



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University Of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, March 10, 2016
Time: 9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Location: Conference Rooms 501 & 502, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay, Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (ex officio), and Wayne Northcutt and André Vite, Campus Representatives

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

9:30 - 10:15

CASA Exterior Modification – CU-Boulder

Architects: Architectural Workshop, Denver, Colorado (not present)
Shaffer Baucom Engineering & Consulting, Denver,
Colorado (not present)

CU-Boulder Campus

Presenters: Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of
Planning, Design and Construction
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect, Facilities
Planning

Others

Present: Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning

Description: New 20' x 16' mechanical yard adjacent to the south face
of CASA to support cleanrooms for the Mars UAE orbiter
mission.

Staff Discussion:

At the request of staff, this item was discussed prior to the Engineering Center Renovation as was listed on the published agenda.

Mr. Haverly began the staff discussion by providing a brief background regarding the purpose of the requested modification for the CASA building (the "CASA Project"). CU-Boulder has been selected as a partner by the United Arab Emirates ("UAE") to create a satellite probe ("UAE Project") to study the atmosphere on Mars and will be receiving grant funds for the CASA Project. In order to meet UAE's launch date in January 2020, construction on the CASA Project must be finished by December 15, 2016, so work on the UAE Project can commence.

Mr. Northcutt continued the staff presentation. It was noted that one of the concerns regarding the UAE Project is related to security. Because CU-Boulder also works on other activity related to NASA projects for the Federal government within the LASP and the CASA buildings, none of the employees working on the UAE Project can have access to or any knowledge of any of the activities areas where non-UAE work is being completed and vice versa. As the CASA building can more easily be isolated than the LASP building, it will be used for the UAE Project. Additionally, enhanced cleanroom space and other improvements were also needed for the UAE Project which could be accommodated within the CASA building. As such, required improvements for the CASA Project include but may not be limited to the:

- expansion of existing cleanroom
- construction of restructured enhancements to the concrete floor slab in the CASA building;
- installation of sunken, bermed mechanical yard;
- construction of a 7' – 8' retaining/screening wall outside of the CASA building on the edge of the mechanical yard;
- construction of a driveway for access into an existing overhead door near the courtyard on the east side of the CASA building.

The construction budget is currently between \$4M – \$5M, and project costs are currently estimated to be between \$6M – \$7M. At this point, although the CASA Project construction needs to be finished by December 2016, the facility is being designed to support the design of a spacecraft, but the design of the spacecraft is not yet complete so some required aspects of the construction project are not yet known.

It was noted that upon completion of the UAE satellite project, this upgraded facility may be utilized for other similar international opportunities. Additionally, the upgraded cleanroom in the CASA building may provide scheduling relief for the existing cleanroom in the LASP building.

Ms. Reilly discussed the proposed landscape plan which includes:

- an increase in the number of evergreen plantings in groupings of three to five trees each on the south side of the CASA building along Colorado Avenue;
- the installation of a driveway from 38th Street into the courtyard on the east side of the CASA building to allow for access into the new cleanroom facility; and
- moving and/or partially removing existing plantings currently in the courtyard in order to make room for the new equipment being installed in the building and for the driveway.

Mr. Goodhew elaborated on some of the details of the proposed CASA Project and noted that as future project grants are obtained, additional phases of improvements to the CASA building may be required.

The Board suggested that:

- the improvements to the CASA building could be designed so that the resulting structure would not have the appearance of being a random element in the Research Park but could become something more similar in appearance to other existing Research Park structures;
- because potential future uses of the CASA building may require additional changes and improvements, in order to take advantage of these future opportunities, it may be

important that the existing structure and architectural design of the CASA building remain adaptable and that it doesn't necessarily need to be preserved in perpetuity;

- staff consider options to the outwardly visible improvements, whether to the retaining wall or to the landscaping or both, which will subtly give the CASA building a little more character and quality, which help give the building the appearance of being intentional, which might relate to the use of the building, and which, for example, wouldn't have the appearance of being "a box built next to a box";
- staff investigate building the retaining wall with an open brick pattern, a concrete wall or a series of panels with vertical openings, use of a parapet of sorts etc., to create a higher level of design quality while keeping the security requirements in mind. Given the visibility on Colorado Avenue, the opportunity to use this addition to improve the current large blank wall should be used;
- that staff perhaps consider other types of plantings and new topography/berming;
- that staff take into consideration that given the geographical location of the CASA building, its location on Colorado Avenue, the surrounding Research Park buildings and the scenic foreground of the mountains, this could be a real opportunity to improve the appearance of the area and enhance the experience of driving along Colorado Avenue.

Staff agreed that while the security issues of the wall will still need to be taken into consideration, other options for landscaping and the design of the wall will be discussed.

The Board directed staff to move forward, consistent with the direction given in the following areas:

- architectural massing and form of the building including the landscape, roof structure, retaining walls and access and building renovations being constructed to meet the required weight, level of security, and other standards;
- articulation of landscape visually along Colorado Avenue;
- agreement that staff did not need to bring this matter back before the Board for further review and action but that, if possible, the Board would appreciate an update in the future if other CU-Boulder matters were scheduled on the Board's agenda.

