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

University of Colorado Design Review Board

Date:	Wednesday, March 7, 2018
Time:	9:00 a.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Location:	Linfield Family Colloquium Room, #A400, Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotechnology Building, 3415 Colorado Avenue, CU East Boulder Campus

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"), and Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus ("CU Colorado Springs"). Due to a scheduling conflict, Mr. Winters arrived during the 11:30 a.m. agenda item regarding sustainability.

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 9:00 a.m.

9:00 – 10:00 a.m. **Work Session – Board Only**

The Board met to briefly discuss the items on this day's agenda and other administrative and scheduling matters prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

10:15 – 11:30 a.m. **23rd Street Bridge, North of Boulder Creek – CU Boulder Design Development** (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
- Clanton & Associates, Lighting Design & Engineering, Boulder, Colorado

Presenters:
- Jason Messaros, Landscape Architect, Project Manager, BHA Design, Inc.
- David Graff, P.E., Loris and Associates, Inc.
- David Roederer, LEED AP BD+C, IES, Clanton & Associates

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
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Description:
Design Development submittal regarding bridge crossing over Boulder Creek

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Moffitt provided an update regarding the FEMA and SHPO agreements both waiting to be signed. He also noted that the project is on track for Phase II funding by June 1, 2018, and staff hopes to begin the bidding process in late April 2018 and construction over the summer 2018. They expect to use a design-bid-build construction method per Federal requirements and will be based on CDOT specifications.

Mr. Messaros and Mr. Graff reviewed updated documentation for the Design Development ("DD") submittal including the overall site plan; site cross-sections; details regarding the south and north landings; grading plans; various renderings of the crossing, landings, and bridge character; bridge and pier cap profiles and sections; landscape plans and plant materials; details regarding the retaining walls; sustainability; materiality specifications for the railings, etc.; and the schedule for the next steps for and project.

It was noted that although specific locations had not yet been determined, wayfinding signage would be standard campus signage.

Mr. Roederer discussed the lighting plan and fixtures and presented working samples of the proposed fixtures for the railing. Mr. Roederer indicated that a photometrics study of the lighting would be completed in order to ensure that the lighting specifications were appropriate for the needs identified.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

The Board shared the following direction and comments:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Regarding the plazas/landings, review signage, lighting, scoring texture on the concrete, etc. to ensure there is clear demarcation/distinction between the landing/plaza areas and the crossing for bicycle traffic.

- Review the lighting for the existing Boulder Creek pathway where it crosses underneath the bridge for safety considerations and to discourage transient use.

Architecture:

- Consider modifying concrete surface scoring of angled joints on crossing for traffic calming purposes.

- Review section of bridge crossing Boulder Creek to determine if creek crossing can celebrated by changing the scoring of the concrete or making some other indication in horizontal ground plain at that location.

- Review design and mechanics of drip edge, ensure that water drips adequately or is channeled to either side away from pillars and plinths in order to control staining from the Core10 steel.

- Investigate ways to improve curves and make hand rail more elegant by adjusting as needed radius on outside bend of steel plate and/or the spring points.

- Also regarding elegance of railing, investigate making kick plate tube steel slightly thicker and inset underneath the edge.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Provide to the Board Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) sheets regarding concrete mixes for proposed blends for crossing and piers (see https://www.nrmca.org/sustainability/EPDProgram/#ProductSpecificEPDs).

Upon completion of the presentation and discussion, Mr. Epstein moved to approve the Design Development submittal for the 23rd Street Bridge project with the comments noted above regarding sustainability, the plazas, the scoring patterns, and details of the railing. Ms. Brown seconded the motion which unanimously passed by the Board members present. Mr. Winters arrived at the end of the discussion on sustainability.

11:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. **Discussion of Sustainability Goals for Boulder Campus**

Presenter:
David Kang, Vice Chancellor, Infrastructure and Sustainability

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Edward von Bleichert, Facilities Management Sustainability
Zac Niehues, Assistant Director, Engineering Services, Facilities Planning, Design & Construction

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Kang explained a recent change to his position title at the university to include sustainability as an important function for which he will be responsible going forward. He elaborated on sustainability efforts as they current exist at CU Boulder, program goals and how these efforts should grow in the future, and ways to accomplish this growth.

The Board discussed with Mr. Kang creating strategic and/or implementation plans or other ways in which the Board can assist in the goals and objectives he mentioned such as including sustainability issues within the planning and design criteria for buildings built on campus. Also discussed was the desire to make improvements in this area as successful as possible but that the such progress also needs to be seamless to the Campus, enhance the campus, and is cost effective as well.

The Board indicated that it does embrace and support the long term apirations that Mr. Kang discussed and that it would be pleased to work with Mr. Kang and his staff to assist in creating strategic, comprehensive, and measurable sustainable program goals, objectives, and standards that the Board could incorporate into their review and approval process.

12:45 – 2:45 p.m. **Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – CU Boulder Conceptual Design**

Architects:
Gensler Architectural Design/Consultants, Denver, Colorado
Civitas Landscape Architecture, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Brian Vitale, Design Principal, Gensler
Craig Vickers, RLA, Civitas

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Jon Gambrill, Managing Director, Principal, Gensler
Jonas Philipsen, Design Director, Gensler
Scott Hurst, Design Director, Gensler
Kyle Hopkins, Landscape Architect, Civitas

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Stephanie Gillin, Assistant Dean, Leeds School of Business
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
David Kang, Vice Chancellor, Infrastructure and Sustainability
Sharon Matusik, Dean, Leeds School of Business
Keane Ray, Project Manager, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Doug Smith, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering and Applied Science

Description: Conceptual Design submittal for an addition and renovation to the Koelbel Building and the Engineering Center for the Leeds School of Business and the College of Engineering and Applied Science

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Haverly began the workshop with a brief introduction after which introductions were made.

Mr. Vitale briefly reviewed the project goals, project site, area and campus influences and inspirations, and massing studies. Multiple design options, elevations, building sections and floor plans were reviewed. A Sketch-Up model of the recommended option was also presented.

Additionally, Mr. Vickers elaborated on site and landscaping concepts including programming and details such as circulation, bicycle racks, green spaces, gathering spaces, for example; various site plans and site limits; and a preliminary micro master plan.

The Board discussed the east and west entry options for the expansion, student circulation and access, and the proposed roof forms for the expansion.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

General:

- Goals are clear and concise.
- Diagram on page 23 describes a strong parti which the Board embraces:
    - New, strong entry from both east and west;
    - Auditorium location as shown;
    - Second floor link creates connection;
    - New identity for this link that supports both the new Business School entry and the concept of "mixing" the two programs.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Explore hierarchy of plaza/open space between the two buildings. Can this be a stronger "positive space" rather than just a pass through?
- Explore the relationship and hierarchy between the four new spaces on the west side of the Business School: plaza, grove, green roof, reading garden. Can the form and location of the skylights inform these exterior spaces? Can the connection between these spaces be stronger? Should the "mixer porch" be more or more connected to the entry? Can the entry plaza encourage gathering and resolve the grade changes?
- Explore the bike parking locations. Does the parking shown at the edge of the quad (#1, p.54) reinforce the entry and use of the space? Are there any other options to support the new entry but not impede the space and identity of the entry?
- Review the sidewalk on the west side above the utility tunnel. Can this circulation be better resolved?

