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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, October 12, 2017
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Location: Seminar Room 150, Koelbel Building, CU Boulder

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 André Vite, AIA, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus ("CU Denver").

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 8:10 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly review administrative items with Ms. Gerou and to briefly discuss the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

Additionally, the pre-meeting conference with representatives from CU Boulder and CU Denver also occurred between 9:00 – 10:00 a.m.

10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Tours on the CU Boulder campus, Lunch**

The Board, Ms. Gerou, and various members of the CU Boulder Facilities Planning staff toured areas of the Koelbel Building, focusing on the inside and outside north end between the Koelbel Building and the Engineering Center; areas of the Imig College of Music Building; and the CASE Building. After the tours, the Board took a brief break for lunch.

12:30 - 1:30 p.m. **Business School Phase II - CU Denver**

Architects:
RNL Design, Denver, Colorado/Stantec, Inc., Architects

Presenters:
Aaron Harcek, AIA, LEED AP, Associate Senior Design Architect, RNL Design/Stantec
Angelia Cowgill, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Associate, Architect, RNL Design/Stantec

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

Other Campus Representatives Present:
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning, CU Denver Campus

Description:
This will be the Pre-design presentation for this project. The Business School Phase II is a donor-funded project that involves filling in the interior courtyard of the CU Denver Business School at 15th and Lawrence. The program includes an events center, several classrooms, and office space for the Business School.

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

All individuals present for the meeting introduced themselves after which Mr. Weatherford provided a brief description of the project, the anticipated scope of the project, the history and location of the building, a description of the CU Denver ("UCD") Business School (collectively, the "Business School") program needs, design considerations, the budget and anticipated schedule, and any potential concerns.

- The project team will include representatives from UCD; RNL Denver/Stantec, Denver, Colorado, architects; Shaffer Baucom Engineering & Consulting, Lakewood, Colorado, mechanical, electrical and plumbing engineers; Martin/Martin, Inc., Lakewood, Colorado, structural engineers; and JE Dunn Construction Co., Denver, Colorado, cost estimators.
- The scope of the project will include preparing a conceptual design and the development of a program plan document.
- The building was constructed in 1982, was purchased by the University in 2008 for the purpose of housing the Business School, and was renovated by RNL Design in 2012.
- The UCD neighborhood on the Auraria campus includes three buildings owned by the UCD including the Lawrence Street Center, the CU Denver Building and Annex, and the Business School Building.

Mr. Harcek reviewed a number of graphical images representing the Business School as it exists and as proposed with the infill. He noted that the Business School is surrounded by Lawrence Street, 15th Street, and an alleyway parallel to Lawrence Street. The building currently includes a courtyard area accessed from the alley which is the area of the proposed infill renovation. The renovation will include a multi-function event center on the ground floor which could hold between 300 to 400 people, and the second and third floor upper levels will include a number and variety of classrooms, offices, and a large lecture hall, for an approximate addition of 12,000 square feet.

The design considerations include:

- The alley, the access behind the alley, and making possible connections to Larimer Square stronger;
- Ingress and egress to the Business School from the alley;
- Transparency and visibility of the Business School;
- Requirements of the event center on the first floor;
- Aligning the upper floors of the infill construction with existing circulation and lighting patterns;
- Preserving as much as possible existing daylighting and views;
- Minimizing disruptions from new construction to existing spaces;
- Minimizing mechanical systems as much as possible; and
- The existing structural systems contained within the building.

Mr. Weatherford reviewed the preliminary budget for the proposed project. He noted that it would be entirely cash funded, part of which will be provided through a $4 million gift from a donor. The remaining cost of the project, approximately $6 to $7.5 million, will be provided through a combination of additional gifts and Business School reserves and/or a reduction in Business School programming.

The currently anticipated schedule includes completing the conceptual design process in November 2018, a presentation to Board of Regents Finance Committee in January 2018, which will be followed by a presentation to the Capital Development Committee in February 2018. The remaining design schedule will occur from May to July 2018, with construction occurring from August 2018 through May 2019.

