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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Amended Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Location: Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado, and via Zoom

DRB and Campus Members present:
Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, Jered Minter, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus ("CU Denver"), and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Sarah Brown was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict.

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

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:43 a.m.

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

The DRB reviewed the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:30 – 10:30 a.m. **CEDC DRT Study Session – Board Only**

The DRB met with Jered Minter to review the CU Denver College of Engineering, Design, and Computing Building schematic design submittal.

Additionally, University of Colorado President Todd Saliman joined the meeting to present an award to Chris Shears recognizing and thanking him for his service on the DRB.

10:45 – 11:45 a.m. **Fleming Building Phase II Renovation, Window Replacement – *CU Boulder***
Information Only (No Action)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
Anderson Mason Dale Architects ("AMD")
Ambient Energy

Presenters:
Andrew Nielsen, Anderson Mason Dale
John Everin, Anderson Mason Dale
Linda Morrison, Ambient Energy

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Description:
Informational submittal for window replacement and thermal improvements to the exterior walls of the Fleming Building. This project follows the west tower renovation completed in 2019 and includes 13,600 SF of interior renovations to the center of the building for the School of Education.

A/E Presentation

The presenters gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

The project scope does not include any site or landscape architecture improvements.

B. Architecture

- Given the constraints of the project and the desire to make the renovated window appear as close to original as possible, the DRB felt the proposal was the right solution.
- The DRB liked the selection of glass proposed.
- Regarding the window frames:
  - The DRB preference is for all steel frames because they would be a better match to the original. However, since this is not within budget, the DRB agreed that the combined aluminum frame with the middle steel mullion is a good alternative.
  - Concern was expressed about whether the steel and aluminum elements of the window frames would appear the same as they aged. Andrew Nielsen from AMD confirmed that the metals, both anodized, would age at the same rate.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- The design is limited by space constraints on the glazing selection. The proposed window is double pane. In order to achieve the desired appearance and energy requirements, the windows will be triple glazed with tinting on multiple surfaces. The DRB agreed with this solution.
- The DRB asked if the spandrel would be improved, especially concerning thermal bridging. Andrew Nielsen from AMD indicated that the spandrel will be insulated and that additional spray foam insulation will be added to resolve existing energy leakage.
- Concerns regarding using operable windows vs. non-operable windows were discussed. d'Andre Willis explained the reasons why operable windows will not be used.

DRB Action

No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB provided the comments noted above and indicated that this matter would not need to return to the DRB for further review.

11:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Potts Field Concessions and Restrooms Building – *CU Boulder* Pre-Design** (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
TBD

Presenters:
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect
Jason DePaepe, Deputy Athletic Director, Athletics
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Ryan Moeller, Project Manager, Facilities Planning

Description:
Pre-Design submittal for new 3,000 SF building adjacent to Potts Track & Field to house ADA restrooms, storage space, and concessions in preparation for the May 2024 PAC12 Track & Field Championship.

A/E Presentation

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

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

Regarding the submittal and the current site, staff confirmed the following to which the DRB agreed or expressed understanding:

- No signage will be submitted in conjunction with this proposal.
- The goal is for the surface on the track to last approximately 15 years.
- Temporary bleachers can be rented as needed for events until track facilities are moved to a permanent location north of Boulder Creek (as shown in the campus master plan).
- No additional parking is planned at the existing location.
- Due to cost, some of the desired improvements to the field will not be completed as part of the project.

B. Architecture

- Consider relocating access to the janitor closet from an interior restroom to the outside of the building. This would provide more functional and equitable access to staff.

C. Energy and Sustainability

No comments.

DRB Action

No formal action was required for this submittal. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above and indicated that it will discuss what additional levels of review are needed.

