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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, September 8, 2016
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Location: McAllister Building, Sustainability, Energy and Environment Complex (SEEC), 4001 Discovery Drive, C120A & B, University of Colorado Boulder

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay, Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (ex officio), and Tom Goodhew and Richelle Reilly, campus representatives for the University of Colorado Boulder Campus ("CU Boulder ") and André Vite, campus representative for the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus ("CU Anschutz Medical Campus" or "CU Anschutz").

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

10:00 - 10:30 Study Session – CU Boulder, Board only

The Board met in a private session to review the procedures for the day's meetings with Ms. Brown and to discuss the first item on the agenda with Richelle Reilly, CU Boulder Campus Landscape Architect, prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the public portion of the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m., after which he introduced Sarah Brown, a newly appointed member of the Design Review Board, and other individuals present for the meeting also introduced themselves.

10:30 - 12:00 North of Boulder Creek Bridge Replacement – CU Boulder

Architects: Loris and Associates Consulting Engineers, Louisville, Colorado

Campus Presenters:
Brian Moffitt, Project Manager, Planning, Design & Construction, Facilities Management
Amy Kirtland, Architect & Project Planner, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Other Presenters:
Dan Beltzer, P.E., Loris and Associates Consulting Engineers
Chase Mullen, Director, MIG, Inc., Architects and Planners

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Planner, Facilities Planning
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning
William "Bill" Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Ida Mae Isaac, Senior Project Coordinator, Facilities Planning
David Kang, Vice Chancellor for Infrastructure and Safety
Wayne Northcutt, Architect – Facilities Planner

Description: Conceptual submittal for the design and construction of a bridge across Boulder Creek connecting the main campus with the North of Boulder Creek neighborhood, to be partially funded by FEMA.

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Moffitt and Ms. Kirtland provided an update to the Board regarding the current status of the bridge crossing project, including the proposed design options, modifications to the project as compared to the original grant proposal for two bridge crossings and accompanying pathways, the hydrology and related floodplain of the area, project and funding-related requirements by FEMA. The funding for the grant will remain at a total of $3.8 million, of which FEMA will provide 75% and the University will provide 25%, and will now include the removal of three existing bridges to be replaced with one new bridge in the North of Boulder Creek neighborhood. The requirements for the new bridge are that it will be above the 100-year floodplain elevation and that it will be a non-break-away bridge.

A historical and cultural studies report has been submitted to the State Historical Preservation Office ("SHPO") and the City of Boulder related to a number of the specific sites located within the project boundaries. The report indicated that there were two site features that are historically eligible which include the existing stone 21st Street bridge and stone walls located along the site built by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Staff is waiting to receive a response back from SHPO regarding whether or not they agree with the report and what mitigation might be required if any of these sites are altered as a result of the conditions of the FEMA grant. The new bridge project will not affect the stone walls but will require that the 21st Street bridge be removed. The determination from SHPO may not be received prior to the submittal of Phase I documents to FEMA. FEMA has indicated that delays related to SHPO determinations are not uncommon and should pose no problem moving forward with the project.

Specific changes to the FEMA grant include a request for 1) a three-month extension to late January 2017 for the submission of the Phase I design and related studies and 2) a reduction in the number of FEMA-funded bridges from two bridges down to one bridge, which is now proposed for a crossing at 23rd Street. After additional consideration was given to the hydrological/floodplain issues of the site, it was determined that the budget of the original grant for approximately $3.8 million would be sufficient for the 23rd Street Bridge crossing and approximately $6 million would be allocated using separate funding sources for the 19th Street Bridge crossing. The amount of the grant for the 23rd Street Bridge will remain the same for the

construction of one bridge and, of that amount, the amount allotted to complete the Phase I design and related studies cannot exceed $200,000.

Mr. Moffitt reviewed an additional condition by FEMA to maintain the cost-to-benefit ratio as originally proposed and to document that it can be built at or below budget and document the mitigation that will be required regarding the historical features. He noted that this project may not move forward if all of the FEMA conditions cannot be met.

Ms. Kirtland indicated that CU Boulder has been awarded a $6 million Transportation Improvement Program grant from the Denver Regional Council of Governments ("DRCOG") for the construction of the 19th Street bridge previously proposed for FEMA funding. DRCOG will provide 80% of the funding, and the University will provide a 20% match. The crossing location of this second bridge will be at or near 19th Street and will include an ADA trail connection leading up to the main campus.

The Board reviewed a slide presentation of various maps, site images, sample bridge images, concept drawings, site plans, and renderings prepared by Loris and Associates and 3D sketch-up models prepared by consultants at MIG showing two potential design options for the 23rd Street location. These concepts were discussed with the consultants and staff. It was noted that the uniqueness of combining stairs along with the crossing itself results in few, or possibly no, precedents regarding design options. After holding a charrette to study multiple design options, staff and consultants settled on using an arch design due to the hydrological/floodplain and existing site-specific requirements.

Staff noted that a specific pedestrian connection to Arapahoe and the final layout of the recreation fields have not yet been integrated into the master plan for the neighborhood.