Architecture:

- Explore the proportion and scale of the entry element. This includes its relationship to the sloped roof of the existing Business School and its proportional relationship to the bridge. Should it be sloped on both sides? Should there be a difference in form/hierarchy between east and west entries? The current configuration seems too close to the Business School roofs with a different form creating a conflict between these two elements.
- Explore the relationship between the two sides and how they connect at both ground floor and bridge level. Some of the spaces seem pinched and not as conducive to mixing and the heavy circulation functions. The concept of "mixing" should be stronger and more primary to the architectural idea on all levels on both sides. This includes strengthening the relationships of the ingress/egress hubs on both sides, giving the space between more identity, and sorting out circulation between the two spaces including door/entry locations. Consider linking the buildings with clear circulation and strong spatial definitions. Can there be a stronger connection at the ground level? (Should there be one café?) Should glass on IE hub on Engineering be pulled back to strengthen the identity of the space between? How does the bridge support this concept of mixing and connection both functionally and architecturally? The internal connection to the Engineering Building is awkward and should reinforce use of the bridge and idea of "mixing."

- Explore the architectural expression. The current collection of elements seems complex and chaotic. If Business School is "A" and Engineering is "B," what should the link be? Is there a "C" that unifies these two disparate architectural expressions? Can the link be a quieter architectural vocabulary with punctuation at the new entry that maintains the CU architecture? Should the new auditorium be articulated and given character?

Sustainability and Energy:

- Better understand the daylighting needs of the lower level and how this can inform the design of the roof garden.
- Given the quantity of west facing glass, explore concepts for reducing solar heat gain through shading and daylight control.
- Further explore integration of solar into the form of the building so it is not an "add-on."
- Consider designing the roof plan (especially in the "Bridge" area) as an opportunity to bring daylight to the internal windowless offices.
- This is an appropriate time to set energy goals for the project (in kbtu/sqft/yr) and create a preliminary energy model to inform the evolution of the design going forward.

The Board, recognizing that this project continues to be a difficult one, thanked the design team and staff for their hard work in moving the project forward and indicated that everyone was appreciative of their efforts.

Mr. Brandes moved to approve Conceptual Design submittal with the conditions, comments, and suggestions noted above. Mr. Brandes suggested that prior to the formal submittal of Schematic Design, it may be worthwhile to have an intermediate meeting or workshop to review these comments and suggestions and to review the progress and status of the Schematic Design submittal. Mr. Winters seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

3:00 – 4:15 p.m. **William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center – CU Colorado Springs**
Pre-Design Development (Information Only)

Architects/Designers/Project Team:
RTA Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado
HOK, Designers, St. Louis, Missouri
JE Dunn Construction, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Stuart Coppedge, Principal, RTA Architects
Peter Tronnier, Design/Build Manager, JE Dunn Construction
Eli Hoisington, Design Principal, HOK

CU Colorado Springs Campus Presenters:
Kent Marsh, Campus Planner for this Project, Associate Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning & Facilities Management, Facilities Services
Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design & Construction, and University Architect, Facilities Management

Description:

Informal introduction regarding a new building to be located on North Nevada Avenue for clinics, academics, and research to create an interprofessional approach to develop future healthcare providers

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Marsh introduced the project team present for the meeting and provided a brief introduction to the project after which Mr. Coppedge continued with the presentation. He spoke regarding the CU Colorado Springs 2012 master plan, the project site, the surrounding neighborhood, the project team, site conditions and constraints, parking, and sustainability goals for the project. Mr. Hoisington elaborated on the maximum building area.

Mr. Marsh and Mr. Coppedge also discussed the relationship with City for Champions program and associated project funding.

Ms. Fox addressed the project schedule and current timeline. They anticipate returning to the Board for the Pre-Design Submittal in April 2018 and the Conceptual Design submittal in May 2018. She also briefly discussed the program plan and the relationship with Penrose-St. Francis Health Services, a major tenant in the project building.