1:00 – 2:30 p.m. **Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre Renovation – *CU Boulder***
Conceptual Design (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
Hacker Architects, Colorado
Handprint Architecture, Colorado
WENK Associates, Inc., Landscape Architecture, Colorado
Ambient Energy, Colorado

Presenters:
Tania Salgado, Handprint Architects
David Keltner, Hacker Architects
Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates, Inc.
Linda Morrison, Ambient Energy

Others Presenter:
Kaitlin Bernal, Wenk Associates

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Architect, Senior Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning, (via Zoom)
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Brian Lindoerfer, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect
Others attending via Zoom:
Emina Begovic, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Resource Management, Academic Affairs
Blake Guyer, Project Manager, Facilities Planning
Dena Heisner, Project Manager, Facilities Planning
Marni Wheaton, Project Coordinator, Facilities Planning

Description:
Conceptual Design ("CD") submittal for a complete renovation of Hellems, site work at building entries, and a limited scope renovation of the Mary Rippon Theatre, continued from June 14, 2022.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments and Action

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The DRB appreciated the proposed design of:
  - The plaza walls;
  - The mirrored courtyard areas; and
  - The theatre lighting.
- The DRB supports the proposed landscape solutions and the ADA access and circulation improvements at the building entrance and in the theatre.
- At the Schematic Design ("SD") submittal, determine if there are additional areas where handrails can be eliminated while still meeting ADA and code requirements.
- At SD, include details regarding the callouts for materiality, pavement, scoring, site lighting and signage.
- At SD, include detailed callouts for the planting areas, such as irrigated, non-irrigated, shrub, turf, seasonality, and the mix of vegetation and trees.
- Where the three buckthorns are currently planted in the theatre, the smaller trees proposed will frame the theatre nicely.
- Continue to study how WiFi and electricity can be provided in the theatre space to encourage its use as an outdoor classroom.

B. Architecture

- The east and main entrances as designed are significantly improved over the existing conditions.
  - Study the vertical proportion of the new east doorway. Consider adding a header or spandrel to match the transom.

Comments about the theatre:

- Identify opportunities for multiple individuals in wheelchairs to sit together.
- Consider design alternatives for the sound booth.
- Continue to study the exits into the building at the courtyard and café. Consider the direction of the door swings with regard to wheelchair accessibility. Concern was raised with the exiting into the building (by accessibility patrons) in an emergency. Consider opening the doorway into the concessions area to provide for an operable glass wall system (to alleviate the issue of door swings in an emergency).

C. Energy and Sustainability

- Work with the manufacturer to model the proper u-factor energy performance of the windows:
  - Steel is less conductive than aluminum; and
  - The campus standard u-factor is 0.27.
- Determine if a true air barrier can be introduced in the roof design. If so, it may need to be placed on the inside to maintain its integrity. This could provide more benefit in reducing heating requirements, especially with the additional insulation.
- Consider selecting mechanical equipment that targets the health of building occupants through improved air quality:

  - The recommended VAV systems don't seem appropriate; and
  - The displacement cabinet chilled beam seems like the right approach.
- Regarding LEED scorecard:
  - What is the initial energy target?
  - What is the estimate LEED baseline energy use for this building?
  - Continue to study whether any campus-wide solar collection could be allocated toward this project's performance.
  - Provide additional information about the safety-first pilot credit.
- Provide additional information about the daylighting pilot program.

DRB Action

Don Brandes moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre Renovation, including the comments noted above. Cheri Gerou seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2:30 – 4:00 p.m. **Residence One – *CU Boulder***
Pre-Design (Information/Direction)

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

Presenters:
Daniel Lee, Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
Sarah Astheimer, Field Operations
Andrew Nielsen, Anderson Mason Dale

Others Present:
Thomas Kirk, Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
Erin Hillhouse, AMD
Karli Molter, Field Operations

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Dan Getty, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect
Brian Lindoerfer, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management
Patricia McNally-Leef, Project Manager, Housing Facilities Services

Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Description:
Pre-Design submittal for introduction of Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek ("NBC") neighborhood.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The site poses interesting challenges with regard to the floodplain and connectivity to the main campus and surrounding communities. The DRB observed:
    - Every property developed in the neighborhood will meet the ground at different elevations since the ground plane slopes gently downhill.
    - This site, along with Terrace Green and the 19th Street Pedestrian Bridge, may eventually become a gateway to the university.
    - The new neighborhood will be more densely developed than the existing neighborhood.
    - Consider that having the same, uniform look across all of the new buildings in the neighborhood isn't necessarily the right direction.
        - The neighborhood should have some texture and variety.
        - Be mindful about the additional amenities built in the neighborhood and creating meaningful open space.
- Regarding the floodway/floodplain in the area of this project, staff confirmed:
    - A Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from FEMA is on record and was accepted by the City of Boulder as part of the recent pedestrian bridge project. Each future project in the floodway/floodplain will need to go through a flood development review process.
    - A flood development permit is required.
    - The building will need to be elevated above the flood plain.
        - The DRB suggested that this will create an artificial terraced plateau that will become the finished floor elevation for this project and most of the surrounding development.
        - Determine the implications of a terraced plateau on water, sewer, gas, power, and electric infrastructure.
- The DRB clarified its understanding that the design team will develop the streetscape, with input from staff. The DRB will provide comments once the site is defined.
- Provide an update on the status of the various site and technical surveys and vacating any rights-of-way in the conceptual design submittal.
- Provide additional information about how neighborhood parking needs will be addressed.

