



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

Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance

1800 Grant Street, Suite 800
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 860-5600
Fax: (303) 860-5640

University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of August 8-9, 2013

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, August 8, 2013, in the Multi-Purpose Room, Student Recreation Center, UCCS Campus, and on Friday August 9, 2013, Room 501, 1800 Grant Street (Denver).

DRB members present were: Candy Roberts, Victor Olgyay, Rick Epstein, Don Brandes, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

Thursday, August 8, 2013

Village at Alpine Valley (formerly First Year Experience)

Architect(s): Kiewit/Page Southerland Page (Design/Build)
Presenter(s): Christopher Carvell, AIA, Design Principal – Page Southerland Page
Present: Charles Schmidt, AIA, LEED AP, Project Designer – Page Southerland Page; Harvey Whitcomb, RA, LEED AP, Project Manager – Page Southerland Page; Greg Dolorek, Project Landscape Architect – Wenk; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director of Facilities Services – UCCS; Carolyn Fox, Campus Architect – UCCS; Ed Chagnalaf, Project Manager – Kiewit Building Group; Shannon Meyer – KSQ, and David Short, Project Designer – KSQ; Christopher Kleingarfner – PSP, Chris Carvell – PSP, and Harvey Whitcomb – PSP.

Overview from Consultant Team

Program overview – The project now combines phases 1 and 2 with two residence halls containing 510 beds and a dining hall containing a total of 180,000 sf, of which approximately 35,000 gsf is multipurpose. Phase 3, as shown on the drawings, proposes two residence halls at 96,000 gsf and requires future Board of Regent approval. Six alternatives were prepared, with page 37 being the preferred alternative. Goal is to make the whole residence community feel like one vs. new and old.

A presentation of the existing campus hillside character, other similar hillside campus design, and the building site topography was outlined. The proposed architecture of the new buildings will be informed by:

- Summit Village, new and old, including portals, wings and corner connections.
- Portal terracing and connections will be determining space between buildings. Open from active to passive places.
 - Courtyards and porches into buildings will be created.
- No building will be taller than existing buildings at Alpine Village. Active programs will occur at the base of building.
 - La Plata House has conference areas that related to dining halls.
 - Cucharas House will have laundry and mail for the entire village.

Board Comments

Don Brandes

- Requested that the consultant team refer to notes from July 15th meeting - and address recommendation.
- Encouraged the consultant team to complement Alpine Village and demonstrate the marriage of both projects (the existing Alpine Village and the new Village at Alpine Valley) to avoid the appearance of two housing areas – rather than one comprehensive village.
- Encouraged the consultant team to minimize the cut slope and fills for roadways and the need to embrace the adjacent and surrounding landscape into the site plan – unifying grading, vegetation and drainage.
- Noted that once there is a certified site survey and geotechnical information, there is the need to prepare a “synthesis of physical and natural site constraints” illustrating how the consultant team is hoping to resolve these physical and natural constraints.
- Complimented the consultant team on the presentation and extent of work completed to date.

Rick Epstein

- A thoughtful and careful approach strategy, but still a separation between old and new complexes needs to be addressed.
 - The separation between La Plata and Cucharas may be too small.
 - Landscape edge condition and the way the architecture reaches the ground does not resolve barrier.
 - Yampa House should be sited to follow existing topography/grading.
 - Edge of construction should merge into native landscape better.
 - The front plaza needs to relate more to existing campus.
 - Arroyos have been thoughtfully considered.
 - Show solstice on shadow studies and equinox.
 - Work with grade more to inform building plaza locations.
 - This is a massing diagram supporting a site plan - hard to approve concept architecture.
 - The secondary spine also should connect through the old site (existing Alpine Village).
 - The front knuckle at Dining Hall Plaza is key to architecture marriage between residential and academic buildings.
 - Need better explanation of building program and how that is informing the building architecture.
 - Show the aperture views – let the views direct the building orientation - want diagrams that show the viewpoints.

Victor Olgyay

- Massing of the buildings and landscape need to be resolved. Proposed building massing is simplistic and massive; plan looks interesting but buildings are vertically extruded blocks. Consider massing to better fit in with ground form terracing and the topography. Want to see connections in massing of the buildings.