Additionally, a brief history of the Hybl family and its connection to CU Colorado Springs and this project was presented.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board reviewed the expectations for the upcoming levels of review and subsequent Board approvals. The following challenges and project related issues were acknowledged and briefly discussed:

- Parking, anticipation of future parking needs
- Relationship with Nevada Avenue
- Importance of the architectural character
- User types
- On-site and off-site views
- Slope and drainage issues
- Noise issues from surrounding streets
- Urban frontage/edge
- Pedestrian/bicycle/vehicular traffic circulation and connections

The Board also suggested that as the design is developed through the various phases from Conceptual to Design Development, the use of physical models, 3D, and/or Sketch-Up models and other visual aids will be helpful to the Board. Based on the projected schedule, funding and formal approvals required for this project, the Board suggested that it may be appropriate to have informal and in-progress review sessions with one of more members of the Board and the UCCS staff and A/E consultant team to accomodate the project construction schedule.

No action was required for this item. There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

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

University of Colorado Design Review Board

Date: Friday, March 9, 2018
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Location: Conference Rooms 502, 503, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus ("CU Denver") and the CU Anschutz Medical Campus ("CU Anschutz").

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 8:25 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly review agenda items heard during the prior day's meetings and to discuss the items on this day's agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:45 – 10:45 a.m. **CU City Center – CU Denver**
Conceptual Design Submittal (Action Required)

Architects: Architectural Workshop

Presenters: Mark Bowers, Architectural Workshop

CU Denver Campus Presenter:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:
Erik Balsley, AICP LEED AP, Senior Planner, Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz
Nolbert Chavez, Chief of External Issues/Chief Strategy Officer, CU Denver
Holly Hall, Architectural Workshop, Denver
Cary Weatherford, Associate Director, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz
Jessi Zemetra, Program Manager, City Center

Description:

Conceptual Design presentation for a project which will create space for the new City Center program at CU Denver in the existing CU Denver (Dravo) Building at 14th and Lawrence Streets, modifying the exterior of the building to create a new entrance on 14th Street and a new glass front under the corner of the building, and install signage and newer interior layout and design.

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Vite and Mr. Chavez briefly provided an update regarding the project. An increase in the proposed budget for the project was approved by the chancellor for CU Denver and should now be sufficient for the completion of the project.

Mr. Bowers briefly discussed updates to the project based on pre-design comments made by the Board and then reviewed a current partial site plan, photographs of the existing building, two proposals for the site, Option A without a set back at the entry on the 14th Street side and Option B with a set back at the entry, the preferred option.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board shared the following direction and comments:

Site and Landscape:

- Confirm that any signage mounted or applied to the building face should be reviewed by appropriate CU System staff to ensure it complies with current branding standards.

Architecture:

- Consider adding motorized controls for window blinds.
- Encourage elimination of exterior planter and relocation of front entry way to the northwest end of the set back so that planter will not detract from-and compete with-the entry.
- Consider removing horizontal mullion over door and making door full height.
- The ceiling is higly visible from the street and could be an element to reinforce the goals of the project. Investigate the ceiling to determine if the:
    - Tile grid can be eliminated to reveal raw ceiling space;
    - Edges of the grid can be pulled in away from the walls so it appears as if it is floating;

  - Ceiling can be made of a more creative treatment; such as digital fabrication, dropped wood panels, etc., in lieu of ceiling tiles, which contributes to the definition of the space and helps improve the identity from the street; and
  - Modify lighting plan accordingly.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Regarding lighting plan:
  - Consider aiming external lighting fixtures to illuminate wood panels on ceiling and wall of setback area;
  - Consider 2 x 2 internal lighting fixtures to improve distribution at a similar cost of proposed 2 x 4 fixtures, or consider direct indirect pendant LED fixtures to upgrade the appearance of the space;
  - Consider useing wall washers and uplighting to illuminate the walls, artwork, other items on vertical surfaces to draw people into the space;
  - Work to achieve the most satisfying illumination with the lowest lighting power density (LPD, in W/sqft); pendant fixtures which contain an uplight component to brighten the ceiling may help achieve a lower LPD; and
  - Consider using daylight sensors to dim perimeter light fixtures; design the fixture switching layout to facilitate this type of daylight harvesting.