10:30 - 11:15

Introduction to Engineering Classrooms – CU-Boulder

Architect: Anderson Mason Dale, Architects, Denver, CO

CU-Boulder Campus

Presenters: Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Description: New centrally-scheduled, 200-seat infill auditorium within the southern courtyard of the Engineering Center.

Staff Discussion:

Mr. Haverly introduced this agenda item by noting that this Engineering Center Renovation is regarding the partial infill of the courtyard at the Engineering Center for the construction of a 200-seat auditorium (the "Auditorium Project").

Mr. Northcutt continued the staff discussion by elaborating on a description of the project. The site of the proposed 200-seat auditorium is in the south courtyard in the center of the

Engineering Center. This Auditorium Project is separate and apart from the south wing renovations presented to the Board at its meeting in November 2015. It is being funded by the College of Engineering and the CU-Boulder campus. The current design will place the auditorium so it is aligned with the existing lobby space, will be gently sloped and will include some distance learning enhancements. It also will provide a rooftop terrace that will be available for various uses.

Mr. Goodhew noted that the intent is to more or less mimic the concrete and stone framework already present at the Engineering Center.

He also elaborated on the new gateway process by indicating that this process included the following steps:

- establish that the project is a good idea and is worthy to move forward to the next steps;
- prepare a feasibility study to indicate the demand for the project;
- prepare a conceptual design and determine preliminary pricing;
- prepare a preliminary schematic design in order to determine the project layout;
- present preliminary schematic design and pricing to the Design Review Board for comment; and
- present a schematic design along with a budget for funding and related expenses to the Board of Regents for review and approval.

Although the presentation before the Board at this meeting is beyond pre-design, it was noted that this is the first time this matter has been presented to the Board.

The Board and staff discussed the presentation made to the Board and shared feedback. During this discussion, staff:

- further explained the idea of the roof terrace and the proposed connections to and current uses of the existing lobby;
- indicated it had determined that it would be cost beneficial to add this to the scope of work for the architect and the contractor who are already working on existing improvements being made to the Engineering Center;
- discussed the landscaping in the existing courtyard of the Engineering Center and expressed a concern regarding the remnant section of the courtyard to the south which will remain after the auditorium is built;
- presented an animated sun/shade study to the Board which indicated that the shadow line is aligned with the edge of the proposed auditorium, resulting in an all-day, full-shade courtyard which may prohibit the growth of new, healthy landscaping;
- felt that the proposed location of the auditorium addresses circulation since it is located immediately off of the main lobby and can be accessed from the lobby and also from the floor below the lobby;
- regarding the shade study, suggested that the proposed auditorium was located in the sunniest location in the courtyard because of the rooftop terrace and indicated that the rear portion of the courtyard will be in shade most of the time with minimal direct light and minimal ambient light;
- noted that currently, the existing courtyard is only used on a minimal basis due to the lack of sunlight and lack of furnishings;
- indicated that the wayfinding preferred by the Engineering program is to enter the lobby of the Engineering Center and have easy access to the auditorium, rather than have easy access for the rest of the Engineering Center;

- noted that it was desired that the auditorium be activated off of the lobby;
- noted that almost any time staff has been asked about creating exterior classroom space at the Engineering Center, the sunny side of the center courtyard is the area suggested for this use; and
- staff noted that no other options for the location of this function had been explored.

Additionally, during this discussion, the Board provided the following feedback:

Comments regarding the proposed design and placement of the auditorium - Further study of the placement of the auditorium, points of connection, the orientation of the auditorium, and the remnant space in the courtyard are warranted.

- the proposed placement of the auditorium in the courtyard leaves undesirable remnant space. Useable outdoor space is a precious commodity at the Engineering Center; as such, alternative opportunities for the placement of the auditorium which enhance the remaining courtyard areas should be explored;
- the first level was less integrated into its surroundings; and
- the ingress, egress and design of the rooftop terrace may need some additional work as a second means of egress off of the rooftop terrace down into the courtyard may be needed; there may be an opportunity to install a staircase on the south side of the terrace which could solve the problem of linkage at the end of the corridors.

Possible options to be considered include:

- rotate the placement of the auditorium by 90 degrees so that the lobby would run along a different side of the auditorium which could also connect the rooftop terrace to the lobby space and might provide an opportunity for sunlight in the interior spaces of the lobby and the level below the lobby, as well as provide a visual connection to the remnant courtyard to the south;
- attach to an entrance or place on the roof at an entrance to the Engineering Center to make it more accessible and to provide more light in the dark side of the courtyard. The proposed matching architecture for the auditorium might need to be revisited so that the architecture is made up of a complementary yet similar material, such as concrete rather than stone, so it can provide a better means of reflecting light into the courtyard;
- switch the two areas of the courtyard so the strongest, sunniest area of the courtyard is the area which is activated with people using the auditorium or the remaining space in the courtyard;
- rather than improving the rooftop terrace where it would cost more money to articulate it as an architectural space, if the front door for the auditorium were to face the sunny side of the courtyard, it would be more cost beneficial to spend funds to improve the courtyard;
- explore and enhance additional connections and ways of finding and entering the courtyard and the auditorium both from an interior and an exterior point of view due to the existing and proposed circulation pathways;
- it may be preferable to have the connection to the auditorium through the courtyard rather than through the lobby, although staff responded that security may be an issue with an exterior entrance because the Engineering Center is open 24 hours a day; and
- another option is to preserve the existing courtyard and locate the new auditorium on the west roof and have the entrance to the new facility on the west exterior where the existing entrance is located. This would directly address security concerns.

