



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Office of the Vice President for 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 December 13, 2012

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, December 13, 2012  
1800 Grant Street, 8th floor, Astronauts Conference Room  
(Denver)

DRB members present were: John Prosser, Jerry Seracuse, Candy Roberts, Don Brandes, Victor Olgyay, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

---

#### **Academic Office Building**

Architect(s): SlaterPaull Architects, Inc.

Presenter(s): Tyson Nunn, Gary Reynolds, Carolyn Fox, Michelle Delk, and Heath Mizer.

Individuals present: Gary Reynolds, Executive Director – University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Carolyn Fox, University Architect - University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Heath Mizer, Landscape Architect - Civitas; Michelle Delk, Principal - Civitas; Tyson Nunn, Nunn Construction. Gwen Gilley, Project Manager - SlaterPaull; Travis Bostic, Project Designer - SlaterPaull; Jennifer Cordes, Principal - SlaterPaull; Ara Massey, Sustainability – SlaterPaull; Christine Teichert, Job Captain – SlaterPaull.

Gary Reynolds:

- Reviewed the design progress that has been made since the last meeting.
- Discussed the current restraints on the project site: Austin Bluffs, the detention basin, and the existing structures.
- Noted that they are still working on finalizing the budget and the total square footage.

Michelle Delk:

- Described the existing conditions of the site and noted the importance of the existing pedestrian spine to the overall design.

- Noted the location of the site in regards to the entire campus – identifying urban landscapes and how they play an integral role in the proposed location of plaza space.
- Reviewed site influences and specific opportunities that are found in the native landscape. Through this research, they have located key areas for building entries and plazas that create intimacy while minimizing noise from Austin Bluffs Parkway.
- Noted the importance and opportunity stemming from the existing wetland pond.
- Reviewed section diagrams and explained the opportunity for a raised, planted median to separate the building from the Parkway.
- Noted the opportunity to connect the proposed walkway to the existing ADA path.

Heath Mizer:

- Discussed the opportunity to preserve the native vegetation on the site and utilize the detention basin as a key storm water management element.
- Noted the water quality band on the southwest side of the building.

Jennifer Cordes:

- Described in detail the two key building options.
- Described elevation studies for the two preferred buildings.
- Lightly touched on the massing analysis conducted.

Ara Massey:

- Reviewed in detail the energy usage massing comparisons.
- Described how they can further optimize the energy intensity goals for massing 2 and 4 specifically.
- Briefly touched on storm water management techniques previously discussed by Michelle Delk.

Travis Bostic:

- Described the different Parti (massing) diagrams and how the circulation and flow would function for each building.
- Noted the spectacular views and entry locations for each diagram.
- Noted challenges of designing a 360-degree building.
- Discussed taking shape and materiality from the Dwire and Osborne buildings and bringing them down to human scale.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Asked for clarification on vertical grade change throughout the site and expressed concern about overall connectivity.
- Expressed concern regarding the entrance on the north side – ice, snow, etc. – and suggested bringing light into the area.
- Expressed concern for how the proposed building materiality will fit within the existing campus buildings to create a seamless integration; requested a holistic solution.

Candy Roberts:

- Commented on the “core concept” of the building massing and how it does not account for future expansion.
- Recommended that the design team create a program to drive the design and inform the building’s shape and materiality.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the opportunity and need to consider the future expansion of the infrastructure.
- Inquired about the potential users of the site and how they might move through the space.
- Showed concern for the onsite/offsite storm water capacity flows, and suggested more research and understanding on the issue to make it into a more integrated system.
- Discussed the opportunity for maximizing a linkage system(s) for students and faculty.
- Noted the seasonal opportunities that currently exist for heating and cooling.
- Expressed concern for the lack of bike parking for students and faculty alike.

Gwen Gilley:

- Spoke to the project from a programmatic viewpoint noting the importance of bringing and welcoming students into the space(s).