The Board discussed the location of the proposed 23rd Street bridge, including the alignment of the bridge, the configuration of the athletic/recreation fields, the need for a pedestrian pathway to Arapahoe Avenue, the design and function of both of the north and south landings of the bridge, and specific suggestions regarding the proposed designs for the bridge itself, including the structure, railings, and the overall function, context, connection to the CU Boulder campus and aesthetics of the entire project.

The Board held an executive session with the staff Board liaisons, Brian, Amy and Richelle, in order to discuss the options presented and develop recommendations for moving forward.

The consultant team and other staff returned to the meeting, at which point Mr. Brandes indicated that no approval is required at the conceptual design level, but rather the Board will provide direction which will enable the project to move forward for the review and approval required at the schematic design submittal. He then noted the need for the design team to do the following:

1. Documentation and Clarification of Existing Conditions
   Provide better documentation to the Board so that a more complete understanding of the existing conditions (some of which may already be in process) can be obtained, including, but not limited to:
   - Evaluating the limits of construction, especially as related to the existing floodway/floodplain;

- Evaluating the existing conditions survey including, for example, the location of the trees, walls, slopes, existing site features, etc.;
- From a conceptual standpoint illustrate the conceptual layout, functions and impacts of the future athletic/recreation fields;
- Relationship of the bridge to the North Boulder Creek Master Plan;
- For both the north and south ends of the project, determining the horizontal and vertical control of the topography, reviewing the gradients and how each landing relates to the floodplain/floodway analysis, slopes, topography, vegetation, views, gathering areas, traffic, drainage, etc.; and
- Provide more comprehensive information on the existing Buff Walk, railing details, etc.

2. Develop and provide conceptual programs and plans for the north and south landing areas that take the following into consideration:
    - The north landing will need to accommodate and take into consideration daily needs for the student body, game day pedestrian volume, ease of daily pedestrian movement, vehicular movement patterns, bicycles, emergency access, etc. Similarily, the south landing should be a gateway to the stadium and university from the proposed North Boulder Creek development area, as master planned; and
    - The landings should reflect the history and context of both the university and Boulder Creek as a crossing. Each landing should be a welcoming gateway that is intuitive to use and connected to its unique setting and reflective of the university. The landings provide important transitions to other spaces at the north and south and should be considered in context. This especially includes the pedestrian flow from each direction and the aesthetic expression of each landing.

3. Provide Conceptual Studies of the Bridge Crossings and the Connection/Relationship to the Landings:
    - Illustrate and discuss how each conceptual bridge crossing relates to the following attributes:
        - Character/relationship to the university and Boulder Creek
        - Theme/sense of place
        - Materiality/texture
        - Design integrity, i.e., regarding the proposed designs; reconsider how to integrate a stair and a bridge. All of the references shown were of bridges; however, the vertical gain in this crossing requires understanding how to integrate the geometries of a stair and a bridge.
        - Be cognizant of the size of the bridge. We may prefer the emphasis to be on the path through the trees, rather than three-story arches.
        - Consider reducing the number of plazas to the center of the bridge and the two landings.
        - The stair bridge will be seen primarily from the north looking south. This aspect should be carefully studied as an access, entrance and egress.
        - Specifically bring together the geometry of the lower truss, the stair, the railing, the larger arch (if necessary), so they are better resolved and more naturally integrated;
        - Seasonality, e.g., how will the bridge function during the winter, summer, various weather conditions, etc.; and

  - Programmatic standpoints, e.g., how will it behave during different use cases, for example, on a Tuesday afternoon at 3 p.m., a game day, how will the overlooks function, etc.
- Investigate additional design options for the Bridge Crossings; and
- Relate the bridge to the university:
  - Determine and demonstrate how it can be an extension of the Buff Walk;
  - Take into consideration that the crossing will be in a forest between the trees;
  - As an extension of the campus, expand the "lens" and look all the way to Arapahoe to identify the relationship with the bridge;
  - Address adding a major bridge element in a university setting; and
  - Step away from the known parameters and look at how the bridge relates to the university, what is the meaning of the bridge, what is the purpose, what are the precedents.

4. Increase the use of graphic technologies and methods to better illustrate and document the conceptual schemes:
   - Provide additional information regarding existing conditions;
   - Increase the number of cross sections, views, walkthroughs;
   - Consider additional methodologies; and
   - Provide the Board with a conceptual design approach that yields a "preferred direction" that can lead to a supportable schematic design submittal.

Next steps:

- Continue to work with the University of Colorado professional staff to illustrate and resolve the issues described above.
- Return to the Board in October, 2016, for a workshop session where the plans and drawings can be discussed in more detail.
- The objective of the workshop will be to prepare the consultant team for a schematic design submittal in November, 2016;
- It is possible that the October DRB workshop would also help with the completion of the cost/benefit analysis required for the FEMA Phase I submission in January 2017;
- The consultant team is encouraged to explore conceptual alternatives that the Board can respond to and serve as the basis for schematic design; and
- Given the timing and status of the project, it will be acceptable to bring the workshop plans and materials to the October DRB meeting and not submit the materials in advance.