Concerns expressed by the design team and facilities related to the project were reviewed and include:

- A deficit of space needs for the Business School;
- Budget/funding;
- Site staging; and
- Building occupancy during construction.

B. DRB Comments:

Mr. Brandes reviewed the requirements for Conceptual Design (“CD”) submittal as this project moves toward after which the Board shared the following comments and/or concerns with the design team:

- This is an exciting project, and it will be a great asset for the University;
- The building renovations made in 2012 helped to open the building up to the streetscape, improved the urban design, and were a desirable addition to the building in terms of transparency and visibility;
- The building is essentially located in the heart of an entertainment district and the urban connection and the urban design of the area, the existing and potential pedestrian connections, and the continued perspectives of transparency and visibility are all very strong elements and should be all considered and explored as the conceptual design is

developed regardless of how Larimer Square and the alley adjacent to the Business School may be developed in the future;

- Consider the role of the alley in the future of Larimer Square redevelopment and how this addition relates to it in terms of access, view, visibility, exterior aesthetic, etc.
- The programming for the proposed space, especially the elements of the first floor and how those elements will work together physically and logistically, particularly the transparency of the infill project, connections from the pedestrian edge through the building, and the alley itself will need to be taken into consideration while designing and planning the CD submittal;
- Specific logistical issues may include installing and using auditory equipment, safety, access, and distractions from the alley;
- The infill area should be reviewed in order to determine what the nature of the access is, i.e., should it be considered a back door, does it connect to the lobby or to Lawrence Street, is there visibility through the building to the ally via the infill area, etc.;
- With the potential redevelopment of the University's Dravo Annex building, the connections between the Dravo Annex and the Business School could become important and should be considered;
- Regarding the total floor plan of the first floor, consider alternative uses to some of the spaces surrounding the proposed event center, such as opening up the classroom in the corner to enable it to become a more friendly edge and possible entryway to the alley, could windows be added, could storage areas on the left side of the event center be opened up and made into pre-function space or an entry way for the event center, etc., and think about the connectivity to the alley along the left side of the event center and other ways the alley can be activated through this project in order to make it more pedestrian friendly and bring people into the space; and
- Consider the "winners and losers" as a result of the renovation, such as:
    - When the courtyard is filled in, although the building will likely have less heat loss and may perform better from an energy standpoint, it will also enclose a bigger and darker space with fewer windows;
    - Removing the courtyard from the alley space and creating a sheer wall in its place may not make the alley more pedestrian friendly; perhaps consider some articulation of this façade, such as a slight inset to take the place of the courtyard being removed;
    - Consider all of the relationships and study the impact the project will have on the alley itself;
    - While thinking about the options for the design, try to ensure that there are more positive results (i.e., "winners") as a result of the completion of the project; and
- While not working beyond the scope of the contract, consider the big picture and keep in mind the master plan of the surrounding area, what a micro master plan of the immediate area including the Dravo Building, Dravo Annex and Larimer Square would look like, understanding that the context of these areas is changing and what these changes might mean for the project especially in relation to the alley as a major pedestrian connection for the University.

Additionally, in order for the Board to be on the same page with and understand what the design team is trying to achieve, the Conceptual Design submittal should not be limited to but should include clearly articulated information regarding the following:

- Budget, including how the gap between the $4 million which has already been funded and the total cost of the improvements will be funded and what portion of the budget, if any, is attributable toward difficulties related to the construction concerns noted below;
- Schedule,
- Programming;
- Sustainability and energy issues;
- Landscape and exterior urban environmental issues;
- Architectural goals;
- Low-impact related development; and
- Construction, i.e., what the limitations of construction in a fully-occupied building might be, limited lay down space, can the construction crew work in the alley, etc.

