volumes, and massing. Additionally, SD should include materiality and façade studies and site improvements.

- Focus the articulation at the angle between the buildings that provides connectivity.

- The sustainability review should include additional target and big moves beyond EUI.

- Residence One will set a precedent for Residence Two.

4:45 – 5:15 p.m. **Potts Field Concessions and Restrooms Building – *CU Boulder***
Schematic Design and Design Development (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
Populous

Presenters:
Ryan Sellinghausen, Sr. Associate, Architect, Populous
Justin Cox, Associate. Pr., Sr. Landscape Architect, Populous
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect, Facilities Planning, CU Boulder

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planning
Ryan Moeller, Facilities Planning

Description:
Schematic Design ("SD") and Design Development ("DD") submittal for a new 3,000 SF building adjacent to Potts Track & Field to house ADA restrooms, storage space, and concessions in preparation for the May 2024 PAC12 Track & Field Championships to be held at CU Boulder.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in Attachment 3 – CU Boulder Potts Field Concessions, Restrooms on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes.*

DRB Comments

The DRB consolidated the review for SD and DD.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Consider not using a curing compound/sealer on the surface of the concrete because it lightens the color and increases the reflectiveness of the concrete.
    - A natural gray color for the concrete would be better.

- The add alternate landscaping will be a really nice addition if and when it can be included.

- Consider increasing the drainage slope from 1.2% to 2.0%.
    - If possible, using silva cells for drainage would resolve any concern with the slope.

- Regarding restrooms and concessions signage, determine if painted lettering would be more durable than a pin-mounted or a stand-off sign.
    - Painting lettering is recommended due to the longevity.

B. Architecture

- Provide details regarding the materiality including colors, brush finishes, etc.
    - The proposed grey colors are preferred over the alternative tan.

- Investigate if the cage on the upper portion of the parapet fixed roof ladder is required for access to the mechanical equipment or if a hatch or an opening in the walkway could replace the fixed roof ladder.

C. Energy and Sustainability

No comments provided.

DRB Action

Don Brandes made a motion to approve the Schematic Design and Design Development submittals for the Potts Field Concessions and Restroom Building, including the comments noted above. Mike Winters seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Additionally, the DRB requested that campus staff provide an update to the DRB regarding:

- Drainage and whether Silva Cell can be used;
- How the concrete will be finished: e.g. scoring, texture, broom, brush;
- Details regarding the placement of the site lighting fixtures;

- Whether there is an alternative to the fixed roof ladder;
- Details regarding the signage and how it will be attached to or placed on the building; and
- The status of the add alternate area to the south of the patio.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

(For assistance obtaining any copies of the submittal documents referenced within these meeting notes, please contact Linda Money at (303) 860-6110 or linda.money@cu.edu.)