1:00 - 1:20 **Library Quad Lighting Enhancements – CU Anschutz**

Architects: Clanton & Associates Lighting Design and Engineering, Boulder, Colorado

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

Other Presenters:
Dane Sanders, PE, Principal, Clanton & Associates

Description: Design Development Presentation

Presentation to the Board:

Mr. Vite indicated that this project was previously brought to the Board for conceptual design review during which the overall concepts were well received. The Board provided a few suggestions which were then incorporated into a schematic design review submittal. This presentation for design development is to ensure that the final design is acceptable to the Board.

Mr. Sanders reviewed the proposed lighting concepts and locations for the Library Quad Plaza, including the goals for the project, which are to improve visibility and the health, safety and welfare of individuals using the area through vertical and horizontal illuminance while maintaining low glare and to accent architectural features.

Mr. Vite noted that the budget for the project is $250,000, and that the projected total cost of the project will be over $400,000. He indicated that the Board approval being requested will be for the overall project package and that a phasing methodology for the project will be determined internally so it can be built and installed over time.

Facilities impacted by the lighting improvements include the exterior, interior seating areas, and the external entry canopy of the Library Tower; light obelisks, pedestrian and accent balustrades and columns, the circular planter, the sculpture at the Pharmaceutical Building, the World War I memorial ("Beehive"), pathways and additional electrical system modifications. In order to determine the exact placement of the new fixtures, where needed, mockups can be completed on site prior to final installations. Mr. Sanders noted that related to the circular planter, due to the varying widths of the overhang surrounding the flagstone panels used to create planter, using linear lighting may not be possible in which case stepped lighting can be used and he indicated that performing a mockup for this area prior to determining the best option would be preferred.

While reviewing the submittal package, the Board suggested the following:

1. The fixtures being attached to the exterior of the Library Tower be painted to match the limestone;
2. The lighting for the external entry canopy of the Library Tower may need to be one of the brightest and/or densest elements of the whole landscape since it is the entry into the Library Tower building;
3. For the suggested obelisk lighting, the Board preferred the Ecosense lighting fixture;
4. For the balustrade lighting, the Board agreed with the proposed Luminii linear light strip;
5. For the new fixtures to be added to the tops of the columns, the Board also agreed that a flat-topped lantern should be used;
6. Related to the circular planter, the Board agreed with the suggestion that a mockup for this area be completed in order to determine the best lighting option prior to final installation;
    - Additionally, the Board indicated a preference for the linear lighting, if possible, since this would provide more vertical illumination but if not possible, the stepped lighting would be acceptable;

7. Also regarding the circular planter, the Board indicated a preference for lighting the trees regardless of which lighting option is selected for the planter itself; and
8. The Board inquired about whether the "Beehive" could be lit from the tree canopy rather than uplighting it from the ground.

Mr. Winters moved to approve the design development submittal package. The motion was seconded by Mr. Olgyay and unanimously passed.

1:25 - 1:45 **Breckenridge Parking Lot Expansion – CU Anschutz**

Architects: Kimley Horn, Denver, Colorado

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

Description: A total of 179 parking spaces will be added to the Breckenridge Parking Lot. The expansion will be towards the west, occupying the existing field to the south of the Pharmacy Building. The project is for information only.

Presentation to the Board:

Mr. Vite indicated that he had only recently become aware of this project and was providing a brief, informative update to the Board. The expansion will be of the same character as the other parking lots in the area and will accommodate an additional 179 parking spaces. Mr. Vite has been unable to connect with the project manager at Kimley Horn as this person has been out of the country. As such, Mr. Vite suggested that this matter be continued to the next meeting of the Board since he had minimal knowledge about the project.

With respect to this matter, though, Mr. Vite requested direction from the Board regarding what types of projects need to come before the Board for review or other action. Mr. Brandes indicated that if the project receives capital funding or if it requires the hiring of consultants, then the project should be referred through the four-step review and approval process already defined for the Board. Otherwise, the project can come before the Board as an informational or consensual item.

The Board discussed the layout of the proposed parking lot expansion and desired pedestrian access from the Henderson parking garage and provided Mr. Vite with some suggested improvements.

Mr. Vite also provided an update to the Board regarding the status of the following:

- An area east of the University of Colorado Hospital currently used for storing construction tractors and trailers whereby the construction trailers have been removed and replaced with temporary double-wide trailers to be used for swing space during a remodeling project within the hospital;
- A new potential project originally proposed for a new data center and faculty office space building which has been revised to house personalized medicine, genetics research and biopharmatics programs and includes an expansion of the building from 75,000 square feet to 220,000 square feet;

- A request from the chancellor that a holistic inventory of all of the space at the CU Anschutz campus be completed in order to determine all of the space needs for the campus;
- A new wellness center for the University of Colorado Denver ("CU Denver") campus in Downtown Denver which was approved by the applicable design review board, and other space renovations related to Downtown Denver classroom space;
- The current signage project at CU South Denver; and
- The master plan update project for CU Denver.

The Board discussed additional administrative matters with Ms. Osborne.

Due to timing constraints, the tour of the Boulder campus previously scheduled on the agenda will be rescheduled.

There being no further business, the public meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.