The design team should also be prepared to share and explore with the Board the development concepts that were tested, how they arrived at their preferred option, etc., and be able to document the energy, sustainability, other development factors, etc., and be able to speak to these as part of the evaluation for the CD submittal.

The Board recognized where the design team is in terms of the program and the budget and where the it needs to end up in order to make a considered opinion about the project for the CD submittal. The Board also looks forward to this submittal and to being able to share the thought processes regarding planning, design, and the rationale for the final recommendation.

Ms. Cowgill indicated that there will be a challenge in opening up the infill area while still providing the privacy needed for functions in the event Center, so they will be taking these items into consideration as they move forward with the design. She also mentioned that the redevelopment of the Dravo Annex may provide some leverage regarding the alley connection and access for the Business School.

Mr. Harcek also indicated that due to the zero lot line, there may requirements regarding the glass, such as sprinkling and rated glass, which may impact the ultimate design and transparency but that they would keep these things in mind as they move forward with the CD submittal.

1:30 - 2:45 p.m. **Imig Building Addition, College of Music – CU Boulder**

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

Presenters:
Alberto Cavallero, AIA, LEED AP, Pfeiffer Architects
William Murray, FAIA, Pfeiffer Architects
Susannah Drake, FASLA, AIA, Principal, DLAND Studios

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Rachel Stonecypher, Project Manager, Planning and Construction, Facilities Management

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Ann Dang, Intern, Junior, Environmental Design Program
John Davis, Associate Dean, College of Music
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning
Jessica Gammey, Planning Coordinator, Facilities Planning
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Stacey Lindholm, Project Administration/Owner's Representative, Construction and Safety, Facilities Management
Kathan Meyer, Executive Assistant, Planning and Construction, Facilities Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Elisha Reyes, Executive Assistant, Planning, Design and Construction, Facilities Management
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description:
Pre-design introduction presentation for addition to existing Imig Building for the College of Music

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

New members of the Facilities Planning staff and Board members present for the meeting introduced themselves, after which Ms. Kirtland provided a brief history of the expansion project for the Imig Building which began approximately three years ago. The majority of the programming functions for the College of Music ("Music") are located in the Imig Building ("Imig"), but there are also programming functions located at Macky Auditorium ("Macky"). Some of these functions currently located at Macky will be relocated to the new addition at Imig once completed.

The anticipated opening date for the new addition in the summer of 2020 which aligns with Music's 100th anniversary.

Ms. Kirtland provided details regarding the size and approximate completion dates for all of the various sections of the current Imig Building. Portions of the south side of Imig, approximately 9,000 NSF/12,000 GSF, most of which was built in the 1950s, will be demolished in order to make room for the new addition. This side of Imig is one story and, as such, is underutilized. There is also space adjacent to the south side of Imig which can be utilized for an expansion. The expansion will include approximately 72,000 GSF of new construction (the "Addition").

Concerns with this expansion include, but are not limited, to the fact that the remainder of the Imig will be actively in use during construction, and the basement of the south side of the Imig contains a mechanical room which services the east portions of the Imig.

Mr. Murray reviewed the anticipated program elements and related space requirements of the Music upon completion of the addition. He noted that most of the existing space in Imig is highly complicated and acoustically sensitive and that over 80% will require box-in-box construction and will have adjacency and noise control issues. A recital hall, a major rehearsal hall, major teaching studios, multiple practice rooms, large mechanical and electrical rooms, and administrative space will be replaced or added onto through the Addition. Wellness programming space will be included within the Addition. He also reviewed a graphical representation of the programming needs and building massing included within Imig upon completion of the Addition, including space for rehearsal and recital applications, applied instruction and teaching studios, and administration functions.

Additionally, Ms. Kirtland noted that a dance studio for Theatre and Dance Program currently located in the Carlson Gymnasium Building will be relocated to Imig upon completion of the Addition. This programming need has been included within the graphical representation presented by Mr. Murray. She also noted that while Music will continue to have a presence in the Macky related to performance needs but, as desired, the academic needs currently housed at Macky may also be relocated to the Addition.