B. Architecture

- The DRB inquired about the existence of planning and design guidelines for the NBC neighborhood.
    - Staff responded that there are general guidelines that are attached to the CMP. The DRB suggested that the existing guidelines may be more germane to the east and main campuses. Thus, this project offers a chance to develop a new vernacular and set a standard for the rest of the NBC neighborhood sites.
        - Explore the terrain of the NBC neighborhood to create the new vernacular.
        - Study opportunities to blend the design into surrounding Old Boulder neighborhoods.

  - Will the proposed floor plate and overall building massing accommodate all of the program requirements?

- The group discussed various questions related to programming, including:
  - It is difficult for students to find off-campus housing. The goal is to create primarily four-bedroom units with common areas for students to interact.
  - With the development of the NBC neighborhood, staff is hoping to grow the number of students housed on campus from 28% of the student population to 40%.
  - Additionally, staff is hoping to migrate faculty and staff housing in the NBC neighborhood to a different campus location.
  - What will make Residence One the place students want to live?
  - The building may have a grab-and-go food service area rather than a full kitchen.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- The design team is encouraged to onboard a sustainability/energy consultant as early as possible to help identify project objectives and program drivers. The group discussed:
  - Creating a resilient landscape that will be responsive both to the possibility of flooding and drought;
  - Considering climate change and global warming in the building materials selection;
  - Determining the right use of concrete; and
  - Constructing a facility that inspires students to live sustainably.

DRB Action

The presentation gave the DRB a good understanding of the program, schedule, budget, goals, and objectives. The DRB encouraged the design team not to advance beyond the conceptual design phase in its next submittal. The conceptual design submittal should include a thorough site analysis and address the context leading to the design decisions, including alternatives that were considered and the preferred design direction.

No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above.

4:00 – 4:30 p.m. **Presentation of CU Boulder Energy Master Plan – *CU Boulder* Information/Direction** (No action requested)

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Brian Lindoerfer, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management
CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

A/E Presentation

Brian Lindoerfer gave a comprehensive presentation of the Energy Master Plan, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

- The DRB inquired whether solar panels can be added to the roofs of any existing campus buildings. Staff responded:
    - Opportunities for solar installation are studied at the time roofs require repair or replacement.
        - Solar panels are not an option for any buildings with red-tiled roofs.
        - Funding is not always available for solar upgrades.
        - There are limits set on the amount of electricity the campus is allowed to generate.
        - Storage of generated electricity is an obstacle.
    - New projects are studied to determine if roofs can be made PV ready.
- The DRB inquired about a carport parking lot PV installation on the East Campus. The project was reviewed by the DRB a couple of years ago. Staff responded that the project is on hold until the carport is funded. The concept, location, and solar capacity still make sense to pursue.
- Most of CU Boulder's energy consumption is to heat buildings.
    - The DRB inquired about the possibility of lowering thermostats through the winter. Staff responded that there isn't a strong energy policy across campus.
    - COVID increased campus energy use.
- The DRB discussed its role in promoting sustainability, including advocating for net zero buildings and improved energy standards.
    - The energy standard is set by LEED Gold, which is based on 2010 ASHRAE. Current code is much better. The standards that are being used to measure energy efficiencies are dated.
- Staff noted that there may be ways to set the EUI targets based on specific building types and uses. However, new buildings are a small percentage of the overall campus inventory.

DRB Action

No formal action was required for this matter. In addition to providing the comments noted above, the DRB thanked Brian Lindoerfer for the presentation, indicating that it was helpful.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

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