Victor Olgay:

- Expressed concern for the lack of overall design programming.
- Suggested the design team look at this as a “whole” system and understand how the building will function.
- Noted that water was an important issue and asked how water will play an integral role in the overall design.
- Expressed concern with the lack of floor-to-floor studies and the energy usage model that would accompany it.
- Suggested extensive research about cooling/heating loads and how to minimize the impact during specific times of year.
- Noted the importance of natural ventilation to be incorporated in the design.

John Prosser:

- Expressed concern on how the EVA access and evacuation will function.
- Suggested the design team look at using native prairie grasses to reduce the amount of water needed.
- Recommended looking at a wet-roof design for the building and bio-swales along the garden area to reduce the detention pond footprint.
- Inquired about the feasibility of relocating a portion of the bicycle trail - taking it across the roundabout - freeing up pedestrian/vehicular constraints near the intersection of Austin Bluffs Parkway.
- Noted the size of the proposed building and suggested consideration for its intended use as a driver for orientation, materiality, etc.
- Noted the opportune orientation of the building and how easy it will be to capitalize on it from an energy model standpoint.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

---

### **Parking Garage and Recreational Field**

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Brit Probst, Curtis Cox, Joe Plaskett, Carolyn Fox and Gary Reynolds.

Individuals present: Gary Reynolds, Executive Director – University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Carolyn Fox, University Architect - University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Curtis Cox, Project Manager - Davis Partnership; Lynn Moore, Principal - Davis Partnership; Brit Probst, Principal – Davis Partnership; Matt Schlageter, Principal - Martin/Martin; Joe Plaskett, Senior Project Manager - Mortenson Construction.

Carolyn Fox:

- Gave an updated progress plan for the parking garage and recreational field.
- Suggested sporadic meetings with voluntary board members to facilitate a quick, successful design process.
- Discussed the existing archeological site and the limitations.

Brit Probst:

- Described the overall programmatic elements regarding the structure itself, the total number of stalls, and its 24/7 availability.
- Noted that the recreational field will have limited use.
- Summarized several of the programmatic planning studies - highlighting opportunities and constraints for each.
- Discussed how having adequate room on the corner of Austin Bluffs and Stanton Road is critical for a successful design.
- Described details about the parking structure: bays, stalls, access, and pedestrian/vehicular circulation.
- Noted the overall grade change from north to south and how the fill taken from onsite will be used to create berms to frame views and minimize the visual vertical height of the structure.

Lynn Moore:

- Gave a detailed description of the project including: existing conditions, current and future circulation patterns, transit, view sheds, and the existing architecture.
- Described the typography and how the orientation of the structure will integrate with minimum impact.
- Noted its sensitive native prairie landscape.
- Discussed to whom the circulation (vehicular/pedestrian/transit) will service – students, faculty, and community members – and its multi-use function.
- Noted the importance of a welcoming gateway, as previously noted by the DRB Board last month.
- Mentioned the proposed expansion plan for Austin Bluffs.

Curtis Cox:

- Noted that this project is not eligible for LEED certification due to recent guideline changes set forth by the USGBC.

Don Brandes:

- Asked for clarification on the total number of stories for the proposed structure.
- Inquired about site disturbance and the proposed landscape materiality to seamlessly integrate this site as an extension of the land.
- Asked for clarification on materials that have been considered from a washing/cooling aspect.
- Noted the overall opportunity to utilize the storm water to create a gradient through the site.
- Questioned, from a photometric standpoint – how will the site look at all times of the day/night?
- Suggested using bollards as an alternative to the roundabout feature previously recommended.

John Prosser:

- Noted his appreciation for the new orientation of the building that increases feasibility and implementation.
- Inquired about the potential of implementing a bus/fire truck stop on Austin Bluffs Parkway.
- Discussed the feasibility of “book ending” the cut outs on the building to allow for more parking and access of emergency vehicles.
- Suggested adding a curvature on the backside of the building allowing parents, coaches, and players to congregate off the field.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Inquired about the feasibility of expanding the field footprint as per Prosser's recommendation.
- Suggested looking into other options for the proposed lighting structures on the field.