Ms. Kirtland reviewed the proposed budget for the project of $46.1 million which has been approved by campus leadership and is anticipated to be funded through general campus funding. This budget includes:

Building construction:	$31.2 million
Site/landscape construction	$1.5 million
Utilities:	$1.0 million
Soft costs, FFE, other:	$12.4 million

Mr. Murray reviewed the proposed project schedule including program development, concept design, program plan documentation review, capital construction review, schematic design, design development, construction documents, university approval, and the construction phase, with a targeted completion and move in date in 2020 as noted above. Ms. Kirtland noted that the selection process for CM/GC contractors is currently under way. It is anticipated that the project will return to the Board for conceptual design submittal in November 2017 and schematic design submittal in February 2018.

Ms. Drake and Mr. Cavallero elaborated on the project goals for the College of Music, as well as what the project will do to help improve the CU Boulder campus and the university overall. They reviewed a site analysis, including location; parking; bus, vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation and circulation challenges; permeability and sustainability; pedestrian desire lines and place making opportunities; utilities; street dimensions; site sections including Farrand Field to the east of Imig, 18th Street in front of Imig, and Wardenburg Drive to the south of Imig; existing landscape and topography; site constraints; project extents; and existing circulation and entries for Imig.

Mr. Cavallero discussed the spaces within Imig which will remain after demolition and spaces that may be improved during construction, the portion of Imig which will be demolished, challenges regarding the mechanical room underneath the Addition space, and solar and wind exposure.

Mr. Cavallero and Ms. Drake reviewed a qualitative analysis including the site opportunities which will be provided through the creation of the Addition; the character of adjacent landscaping; a potential material palette for hardscape areas as well as for path, plant, and place; adjacent architecture; the taxonomy, axial alignments, massing and proportions of the area; features of the Imig Building; and ending with a potential materials palette for the Addition itself.

The Board expressed its appreciation to the design team for the thoughtful and comprehensive presentation, noting how complete and informative the analysis was and how helpful learning about how the design team arrived at its proposed solutions was.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board also shared the following comments. In order to inform the design of the Conceptual Design submittal, the design team was encouraged to:

- Consider creating a post-occupancy evaluation regarding traffic, sound, adjacencies, etc., i.e. what existing building conditions are not working now and which and how might these things be repaired with the Addition, and identify these improvements as goals;
- Consider identifying specific goals related to the three areas of DRB focus: architectural goals, campus/landscape goals, and sustainable design goals. These are to be included within the next submittal and used to guide the evolution of the design.
- Evaluate how the massing, shading, edges, acoustical needs of the Addition, etc., will create challenges for the vehicular and pedestrian edges along 18th Street and Wardenburg Drive due to the high levels of all types of traffic along 18th Street, increasing the south side of Imig from one story to four or five stories, creating a permeable façade along the south side, etc., and what opportunities might be available to address these challenges;
- Review how the connections will be made from the Addition to existing Imig structure;
- Consider ways to make the scope of the pre-function area and the related axis of the Addition meaningful;
- Review the sections presented and consider including the following in the Conceptual Design submittal:
    - Extend the section from Farrand Hall through Imig further west beyond 18th Street so it shows the scale of the CASE Building;
    - Include a second section of 18th Street showing potential future changes of the street and pedestrian pathways; and
    - Include an additional section of Wardenburg Health indicating what it and what Wardenburg Drive might become in the future and what impact the Addition may have on these spaces.
- Regarding the analysis illustrating multiple street dimensions to the west of Imig and how the streets relate to the surrounding buildings, explore how can the area be normalized and/or transformed into a transit environment that would be beneficial to the future needs of the area, taking into consideration entries and senses of places that might not have existing before the Addition;
- Consider and present a few alternative options regarding the future use of the parking lot across 18th Street from Imig and how these options might affect the Addition;
- In anticipation that Imig will be a music building on campus for years to come, determine what this means to the building:

  - While keeping a balance between the traditional form and continuity of character on campus and what the future might bring, how do these things transform the design of the Addition, specifically regarding the form of the building, its presence on the site, and the outdoor spaces adjacent to it;
  - Since the entry is likely moving and the current entry is on axis with Euclid, consider the view axis and how the new entry will transform the building;
  - How is the fact that it is a music building indicated to the rest of the campus;
  - What might the future of music be and how could this inform the building; and
  - What does sustainability, technology, etc., mean to the building, now and in the future.
- Consider the various opportunities regarding the external and internal relationships and corresponding fenestration for Imig and the Addition while moving forward to the Conceptual Design submittal;
- In order to help the Board collaborate and share with the design team and better understand the team's thought processes for the conceptual level design related to architectural massing, urban design relationships, etc., enhance the process by sharing alternative design concepts and how the team arrived at its recommendations; and
- Explore the ideas that on most campuses, music buildings are uniquely different and Imig is an island in and of itself so explore ways that it might inspire music and become a place of solace, respite and healing along with its connectivity to Farrand Field and the urban congestion and chaos along the street level and how these juxtapositions influence the vitality and mixture of the place.

The possibility that this Addition may not be the last change to Imig and that Imig may continue to be enhanced with future additions was discussed.

Ms. Gerou inquired about the State requirements and campus guidelines regarding sustainability and energy usage. Mr. Haverly indicated that the campus has a LEED Gold Plus goal which would be applied to this Addition, but the specific goals are yet to be determined.

The Board again expressed its appreciation to the design team for the Pre-Design presentation and indicated that it looked forward to the Conceptual Design submittal.

3:00 - 4:15 p.m. **Ramaley Addition, Integrative Physiology Relocation – CU Boulder**

Architects:
Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado, architects
RATIO Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Jennifer Cordes, AIA, LEEP AP, Principal, CPSO, Hord Coplan Macht
Chris Boardman, AIA, LEED AP, Principal/STEM, RATIO Architects

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Management
Richelle Reilly, Landscape Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Management

Others Present:
Tim Wellner, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager, Hord Coplan Macht
Chris McBride, ASLA, Landscape Architect, Hord Coplan Macht
David Shaffer, Architect, RATIO Architects

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Ann Dang, Intern, Junior, Environmental Design Program
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning
Jessica Gammey, Planning Coordinator, Facilities Planning
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Stacey Lindholm, Project Administration/Owner's Representative, Construction and Safety, Facilities Management
Kathan Meyer, Executive Assistant, Planning and Construction, Facilities Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Elisha Reyes, Executive Assistant, Planning, Design and Construction, Facilities Management
Jennifer Shannon Law, Manager of Operations, IPHY
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Zach Tepper, Physical Plant Manager, IPHY & Arts & Sciences

Description:
Pre-deisgn introduction presentation for addition to existing Ramaley Building for the Integrative Physiology Relocation

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Northcutt began the presentation by reviewing a brief history and purpose of the Integrative Physiology ("IPHY") program on the CU Boulder campus after which introductions of individuals in attendance for the presentation were made.

Mr. Northcutt noted that the Conceptual Design submittal is anticipated for the November 2017 DRB meeting followed by meetings with the Finance Committee in January 2018, the Board of Regents in February 2018, followed by the Capital Development Committee after the Board of Regents.

Ms. Cordes elaborated on the IPHY program, noting that volunteers participate in IPHY research and come to the IPHY space every day. She also reviewed the goals for the project:

- Establish an identify and brand for the IPHY program;
- Create a timeless functional, flexible and adaptable space with character; and
- Providing a sense of health for the faculty, students, and clinical volunteers.