- While determining glazing specifications, take into consideration the:
  - visual light transmission ("VLT") and its relationship to the shading coefficient ("SC"), resulting in the coolness index which should be 2 or above;
  - glazing should have a low reflectivity so it doesn't appear to be metallic; and
  - VLT should be above 60% or higher.

Upon completion of the presentation and discussion, Mr. Brandes moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the CU Denver City Center project, and at the Schematic Design ("SD") submittal, consider the comments noted above, including but not limited to:

- Suggestions made regarding entry way (planter, doorway);
- Comments on lighting (exterior and interior); and
- Share details and samples regarding exterior detailing including materiality, joinery, glazing, etc.

Mr. Olgyay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Mr. Vite, due to the project schedule, inquired if the Board would consider 1) combining the SD and Design Development ("DD") submittals at the next Board meeting, and 2) authorizing demolition work to begin if proposed glass glazing specifications and samples could be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to the next meeting.

The Board indicated that combining the SD and DD submittals would be acceptable if a complete submittal packet is submitted early enough for sufficient review by the Board. The Board would also consider approving moving forward with the demolition work if the glazing packet were acceptable.

11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. **CU Denver Business School - CU Denver**
Conceptual Design (Action Required)
Architects:
RNL Design/Stantec, Inc., Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Dominick Weilminster, AIA, Principal/Board Member, RNL Design/Stantec, Project Designer

CU Denver Campus Presenter:
Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver Campus

Other Campus Representatives Present:
Sharon Anthony, Engineering/Architecture Project Manager, CU Denver
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:
Angelia Cowgill, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Associate, Architect, RNL Design/Stantec, Project Architect

Description:
Conceptual Design submittal for the Business School Phase II Renovation involving the construction of a new, three-story structure within the existing courtyard in the building and some renovation to existing spaces.

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Weatherford indicated that unanimous approval for the project from the Board of Regents and State of Colorado Capital Development Committee had been received. He also noted that the project team has met with Larimer Associates and Urban Villages regarding the site neighborhood and their intentions regarding some of the sites near or adjacent to the subject site.

Mr. Weilminster reviewed how the neighboring buildings adjacent to the alley have engaged with the alley, historical structures and possible redevelopment; how the project site can engage the alley; potential configurations for the project space; and propsed options regarding the exterior architectural elements.

Mr. Weatherford noted that conditions detailed in gift agreement and subsequent letter of intent executed by a substantial donor to the project stipulated how much of the project space would be used.

He also discussed the conversations held earlier with Larimer Associates regarding potential re-development of buildings located between the alley and Larimer Street concerning the future use of the alley.

B. DRB Comments:

Upon completion of the presentation, the Board shared the following comments/direction:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Concerning alleyway as a wayfinding passage, determine what pedestrians will experience in terms of materials, lighting, wayfinding, etc.

- Investigate the actual depth and length of the alleyway element created by setback and how can it be maintained and remain clean, usable, and not impacted by potential transient use.

- Document the alleyway along its length at the ground level to understand how the setback proposed relates to other parts of the alley.

- Explore the 15th Street/Alley corner as a potential junction or corner that may provide fenestration and transparency for the Business School.

Architecture:

- Study hierarchy of proposed design especially related to the entry, investigate doorway to the right of the setback:
    - Can it be emphasized, heightened, lit, and/or have signage or a canopy added to it to make it a stronger part of the project?
    - Can the back wall of setback be continued past column to help form a canopy?

- Explore ways setback can be modified to discourage transient use; i.e. lighting, bollards, transparency using spandrel glass/screen, etc.

- Investigate metal paneling proposed for the first floor exterior wall between 15th Street through the setback, concerns regarding wear and tear, abuse/vandalism, sustainability.

- Study hierarchy of elements, explore number of architectural elements and/or materials used and if they can be reduced/simplified/strengthened.

- Investigate if glass panel can be added to the first floor wall along 15th Street adjacent to the corner near alley.

- Avoid use of metal panel on alley—look for a more durable material.