Candy Roberts:

- Suggested utilizing the corner that meets grade as a gathering place – shade structure, BBQ, etc. to capitalize utilization and bring people in.

Victor Olgyay:

- Thanked the team for the progress and exploring different models.
- Recommended integrating the top level into the existing contours of the site making a more singular, fluid structure.
- Suggested the team look at rebuilding and restoring some of the native processes on the site.

- Recommended doing further research to what programmatic elements could occur on the west side of the structure.

Roberts made a motion for design approval. The board unanimously agreed. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design and encouraged them to keep pushing the boundaries.

---



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Office of the Vice President for 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 December 14, 2012

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, December 14, 2012  
1800 Grant Street, 8th floor, Astronauts Conference Room  
(Denver)

DRB members present were: John Prosser, Jerry Seracuse, Candy Roberts, Victor Olgay, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

#### CU Campus Sign Standards

Presenter(s): Ken McConnellogue

Individuals Present: Kathy McNally, Senior Manager, Facilities Projects – University of Colorado Denver; Andre Vite, Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; Ken McConnellogue, Vice President for Communication – University of Colorado Denver; Michael Del Giudice, Chief Planning Officer – University of Colorado Denver.

Ken McConnellogue:

- Described the progress that has been made since the last meeting regarding the University's branding through signage.
- Talked about donor sign standards that currently exist and how they can go about creating a new standard.
- Mentioned that the sign and materials are unique to each campus.
- Noted the importance of referencing the US Sign Council Guidelines.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Commented on the fact that each campus should be treated separately, but each should be held to a high standard.
- Suggested leaving the style the same across the board (CU brand), but alter the materials, etc., that are unique to each campus.
- Recommended letting the specific needs drive the design of the sign(s).
- Suggested creating a centralized area for all donor names to be included.

John Prosser:

- Shared a personal experience relating to college campus signage and how important it is to correctly direct individuals day and night.
- Suggested adding informational kiosks for ease of the user.
- Mentioned unification and avoiding recreating the wheel for every campus.
- Suggested doing a mock-up for signage.
- Noted when setting these guidelines, design with the elderly and handicapped in mind to maximize the total availability of usage.
- Suggested using backlighting in place of box lighting.
- Asked for clarification on specific articles within the document – suggested making these more clear for the reader to avoid misinterpretation.
- Noted that the scale needs to be addressed to avoid oversizing and crowding on buildings.

Victor Olgay:

- Reflected on the detail and consistency needed throughout.
- Noted stylistic ideas that transcend campuses to keep the branding alive, but remain unique to each entity.
- Noted that there should be some prescriptive standards uniform across all campuses, but that there should be some leeway for variation.

Candy Roberts:

- Seconded Brandes's suggestion on making these guidelines illustrated to avoid misinterpretation.
- Commented on the fact that each campus serves a specific function and how a programmatic needs assessment should be developed before any guidelines can be set forth.
- Noted several examples of signage completed on the campuses and what made them successful.
- Asked for ideas on how donor signs will be treated and how to demarcate them.
- Suggested bringing all the campus architects together to get their opinions on set standards.

Don Brandes: (Notes - reviewed by Roberts)

- Noted that having a written document alone can be hard to interpret for architects – suggested adding imagery to show visual examples.
- Noted the process for setting standards is very important but difficult – suggested keeping logos, colors, sizes, etc., the same, while allowing the individual campus architects to decide on location, materiality, etc.

Michael Del Giudice:

- Asked for clarification for the existing standards set forth by the university with logo size, color, etc.
- Noted that the Denver and Anschutz campuses are unique in the fact that you have an eclectic mix of public/private buildings.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

---

**Update on Anschutz Medical Campus Master Plan and Site-Wide Study**  
“Redefining the Deliverable”

Architect(s): Same consultants - minus one.