The estimated size of the IPHY addition will be approximately 6,000 SF/floor over four occupied levels with a mechanical penthouse level for a total of 25,000 – 28,000 GSF with a proposed budget for the program includes:

Construction Costs	$14.7 million
Site Costs	$700,000
FFE, Construction Contingency	$1.1 million
Other Soft Costs	$4.3 million
Total project budget	$20.8 million

Additionally, Ms. Cordes elaborated on the anticipated project schedule, noting that at this time, the anticipated timing for the schematic design submittal to the Board will be at their meeting in January 2018.

Mr. McBride and Mr. Boardman reviewed and elaborated on the following:

- Circulation and connectivity:
    - Vehicular network and program needs;
    - Campus pedestrian networks;
    - Campus bicycle networks; and
    - Axial plan;
- Greenspaces;
- Area plan and various site analyses;
- Connectivity including multi-use, pedestrian and bicycle paths;
- Existing utility services in the area;
- Setbacks and alignments;
- Existing topography and vegetation;
- Anticipated definition of the site;
- Current uses and existing elements along the north side of the Norlin Library;
- Various site views of the surrounding areas;
- Examples of campus courtyards and materials; and
- Site programming, challenges, and opportunities.

Ms. Cordes discussed the need for IPHY's volunteers to arrive at the facility with a normal heart rate with Ms. Shannon Law and Ms. Cordes. This requirement, related to the clinical research, may be solved by acquiring an electric cart to transport the volunteers to and from the new facility space and campus parking. Ms. Shannon Law also elaborated on the current facilities IPHY is using at the Carlson Gymnasium, all of which will move to the new IPHY addition to the Ramaley Building. IPHY's administrative offices currently located in the Clare Small Building north of the Ramaley Building will continue to be housed at Clare Small.

Additional information related to the site neighborhood shared with the Board included:

- Architecture of surrounding building within the neighborhood;
- Historical background, existing conditions and floorplan analysis of the Ramaley Building;
- Challenges and opportunities related to the Ramaley Building and IPHY Addition;
- Analysis of materials, details, and entries of existing Ramaley Building;

Ms. Cordes also briefly reviewed preliminary environmental and sustainability goals for the IPHY Addition including:

- Opportunity to tie into and upsize the generator at Porter rather than building a new generator at the IPHY Addition;
- Identifying spaces in the IPHY Addition which will be laboratories in the beginning vs. laboratories in the future vs. always office uses and how heat recovery and/or energy savings using two air handling units in lieu of one air handling unit which would then provide 100 percent outside air for the entire building which will impact the mechanical penthouse;
- Storm water runoff and drainage; and
- Potential opportunities to locate a "freezer farm" in the IPHY Addition utilizing approximately 400 SF and new freezers as a service to the programs on the campus and what this function may do to the energy utilization for the IPHY Addition.

While this building may be too small for this purpose, a resiliency meeting was held on the campus and these discussions will continue. It was noted that the flat roof of the Ramaley Building is currently unencumbered and may be a potential location for future photovoltaic equipment. Wind and shadow studies will be performed for a future submission.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board discussed the design team's preliminary thoughts regarding the overall infrastructure, the utilities, storm drainage, and the desired sensory/healing gardens.

For the forthcoming Conceptual Design submittal, the Board indicated that the design team should include at a minimum additional existing images of Ramaley and surrounding areas; various site sections; how the IPHY Addition interfaces with and connects to the surrounding areas; information regarding site constraints, especially concerning infrastructure and landscaping perspectives; and ideas regarding how the Board can best work together with the design team in order to move the project forward.

Based on the fact that the Board did not receive the "Pre-Design packet" prior to the meeting, it was suggested that a "Pre-Design Workshop" be held prior to preparing the Conceptual Design submittal.