Candy Roberts

1. Expressed concern about Alpine Lane and the plazas on the northern side of Alpine Village which will be in the shade most of the year. The green space between buildings should be a quiet space and not have an active use.
2. Alpine Lane does not have a use outside of creating a fire lane. Examine any opportunities to activate this lane.
3. Questions whether Cucharas House should have active spaces of laundry, etc. – perhaps it should be in La Plata House or the dining hall to activate the more public areas.
4. There is a disconnect between existing Alpine Village and the new dormitories. Examine making them relate better.
5. Develop green space with this project that is preserved from future development.
6. The proposed connection between the entry and Dining Hall Plaza, in front of La Plata House, needs to serve and connect to the old Alpine Village.
7. Enhance green spaces and explore breaking the portal to connect two green spaces.
8. Make the dining hall unique.
 - a. Should have a different character from residence halls but relate.
9. Views to Pulpit Rock should be preserved throughout the site and used as a design feature.

Motion

Rick Epstein – move to approve site plan approval but not architecture.

Victor Olgyay seconded the motion.

Don Brandes offered a new motion to postpone approval for concept design until next month and address comments presented at this meeting.

Rick Epstein removed his motion. Second motion passed unanimously.

The Board noted that work to date has been good. Carolyn Fox, campus architect, will upload new presentation to SharePoint. Consultant will prepare a presentation on the building designs for the September DRB meeting.

Summary - consultant needs to address the following at the September DRB meeting:

1. Site/Landscape Issues
 - Refer to notes from July 15th meeting - go through and address comments regarding site and architecture analysis needed.
 - Cut slope and fills for roadways need sensitivity to surrounding area.
 - Edge of construction should merge into native landscape better.
 - Work with existing grades more to inform building and plaza locations. There is a concern with the 24' retaining wall needed for the road.

- Continue thoughtful design of arroyos.
 - Enhance the green spaces active and passive spaces and preserve from future development.
 - Consider different road configurations as shown in the options to minimize disturbance and fill.
2. Better Integration with existing Alpine Village
- A secondary spine is needed through the old site connecting to the recreation center sidewalk.
 - Dining Hall Plaza needs better connection to the existing housing.
 - Alpine Lane reinforces the barrier created by La Plata Hall and Cucharas Hall.
 - Landscape edge condition and the way the architecture reaches the ground does not resolve barrier.
 - Active uses are needed at the upper level to address Alpine Lane and existing housing.
 - Front plaza needs to relate more to existing campus design.
 - The new housing as shown created a barrier/wall from the new quad at the existing housing. More permeability is needed between old and new to create an open and continuous flow between both.
3. Architecture/Building Massing/Siting
- Massing of the buildings and terracing of the landscape need to be resolved. There is a concern with the “blockiness” of the conceptual architecture as shown. More articulation will be needed. This could include some expression of the student community module and/or the public spaces in the building.
 - Views should be preserved to Pulpit Rock as well as the mountains to the west from key public spaces.
 - Make dining hall unique.
 - Dining hall should have a different but complementary character from residence halls. It should have a special identity for the campus.
 - The front plaza of the dining hall is key to residential and academic buildings and acts as an extension of the public function of the dining hall. It needs to be accessible from many directions.
 - Reconsider active program spaces and their relationships with existing and new housing to provide accessibility and activate key public spaces from all directions.
4. Provide further information
- Show solstice on shadow studies and equinox. Studies need to be done accounting for the slope of the terrain.
 - Show the aperture views – let the views direct the building orientation - want diagrams that show the viewpoints.
 - Need better explanation of building program and how that is informing the building architecture.
 - Existing grades need to be shown to evaluate against proposed grades.

Recreation Center and Health/Wellness Addition

Architect(s): Barker Rinker Seacat

Presenter(s): Katie Barnes, Architect - BRS; Wayne Hughes, Architect - Hughes Group; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director of Facility Services - UCCS; Carolyn Fox, University Architect - UCCS; Charles Cummings – UCCS; Jeff Davis, Executive Director of Auxiliary Operations – UCCS; Luanne Ducett, President - Terra Nova Engineering, Inc.; Mathew Evans, Landscape

Architect – Lime Green Design; Christie Schneider – Lime Green Design; Rachelle Macur – Group 14 Engineering; Aleka Pappas – Group 14 Engineering.

Wayne Hughes:

Consultant Overview

Project is constrained by program and budget building cannot be terraced up the hillside. Elevators, ramps, etc., were too expensive. Program staff has directed the proposed outcome.

- Program users want one entrance and four court areas.
- Campus wants to minimize construction in existing facility.
- Campus wants Health and Wellness program to be on one level.
- Planning option 4 meets program and site constraints the best. Combined entry with gyms being toe-to-toe.
- Health and Wellness wants to be on the ground floor.
- Plan has been refined to recess entrance, provide front plaza social area, and provide atrium with view to the north. The new lobby will provide a view point to every option available to students. Second floor will now provide terrace on second floor with trellis visor to mitigate sunlight. The preferred Option 3 gable will go all the way through building. Design includes clerestory windows in gymnasium and solar tubes in fitness areas. Want to work with existing fabric for exterior design.