Presenter(s): Michael Del Giudice.

Individuals present: Kathy McNally, Interim Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; Ken McConnellogue, Vice President for Communication – University of Colorado system office; Michael Del Giudice, Chief Planning Officer – University of Colorado Denver.

Michael Del Giudice:

- Gave a descriptive update on the existing conditions and context of the project.
- Discussed the current status and adjustments that have been made between the contracting companies.
- Noted the inadequate, inconsistent communication and the reduced stakeholder involvement.
- Discussed the redefinition of deliverables from the primary architect and sub consultants.
- Noted Anderson Mason Dale was added to the team as lead architect.
- Clearly defined: Scope of work, organization, responsibility, schedule(s), deliverables, outreach program(s), and client review(s).
- Successful efficiency: Systems expansion, cause/effect development strategies, define design + development criteria.
- Work plan(s) to be completed: Existing context, programmatic development, vision planning, scenario exploration and refinement, and master plan documentation.
- Explained in detail the conditions set forth with the light rail treatment through the different areas of campus.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Asked for a digital copy of all materials presented.

Candy Roberts:

- Asked for clarification on the primary and secondary consultants involved.

Victor Olgyay:

- Inquired about upcoming community engagement meetings.

John Prosser:

- Suggested the design team look at bringing on the Aurora Urban Renewal Authority.
- Expressed concern for the treatment of the light rail – urban vs. rural approach.
- Inquired about the feasibility of integrating bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.
- Suggested having the proposed chain-link be coated in a dark vinyl and vegetation added to break up the barrier.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

---

## **Campus Entryway Signs**

Presenter(s): Ken McConnellogue

Individuals Present: Kathy McNally, Interim Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; Andre Vite, Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; Ken McConnellogue, Vice President for Communication – University of Colorado system office; Michael Del Giudice, Chief Planning Officer – University of Colorado Denver.

Michael Del Giudice:

- Explained in detail the proposed signage standards including the treatment of the different areas of campus.
- Noted these concepts are very conceptual – nothing has been formally decided upon.
- Expressed concern about the scale of the signage located on Colfax – must be accurate to be successful.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Noted the west corridor signage would be more powerful if the ground plan was graded up and set off street level.
- Suggested using landscape planting as a soft extension of the signage on Colfax Avenue.
- Sketched out his design idea(s) to clearly relay the message.

Candy Roberts:

- Asked for clarification on the shade of the signage and how it interacts with the existing pedestrian/vehicular circulation.
- Suggested a larger and more predominant cap on the signage located on Aurora Court and Colfax.
- Noted she would prefer to see reverse pan channel lettering.

Victor Olgyay:

- Noted the design of the west corridor needs to be more prominent.

John Prosser:

- Suggested changing the orientation of the signage on Colfax to maximize viewing.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

## **CU-Boulder - Baker Hall Renovation**

Architect(s): Aller-Lingle-Massey Architect (ALM) with Whiting-Turner Contracting.

Presenter(s): Brad Massey, and Henry Ehr Gott.

Individuals present: Tom Goodhew, Facilities Planning – University of Colorado; Paul Leef, Campus Architect - University of Colorado; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect - University of Colorado; Philip Simpson, Director of Facilities Planning - University of Colorado; William Arndt, CU Facilities Management (Retired) - University of Colorado; Moe Tabrizi, Campus Engineer - University of Colorado; Heidi Roge, Project Manager Housing and Dining Services - University of Colorado, Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planner - University of Colorado; Curt Huetson, Director of Facilities Planning & Operations - University of Colorado; David Lingle, Architect - ALM; Matt Newman, Architect - ALM; Jason Messaros, Landscape Architect – BHA Design; Teal Pace, Assistant Project Manager – Whiting-Turner; Henry Ehr Gott, Project Manager – Whiting-Turner; Brad Massey, Architect – ALM; Roger Sherman, Landscape Architect – BHA Design; Mark Thornbrough, Engineer – Martin/Martin, and Rusty Brown, Principal – Semple Brown Design.