4:15 – 5:00 p.m. **Muenzinger Air Intake Exterior Structure Improvements – CU Boulder**

Engineers:

Martin and Martin, Lakewood, Colorado, structural engineers

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Ann Dang, Intern, Junior, Environmental Design Program
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Jessica Gammey, Planning Coordinator, Facilities Planning
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Kathan Meyer, Executive Assistant, Planning and Construction, Facilities Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description:
Conceptual Design submittal addressing the temporary exterior structure of the Muenzinger air intake near the intersection of 18th & Colorado, replacing the temporary structure with a permanent structure

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Freeman presented the Conceptual Design ("CD") submittal for the permanent structure addressing the Muenzinger Psychology Building ("Muenzinger") air intake located at the intersection of 18th Street and Colorado Avenue. She provided a brief overview of the purpose of the project and reviewed the goals of the project:

- Protect the air intake from noxious fumes caused by traffic at the intersection in the same manner as the temporary structure;
- Complement the existing architecture of the Muenzinger and existing site adjacencies in the area, especially concerning the materiality, fenestration, and architectural rhythm and expression, without feeling like an appendage to Muenzinger;
- Incorporate other uses such as seating, signage, and planting

The project schedule anticipates constructure during the summer of 2018, although there is no approved construction funding at this time.

Ms. Freeman reviewed the following:

- Site context;
- Project limits;
- Existing conditions and site views;
- Existing site access and features;

- Pedestrian and traffic flows;
- Existing topography and utilities;
- Adjacent site character and Muenzinger materiality;
- Existing conditions of the air intake;

She also noted that there is a lack of greenery surrounding the air intake. Additionally, there is a number of bicycle racks adjacent to the air intake which are regularly used and should not be displaced by the new structure. There are several instances of curved site walls and lighting in the site area as well, although the project may provide an opportunity to increase the lighting at the site.

Another element to consider while designing the permanent structure is a fire department connection adjacent to the south wall of Muenzinger just to the west of the air intake. Code regulations require that no structure be built within three feet to the east, west, or south of this connection.

Regarding the new, permanent structure, Ms. Freeman presented a number of possible options including:

- Initial concepts concerning a possible seat wall to be incorporated into the structure;
- Concept A which includes two curved seat walls, one detached to the west side of the structure and one adjacent to the east side of the structure, and proposed signage in the center of the south structure wall;
- Concept B including an attached seat wall curved around the southwest end and an attached, stepped back raised planter around the southeast corner with signage located behind the planter; and
- Concept C, the preferred option, also including an attached seat wall curved around the southwest end and an attached, stepped back raised planter around the southeast corner with signage located behind the planter, but in a different, more curvilinear design configuration than what was presented in Concept B.

B. DRB Comments:

Upon completion of the presentation by Ms. Freeman, the Board shared the following comments and suggestions:

- The proposed height is appropriate in that it fits well with the existing constraints of Muenzinger and helps keep the structure from appearing like an attachment to the building;
- Consider the following:
    - Keeping the structure a simpler, rectangular shape, would, overall, be more preferable than combining the various elements into a curvilinear design;
    - Using primarily one material for the surface of the wall would also be preferable;
    - A concrete frame could be used if the frame if it relates to the structure behind it;
    - If included within the design, the height of the seat wall should be one level, with the depth of the wall increasing in conjunction with the slope of the ground;
    - The purpose of the structure is a screen and that adding the stepped and curvilinear elements may be trying to make the structure more than it is;

- Evaluate the need to step the planter out from the main structure as this might be making the design more complicated than it needs to be and is encroaching into an already congested area;
- Extending the existing ground-level planting area currently located on the west side of the southwest corner of Muenzinger, around the stair tower, curving the extension on the other side of the existing bicycle racks toward the fire department connection might provide the desired greenery;
- Incorporating the signage into the project may be complicating the design; investigate the need for the signage altogether given the location of similar signage across the sidewalk and consider either making it a separate, stand-alone element or relocating to a new location it on the wall where it might be more readable and accessible (without a planter at the base); and
- Modifying the design in order to resolve the setback immediately to the east of the stair tower caused by the three-foot code requirement related to the fire department connection.

The Board agreed that the Conceptual Design submittal regarding the Muenzinger Air Intake Exterior Structure should be resubmitted.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.