- Try to extend impact of project to 14th street to allow this project to have more visibility.

- Consider alley-like mural or art on alley, not “traditional signage,” to celebrate the alley aspect of the project.

Sustainability and Energy:

- The design of the fenestration should enhance both the interior distribution of daylight especially on second and third levels, as well as provide a pleasing and aesthetically resoved exterior composition.

Mr. Epstein moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the CU Denver Business School Infill Renovation project with the comments as noted above. Ms. Brown seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

After the motion, the project schedule was also discussed. There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Special Meeting

Date:	Wednesday, March 14, 2018
Time:	8:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Location:	Benson Board Room, #3008, Health and Wellness Center, CU Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, Colorado, and Offices of AndersonMasonDale, 3198 Speer Blvd., Denver, Colorado

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus ("CU Denver") and the CU Anschutz Medical Campus ("CU Anschutz").

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 8:15 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly review scheduling matters with Ms. Gerou and to discuss the item on this day's agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:45 – 11:15 a.m. **Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health – CU Anschutz Medical Campus**
Conceptual Design Submittal

Architects:
AndersonMasonDale Architects, Denver, Colorado
ZGF Architects, Portland, Oregon
Wenk Associates Inc., Landscape Architects, Denver, Colorado
CAA Icon, Owner's Representative, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
David Pfeiffer, AIA, Principal-in-Charge, AndersonMasonDale
Braulio Baptista, Lead Design, ZGF Architects

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:
Joey Carrasquillo, AIA, Associate Designer, AndersonMasonDale
Bob Packard, Associate AIA/Pincipal-in-Charge, ZGF Architects
Dan Loosbrock, PE, Senior Director, CAA ICON
Larry Friedberg, FAIA, State Architect, State of Colorado
Greg Dorolek, PLA, ASLA, Principal, Wenk Associates
Eric Pearse, ASLA, Associate, Wenk Associates
Kristina Thomsen, Architect, ZGF Architects
Justin Brooks, Associate AIA, LEED AP BD+C, ZGF Architects
Cynthia Ottenbrite, Architect, AndersonMasonDale
Dan Williams, Architect, AndersonMasonDale
Kirsten Walsh, Project Coordinator, AndersonMasonDale

Other CU Anschutz Representatives Present:
Michael Del Guidice, Director of Instutional Planning
Cary Weatherford, Assistant Director of Instutional Planning

Description:
Conceptual Design submittal regarding new 391K SF interdisciplinary facility

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Introductions of the individuals present for this meeting were made after which Mr. Pfeiffer, Mr. Baptista, Mr. Vite, Mr. Dorolek, and Mr. Del Guidice presented or spoke to a brief presentation regarding the campus context, grain; site conditions and challenges; neighboring buildings and areas, especially RC2; the campus master plan; the art walk; adjacent streets; parking; proposed open space; and micro master planning.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m. to take a tour of the subject site prior to traveling to AndersonMasonDale for a lunch break and reconvening the meeting to continue the presentation.

At AndersonMasonDale, Mr. Pfeiffer and Mr. Baptista reviewed the campus framework including a number of high-level principles, vision, and goals; the successful design of outdoor space for the project; daylighting; potential opportunities for retail and/or public access food service space. Also discussed were potential programs that could be visible/on display to the public.

Mr. Baptista presented a number of features and elements for each of three concept design options: #1 – Pavilion, #2 – Neighborhoods, and #3 – Atrium. The discussion for each option included the design concept, various axon illustrations, public realm diagrams, circulation, building section, preliminary floor plans and stacking, various elevation renderings, circulation patterns, and potential open space areas and landscaping, and site climate and sustainability analyses.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board discussed various elements of the options presented after which it took a short break to discuss the submittal. Upon returning to the meeting, Mr. Brandes moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health taking into consideration the comments noted below and matters discussed during the presentation:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Study the northwest corner entry to see if it could be more prominent as a gateway and node:
  - Should access be included on north side at grade level?
  - How can front door entry way be made more obvious to people coming from the north?
  - Consider the amount of pedestrian and vehicle traffic coming from the north.