Tom Goodhew:

- Introduced the project and gave a review of the study session notes.

Brad Massey:

- Described the progression that has been made with the comments from the Board.
- Discussed the Baker Hall architectural materiality including the Juliet balcony.
- Commented on the railings coming out of the south side(s) of the building – proposed keeping the existing and making adjustments to meet code.
- Described the south entry's excavation plan to expose the lower level and increase light penetration.

Rusty Brown:

- Agreed with the Board on their comments specifically dealing with window treatment.
- Noted the importance of the central hallway orientation.
- Suggested making programmatic shifts to the Dining Hall from the other lounge/study rooms.

Dave Lingle:

- Described the re-design techniques used to align the axis - creating continuity and unique character throughout the design.

Jason Messaros:

- Discussed specific details with respect to the south courtyard connecting Baker Hall to Farrand Field including the open, welcoming entrance.
- Discussed social diagram description(s) for all courtyards including programmatic uses.
- Described elemental changes that are recommended to the north entry courtyard to maximize socialization and limit straight access through the series of courtyards.

Curt Huetson:

- Noted the challenge in finding the right window to meet the needs of all involved.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Expressed concern for the hard angles in the south courtyard with two-way foot traffic.
- Suggested the design team conduct studies to find a solution to the ADA ramp – ice, snow, grade, etc.
- Seconded the Board's opinion on capitalizing on the central courtyard space as a gathering hub for students.

Victor Olgay:

- Noted all the pieces are here but the design team needs to simplify it.
- Regarding the South Courtyard – commended the team on their progress, but suggested they try different designs while maintaining and celebrating the connection to Farrand Field.
- Proposed enlarging the trash/recycle space.
- Expressed concern for the south entry. Proposed using a more sensitive technique.
- Reiterated the preference of casement windows over awning structures.
- Recommended looking at the industry options to provide maximum functionality/usage.
- Complimented the design team on their overall progress.
- Noted the strong entry point coming into the central courtyard and spoke about the disconnect between the interior courtyard space.

Candy Roberts:

- Suggested widening the connectivity to Farrand Field to create a stronger visual/physical axis.
- Suggested a more sensitive use of materials and style in the south courtyard.
- Proposed thinking 'outside of the box' to create a more cohesive style and plan throughout.
- Noted that window selection can completely change the look and feel of the building; encouraged the design team to keep researching better option(s).
- Noted the importance of the central portion of the courtyard for social gathering opportunities.

John Prosser:

- Noted the conflict with the proposed south courtyard and the handicap ramp.
- Seconded Seracuse on the use of more subtle curves and lines in the south courtyard.
- Noted the lack of similarity between the proposed window style/proportions.

Jerry Seracuse made a motion for schematic design approval “with the understanding that there be more discussion of details of the site and landscape plans, and that the architectural design incorporate comments from this meeting.” The board unanimously agreed. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

---

### **SEEC (formerly Geosciences) Schematic Design**

Architect(s): Klipp Architecture

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt

Individuals present: Marie Cole, Project Manager – Klipp Architecture; Brian Klipp, Principal – Klipp Architecture; Craig Vickers, Landscape Architect/Planner – Civitas; Alec Lacono, Senior Project Architect – Klipp Architecture; Jim White, Director - N-Star; Sean Convery, BCER; Tom Goodhew, Facilities Planning – University of Colorado; Paul Leef, Campus Architect - University of Colorado; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect - University of Colorado; Philip Simpson, Director of Facilities Planning - University of Colorado; William Arndt, CU Facilities Management (Retired) - University of Colorado.