Consultant clarified that the 20-foot spine will be the link to campus and parking; however, only the spine in front of the building is included in scope. The width can be varied in front of the building to accommodate outdoor spaces.

The SOLE element has a two-level section and single level (mezzanine) industrial stair to store seasonal goods. SOLE wants a street front presence and is a separate operation. Functionality needs to accommodate loading and unloading and allow the access to the building after hours.

LEED Overview – Proposed Elements

- LEED GOLD with focus on site design.
- Active design principals – physical body and mental health, use stairs, alternative transportation to get back and forth.
- Incorporate natural elements into building through student thoroughfare.
- Daylight stairs and gym.
- The pedestrian spine will connect different modes of transportation, bike, car, sherpa trail.
- Education features will occur throughout the building.
- Water conservation and energy star appliance.
- Life-cycle approach with materials (local, beetle kill).
- Healthy indoor environment (low VOC, green clean program).
- Energy reduction will occur through day lighting in gymnasium and exercise areas. Lights could be off all day. HVAC will be addressed in further study. Natural ventilation could occur to reduce the HVAC. Inconsistency of the weather is an opportunity. Diurnal variances are a gift - open up building at night.

Board Comments

Victor Olgyay

- Comments from previous meeting are addressed in current submission. Sheet #4 is titled, "Summary of DRB Comments," yet it has omitted many critical concerns. For example, we asked for a summary of what is currently working well in the building and what needed to be improved. This would help inform the design going forward.
- Goals are good for concept, but are not reflected in design sections and elevations.
- Passive solar design and daylighting strategies need to be shown in the architecture.
- Natural ventilation is often an important concept for gymnasiums in this climate; this strategy should be explored in this project.
- Concept design should examine all of the energy, planning, and aesthetic opportunities that exist – does the building want to be more institutional or residential? Currently has elements of both. Should you extend current design? If so, that design option should be shown. If other facade options have been explored, we should see them as well.
- Make features for multi-use that reduce costs.

Don Brandes

- Noted that the 20-foot spine is an important organizing element on campus and that further thought needs to be illustrated regarding the width, alignment and character of the "spine" along the length of the project, including: streetscape, lighting, bikes and streetscape furniture. Landscape elements are important to define the entrance of the building. The edge of streetscape is important.
- Encouraged the consultant team to further explore patios and balconies and other outdoor areas with views to the mountain range that will be an asset for students.
- Encouraged the consultant team to study the hillside impacts related to cut slopes, drainage, retaining wall design, vegetation and the visual impacts of the building mass on the site.

Candy Roberts

- Better design objectives to add to existing architecture and not create a new design character.
- Expression of atrium and entrance should be combined – current designs not successful.
- Investigate taking building elevations out of the housing vernacular and have them be an expression of transition.
- Fault in floor plans – building is right on sidewalk - push the building back. Second floor could cantilever over the exterior ramp.
- Space is needed in floor plan at the transition around corner to existing gymnasium. Explore possible building overhang on second floor.
- Cost savings could occur if counseling area is moved upstairs because the ceiling height can be reduced.

Rick Epstein

- Floor plans and elevations are not coordinated. The DRB needs complete plans and elevations that correspond to approve Conceptual Design.
- Spine does not mean just paving but active uses along it.
- Contradiction with putting most sensitive use along the busiest areas - private counseling area next to very public area. Is there a solution in which the health use is not so central to the recreation use?
- Contradiction in building design between modern and traditional elements in the existing needs to be resolved in the new addition. Do not exacerbate these different design

elements in the new building. A unified building approach needs to be taken in which old and new are integrated. Complete elevations are needed and three dimensional studies to evaluate this.

- There is a concern with the courtyard shown at the existing entry.
- West winds will impact west door entryways. Take care to address this.
- If you step the entry back you can step the roof of the new building entry forward.
- They may need more bike parking.
- A better interior connection to SOLE should be considered.

Motion

Unanimous agreement - Not ready for conceptual design approval – bring project back in September.

Friday, August 9, 2013 **28th Street Gateway**

Individuals present: Steve Thweatt, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management – CU-Boulder; Paul Leef, Campus Architect – CU-Boulder; Phil Simpson, Campus Planner and Assistant Director for Facilities Planning – CU-Boulder; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect – CU-Boulder; Jim Faber, Architect/Project Manager – CU-Boulder; William Arndt – CU-Boulder.