Further Design Review Board Review Warranted

- staff should bring this matter back before the Board at a conceptual schematic design level prior to creating the final schematic design. This could be done at next month's Board meeting along with a presentation by the architects of various solutions;
- the presentation to the Board suffered from lack of plan views, schematic cross sections and elevations and that these items would help visualize the desired outcome and what is a vertically complex building in terms of placing the auditorium;
- revisit on a schematic level the juxtaposition, placement, organization and potential rotation of the Engineering Center and the proposed auditorium based upon the feedback provided by the Board which should lead to the sequencing of the lobby, the gathering spots, the courtyards and foyers, and how these spaces relate to adjacent uses and future uses;
- elaborate on the siting of the proposed auditorium, the implications of the physical aspects of the project, the proposed budget, the goals and programming of the project, what is desired architecturally, the level connectivity, materiality, height, bulk, etc.; and
- due to the complexity of the auditorium project, include additional information regarding the connectivity and the linkage within the Engineering Center and with the lobby; details about the horizontal and vertical nature of the auditorium as it relates to the rest of the Engineering Center.

The Board indicated that one of the purposes of the Board was to be available early on in the planning stages so that the Board and staff can work together to create project plans that are as good as possible. The Board also indicated that it needed to provide more input earlier on in the approval process regarding programmatic concerns, budget and funding concerns, and making recommendations regarding the physical aspects of a project.

Mr. Haverly requested time on the agenda for the next Board meeting in order to provide the Board with an update on the new gateway process and how these processes could more easily be integrated with the existing Board processes, procedures and submittal guidelines.

11:30 - 12:00 Revised Exterior Signage – CU South Denver

Architects: André Vite

CU Denver Campus

Presenters: Luella Chavez D'Angelo, Vice Chancellor for Enterprise
Development, CU Denver
André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional
Planning

Description: The approved exterior signage package has been revised/
simplified and will be presented for Board approval of the
proposed changes.

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning.

Presentation/Discussion:

Mr. Vite provided a brief status update to the Board, noting that Phase I of the renovation of the CU South Denver ("CUSD") location that was completed approximately two years ago included two 40-person classrooms, a computer center, a nursing simulation space, additional training

rooms, administrative support space and faculty landing zones. Phase II was completed last summer and included additional classrooms, an expansion of the nursing space, additional administrative support, and student and faculty amenities.

At the Board's request, Ms. Chavez D'Angelo provided an explanation to the Board of the original purpose and uses of The Wildlife Museum (the "Museum") and the combined purpose and uses of the Museum and the University. Ms. Chavez D'Angelo also discussed the branding of the University, the promotion of the University as the owner of the CUSD building, and the programs that could be available to the local community as a result of this ownership. The Board discussed that the purposes of CUSD include three components: commercial and academic educational opportunities; entertainment opportunities, and experiential opportunities. Ms. Chavez D'Angelo noted that she is working with Ken McConnellogue of the University Relations team in order to create a new marketing campaign over the next few months in an effort to educate the public and increase participation.

Mr. Vite and Ms. Chavez D'Angelo then reviewed the proposed changes to the exterior signage plan for CU South Denver previously approved by the Board. The proposed changes have simplified the signage and include:

- removing the donor's name from all previously approved signage;
- rather than remove the Extreme Screen Theater signage at the corner of Lincoln Avenue and Lioness Street, the proposal is to retain and upgrade this signage so that the commercial theater application is visible; and
- remove the banner from under the upper arch facing Lioness Street and replace it with a three dimensional, 6' interlocking CU icon.

Ms. Chavez D'Angelo noted that she has discussed the signage with the donors and reported that they do not require that their name be included on the exterior signage for the site and agrees with the proposed changes.

Mr. Vite indicated that the appearance of the temporary banners is also being reviewed. Ms. Chavez D'Angelo stated that her goal is to ultimately make all signage for the site fit within the University's guidelines. Mr. Vite also noted that the illumination of the 6' interlocking CU on the west side of the building is being submitted to Shea Properties for consideration.

The Board suggested that, in time, the Extreme Screen Theater sign might better serve CUSD if it were more institutional in appearance and quality and promoted the location as an event center rather than a movie theater. Ms. Chavez D'Angelo agreed with this comment and noted that due to the cost of replacing this sign, it may not occur for another year or so. The Board understood the budget limitations associated with replacing this signage.

Mr. Epstein moved approval of the revised signage proposal as presented to the Board, with the additional comment that the Extreme Screen Theater sign should be considered temporary and should be modified as the budget allows. Mr. Winters seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

The business portion of the meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.