- Study the southwest corner to see if it could be more significant as a node and special area, as discussed:
  - Café/restaurant/retail options on the ground level will be important.
  - Determine how edges can be activated with the outdoors and the art walk.
  - Study how it can be connected to an entry.

- Study N. Revere Street ("Revere") in terms of the streetscape and kit-of-parts, sense of arrival and gateway along Revere, architectural/streetscape relationship:
  - Keep the Revere street edge at grade.
  - Study front door entry, especially for visitors coming from the north, concentrate activity along the edges on Revere to create a more urban, more dynamic, active center with relationships along this edge and which overflow onto the art walk to create a node and provide a different overall experience.

- Consider options regarding the art walk and how, why, and where it terminates:
  - Does art walk stop at Revere or does it continue to N. Racine Street ("Racine")?
  - What are the implications of that difference on this project?

- Conceptually suggest "preferred massing and placement of buildings" along E. 17th Place to Racine, if applicable.

- Regarding the entrance to parking garage and service way demands along E. 19th Avenue:
  - Look at shaping and directing the way people want to go to enter the structure.
  - Make entrances intuitive in addition to incorporating wayfinding.
  - Work with garage design regarding entrances and the bridge.

- Explore western exposure, views, and relationship to the RC2 Building:
  - Regarding massing, how to take advantage of western exposure, views.
  - Consider limitations of parallel orientation and obstructing views to the west.
  - Investigate more perpendicular orientation.

- Continue to explore service space between RC2 and CCPM&BH buildings.

Architecture:

- Explore internal activitation of the atrium:
    - Increase solar exposure and visibility, open it up more.
    - Connections, what does it tie into?
    - Improve sense of place, more like Neighborhoods concept.

- Shift the core so that when you enter, you're immediately engaged in the space.

- Activate floorplates from a programming standpoint:
    - Move large conference room to level 2.

- Concerns with courtyard:
    - Elevated courtyard is not as inviting if coming from art walk.
    - Entry off of Revere is divorced from the courtyard, so coming in at grade is much more successful.

- Circulation in the Pavilion option seems to bring everything together:
    - Consultant comment: User groups would prefer more articulation/separation between so there can be separate faculty/staff and patient/public sides.

Sustainability and Energy:

- In addition to study of atrium and western perspectives, review how daylighting and views for RC2 Building can be preserved. The current designs generally include massing parallel to the RC2 building, which block views from the existing buiding. In addition, this massing creates a large western exposure which if glazed may be a significant sorce of solar heat gain. Explore solutions that reconcile these concerns.

- The wind and climate studies shown are appreciated, as are the "Sustainability Analysis" diagrams for each scheme. However, there seems to be a disconnect between the design and analysis, in that the schemes are analyzed rather than having the goals drive the design. The "Project Design Principals" should be quantifiable and result in metrics that help inform the design solutions. The Sustainability Analysis metrics shown (such as Envelope Efficiency) may not be appropriate for a building that is likely to be dominated by internal loads rather than the envelope, where as effective daylighting might be measured using a Daylight Autonomy" metric. Align the project principal goals with appropriate metrics.

General:

- Regarding campus master plan:
    - Document decision points that might influence how the master pan should be updated
    - What are key aspects of master plan that impact how to think about access points, design, etc.?
    - What assumptions were built into the design that are related to the master plan?
    - How can these be used to help create framework for next update to the master plan?

- Document comments and guidelines regarding forthcoming garage to the north and buildings to the west to help locate them, locate entrances, and reinforce activity and connections created by CCPM&BH project.

Mr. Winters seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

The Board expressed a desire to meet with the A/E design team prior to the Schematic Design submittal for the purpose of checking on the progress and providing direction, if needed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.