Brian Klipp:

- Gave a brief introduction to the project following Northcutt's introduction of the design team and primary stakeholder(s).
- Discussed how Klipp has taken the Board's comments and made improvements to the design, including the transition and updating process to the MacAllister building.
- Expressed the importance of the building to fit within the existing campus's architectural style while retaining a vernacular feel.
- Noted the repetition of the existing square windows throughout the redesign to create a sense of uniformity.
- With help from the physical model, Klipp described the materiality of the roof – clay tile, concrete tile grey roof - and its functionality.

Marie Cole:

- Discussed the importance of reaching a LEED Point-Plus status by incorporating appropriate storm water management plans, planting materials, and reuse of materials.
- Discussed the team's goal to be within the 100 KBTU range for maximum efficiency.
- Noted the optimization and utilization of day lighting, and, in turn, the reduction of energy usage.

Sean Convery:

- Discussed sustainability concept goals with respect to heating/cooling features.
- Explained techniques to chill water (recycled) and use a heat exchange system to reduce the amount of energy and overall cost per year.
- Noted the perforation of the screen model and the opportunity to minimize the stack height.

John Young:

- Discussed the general strategies for grading and drainage.
- Noted the sun/shade attributes and how they drove the planting plan.

Craig Vickers:

- Discussed the framework plan and some key characteristics of the exterior drive lane.
- Noted ground studies completed to understand the functionality of the site.
- Described the proposed landscape study: including natural boundaries and successful ways to integrate them into the built environment to intensify the sense of arrival.
- Elaborated on the landscape typologies found on the site and in the proposed landscape plan – native seed mixes and deciduous trees.
- Commented on the sequencing into the courtyard space and how it's creating a strong, flexible, usable destination.
- Discussed the microclimates that will exist and how to create enjoyable space using appropriate plant materials.
- Noted that ornamental grass seed mix will be used in the storm water drainage swales in order to utilize and slow the movement and percolation of water.
- Suggested the implementation of a long harvest table to encourage usage and movement through the site.

John Prosser:

- Discussed the concern of the parking abutting the building. Suggested reworking the circulation plan and possibly pulling some form of landscape vegetation across the roadway.
- Suggested the design team look at college complexes that have successfully incorporated the building into the landscape while allowing for yearly outdoor events.
- Noted the second level bridge is the key element that can make or break the design. Recommended turning the bottom two columns away from the elevator - squaring up the corner with the building.
- Suggested adding large bay windows to the bridge, therefore capitalizing on the existing views.
- Commented on the orientation of the outdoor seating (south/southwest) and suggested planting a vegetated screen next to the terrace providing shade for the user(s).

Candy Roberts:

- Inquired about the feasibility of moving the parking to the other side of the road to incorporate a pedestrian sidewalk.

- Suggested looking into utilizing perforated steel down to the ground level to tie the two elements together.
- Regarding page 29 – asked for clarification on the horizontal details shown in the section graphics. Complemented the added detail.
- Suggested making the Loge more architecturally dominating.

Victor Olgay:

- Recommended considering the formal way that air will be ventilated through the proposed space(s). Proposed wind tunnel testing.
- Agreed with the idea of verticality and horizontality, but suggested expressing contemporary ideas of ecological design integrity (solar, ventilation, water) within the proposed design.
- Regarding the variable exhaust - suggested conducting studies to see if, architecturally, you could reduce the amount of fan energy used for the labs.
- Recommended considering the location of air intake(s) on the buildings.
- Regarding fume hoods – asked how many and where are they located. Asked how are you going to separate the ventilation and thermal loads.
- Proposed more daylight on the desktops, and proposed daylight modeling to maximum penetration.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Inquired about the opportunity of opening up the building (experience) to the existing typography.
- Regarding page 31 – commented on the quality of work to solve a tough problem.
- Noted how the model helps relay the ideas in an accurate scale.

Victor Olgay made a motion for schematic design approval. The board unanimously agreed. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.