Staff clarified that the Board has previously reviewed this project. Funding is now available and the project is out-to-bid in a few weeks. Options for final design were presented by Richelle Reilly.

Motion – Board unanimously approved Option 2 with direction for staff to work on the details:

- Add seasonality to plant material.
- Water overflow would be great.
- Have trees in back drop.
- Landscape between wall and corner should be cleaned up with seasonal materials.
- Consider lighting the water flow.

POD J Design Development

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Phil Simpson, CU-Boulder Planning, and Brian Erickson, Davis Partnership.

Individuals present: Steve Thweatt, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management – CU-Boulder; Paul Leef, Campus Architect – CU-Boulder; Phil Simpson, Campus Planner and Assistant Director for Facilities Planning – CU-Boulder; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect – CU-Boulder; Jim Faber, Architect/Project Manager – CU-Boulder; William Arndt, CU-Boulder Facilities Management (Retired) – CU-Boulder Facilities Management; Joe Lear, Associate Principal – Davis Partnership; Brian Erickson, Principal – Davis Partnership; Kim Prentice, Managing Director Development & Operations – Nexcore Group; Lynn Moore, Principal – Davis Partnership; and Tony Ruiz, Project Executive, Expansion Projects and Operations/Facilities – University of Colorado Hospital.

The DRB met with CU-Boulder staff during a study session to clarify new design options. Based upon the study session clarification, the Board agreed to delegate final details to staff for resolution.

Motion: Don Brandes - approved Design Development with the following conditions and delegate resolution and implementation to CU-Boulder staff. Seconded by Rick Epstein.

Conditions:

Site

- Develop bioswale and work with staff to complete plant selection.
- Pinch point at entryway may be resolved with smaller tower design; the walk across parking lot needs definition. Paving details and geometry should be resolved with staff.
- Define retaining wall materials and provide cap on the top.
- The planter at the entry blocks it. Architects should redesign it to make the entry more welcoming.

Sustainability

- Provide checklist for LEED Silver Construction.
- Maximize roof for future photovoltaics – maximize future footprint.
- Wall section design - instead of insulation between studs, have two layers of insulation on exterior of studs.

Architecture

- Add texture and detailing to windows.
- On submission, sun shades at the corner tower are not a good cost alternative.
- Refine tower design to be a special element – make window fenestration choices to enhance tower design without massing changes.
- Stucco over east entry top window is awkward - with recessed area it is not issue but could be refined.
- Make tower all brick – make it a feature.

Board thanked the development team.

Anschutz Medical Campus - 2012 Facilities Master Plan - Design & Development Guidelines Draft Document		
Item	Description	Action
1	A revised draft of the Guidelines was uploaded to the SharePoint site and presented to the Board.	
2	It was noted that photos used throughout the draft document will include captions. It was also noted that some of the more compelling and illustrative photos found in the Master Plan would be substituted in the final Design & Development Guidelines document.	OIP to incorporate captions and update photos as appropriate.
3	It was noted by the Board that the 1st floor fenestration percentage requirements noted in the character guidelines table for the C2 Urban Campus District should be included in the guidelines for other districts as well.	Fenestration percentages will be added to the character guideline tables for the C1 Academic Village and the C3 Hospital District.
4	It was noted by the Board that Section 2.8 Site Coverage, as well as the district site coverage ratio information noted in the character guideline tables for each district, should be removed from the guidelines and included as part of the Facilities Master Plan document.	This information will be removed from the guidelines and included in the Facilities Master Plan document.
5	It was noted by the Board that the Urban Design Concepts diagrams for the C1 thru C3 districts could be strengthened by illustrating the concepts in three dimensions.	The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.
6	The possibility of locating dedicated bike lanes in-board of parking lanes was noted. Rick E. provided an example of a street in Berlin for discussion.	The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.
7	It was suggested that east-west streets might have a different character from that of north-south streets based upon solar access/building setback criteria. It was suggested that the work of Ralph Knowles be studied for guidance.	The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.
8	Refer to Page 51. It was noted that the second bullet point under "Major Walkways" should be clarified to indicate that turf reinforcing systems should be used adjacent to paved walkways at these locations.	The section will be clarified as noted.
9	It was noted that bikes and skateboarders are to be discouraged from using pedestrian walkways.	The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.
10	It was suggested that more specific detail be included regarding what is meant by "a minimum of 5% of surface parking shall be landscaped" (Page 53, Section 2.6)	Additional clarification will be added to the section.
11	It was suggested that alternative energy/electric car information be included in the "Sustainable Strategies for Parking" portion of Section 2.6 of the document.	The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.

12	There was some discussion on how prescriptive the Part 3 - Building Design Guidelines Section of the document should be. It was suggested that the ongoing review of the RMLEI project be used as a test case for how the Section might be enhanced.	The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.
13	A motion was made to approve the draft document. All were in favor and the document was approved.	Document has been approved by the DRB
Anschutz Medical Campus - 2012 Facilities Master Plan Draft Document		
Item	Description	Action
1	A revised draft of the Anschutz Medical Campus - 2012 Facilities Master Plan was uploaded to the SharePoint site and presented to the Board.	
2	It was noted that the massing study image on Page V.7, showing the light rail, should be eliminated.	
3	The issue of governance continues to be somewhat lacking. The "BAG" begins to address this; however, there remains the need for some form of documented by-in by all stakeholders in the form of a covenant/compact of shared agreement.	Stakeholders are in the process of reviewing the Draft. The OIP will explore this suggestion and incorporate as appropriate.
4	It was felt that while the document does a good job at documenting existing conditions in terms of utility infrastructure and energy usage, it was lacking in both a sustainable vision and any metrics for evaluating sustainability goals. Victor provided a " Friendly Amendment " with suggestions for further study (<i>see below</i>).	
5	A motion was made to approve the draft document. All were in favor and the document was approved contingent upon incorporation of Victor's sustainability language. The Board defers to the OIP as to where this language would be incorporated into the document; either as part of the 2012 Facilities Master Plan or to be incorporated into the future "Campus Sustainability Master Plan" noted in Section VI.6 of the draft document.	Document has been approved by the DRB contingent upon incorporation of the " Friendly Amendment " noted.
Rocky Mountain lions Eye Institute - DD Work Session		
Item	Description	Action
1	Hugh B. presented a summary of the Energy Model prepared by the Weidt Group. The document was distributed and will be reviewed by the Board.	DRB to review document.
2	Alternate 6, with a unified curtainwall appearance, was the preferred direction of the Board. It was noted by the Hospital that Dr. Mandava was also partial to this scheme.	Davis Group to continue to develop Alternate 6.

3	It was noted that the brackets supporting the canopy could be more elegantly detailed.	Davis Group to explore options.
4	It was noted that the brick banding of the east wall felt to be too greatly articulated in the renderings. Davis Partnership explained that soldier courses were flush and not recessed as they appear in the renderings.	Davis Group to explore options.
5	It was suggested that sunshade depths be analyzed in relation to solar angles and that variations in depth could enrich the façade.	Davis Group to explore options.
6	It was suggested that lighting analysis be conducted on all interior spaces to evaluate opportunities for energy savings.	Davis Group to explore options.
Building 500		
Item	Description	Action
1	Andre to forward IGU information to Victor for evaluation	Will be forwarded next week
2	DRB to be invited to examine window mock-up when in place (anticipated in early October)	Will forward invitation at least two weeks prior to completed mock-up

Ideas for Future Studies for the Anschutz Master plan offered as a “Friendly Amendment”

The existing master plan has wonderful descriptions of existing utility infrastructure; however, it is lacking in planning for the 10-year timeframe future infrastructure improvements. As a ten-year master plan, we suggest considering including some studies as follows.

- 1) Carbon Plan for the campus - does the campus intend to continue emitting carbon at the current rate, or is there another aspiration? How will that goal be met?
- 2) Water infrastructure plan, including nonpotable “purple pipe,” and gray water capture. Consider both multiple possible supplies as well as demand reduction.
- 3) Risk and sensitivity study for energy pricing, and escalation, and evolving relationships with local utilities. This could include ability to provide demand reduction, power conditioning and load leveling for the utility outside the campus; this could be a significant future revenue source.
- 4) Climate adaptation plan, including assessment of most likely risks to campus operations (note current GSA work).
- 5) Possibility for the implementation of a smart microgrid on campus, with “islanding” capabilities. Should include a BMS end use submetering plan for meeting item #6.
- 6) Baseline of current energy use on campus, and plan for continuous increase in building energy efficiency (to comply with increasingly stringent codes (such as ESIA, or Architecture 2030, or IGCC).
- 7) Provision for increasing generation of renewable energy on campus, through photovoltaics or other technologies.
- 8) Provision for increasing level of wastewater and storm water treatment.
- 9) Consideration of solid waste reduction plan.
- 10) A plan for campus “resilience” in the case of various infrastructure failures on or off campus (beyond climate adaption events). This could be immediate useful in providing areas of community refuge, as well as ability for the hospital facilities to easily continue to provide services on a campus (rather than an individual building) scale.
- 11) Consider evolving a transportation infrastructure to provide for increasing numbers of electric vehicles.