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

University Of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Summary

Date:	Thursday, October 8, 2015
Time:	11:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Location:	Lindfield Executive Conference Room A400, Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotechnology Building, University of Colorado Boulder

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

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

11:00 - 2:15 Campus Tour

Prior to beginning the study session as indicated below, the Board met CU-Boulder campus representatives for a tour of several buildings on the Boulder campus.

2:15 - 2:30 Administrative Business

Osborne reviewed a number of administrative matters with the Board.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2:30 - 3:00 Study Session – CU-Boulder

The Board reviewed with CU-Boulder campus representatives several CU-Boulder matters including the agenda item, the details of which have been incorporated into the meeting notes below.

3:00 - 4:30 Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotechnology Building E-Wing Addition

Architects: HDR Architects, Denver, Colorado

Architect Presenters: John Salisbury, Senior Project Manager/Architect, HDR
Christopher Kleingartner, Project Designer, HDR
Dan Strudell, Landscape Designer, HDR

CU-Boulder Campus
Presenters: Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
William "Bill" Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction

Others Present: Kevin Sharpe, Project Coordinator, HDR
Ty McConnell, Adolfson & Peterson Construction
David Sharock, Adolfson & Peterson Construction
Christine Layes, HDR
Giovana Lange, Architectural Intern, HDR
Tom Whetstone, Project Principal, HDR

Description: Design Development Review

Campus/Consultant Attendance:
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning, Architect; Jonathan Bortles, Sustainability Program Manager, Facilities Management; Amy Kirtland, Architect – Facilities Planner; Ida Mae Isaac, Senior Project Coordinator, Facilities Planning; and Monika Magenheim, Project Coordinator, Facilities Management; Dave Danielson, Asst. Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management; Peter Nelson, Project Manager; Jonathan Moore, Facilities Management; and Lee Silbert, Director, Finance and Operations, Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotechnology Building

Design Development Presentation to the DRB:
Mr. Salisbury, Mr. Weingartner, and Mr. Strudell presented the design development plans for the addition of the E-Wing (the "Wing") to the Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotechnology Building located on the CU-Boulder campus beginning with the desired objectives for the wing and the interior and exterior design concepts leading toward these objectives. Project programming and sustainable building design strategies were discussed. Mr. Salisbury noted that rather than pursuing LEED Platinum Certification, the design team would be pursuing LEED Gold Plus Certification as approved by CU-Boulder. Site design plans including design and landscaping concepts, civil engineering plan, planting plan and palettes for landscaping, lighting and furnishings, elevations, a 3-D rendering showing elevations and landscaping, and energy and sustainability strategies for design development of the proposed wing were reviewed and discussed. The Board also discussed the design of the northeast courtyard including the covered bicycle parking structure located in the east courtyard, proposed bioswales, the water table, and proposed bollards.

Mr. Northcutt indicated that the design team is hoping to finalize design development and establish the construction GMP contract the week following the Board meeting. The Board felt that any recommendations made by the Board during this review process could be accommodated through the construction documents and technical specifications and would not delay this progress.

The Board thanked the presenters for their presentations and noted that the Board felt it was very thoughtful and that the project will be a great addition to the campus.

Northcutt moved to approve for design development for the addition of the E-Wing to the Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotechnology Building located on the CU-Boulder campus with the following conditions for which the design team should work with the appropriate campus staff in order to:

Sustainability:

- Study further many of the ideas proposed in the report from Daylighting Innovations in order to optimize the shading, specifically including the recommendation to use a 45- to 50-degree cut-off for the south and east laboratory windows to block the direct sunlight for the warmest six months of the year on the south façade and starting at 10 a.m. on the east façade. This change would be a subtle difference aesthetically but has the potential to make a significant difference in the performance of the windows and shading. Additionally, investigate improvements to the shading structure in order to make the shading slightly wider which could cost less and provide more benefit than would increasing the size of the light windows on the second level and which could function better and reduce glare in the laboratories compared to the shading within the existing structure. Lastly, if agreed upon, these improvements should be included within the energy model since there will be an impact to the energy usage if the improvements are made.

- Investigate the assumptions made by Noresco regarding electric lighting power density. The wattage per square foot, listed at 1.0 Watt/SF, could be high given existing technologies already available and that current best practices now indicate that 0.7 Watt/SF in laboratories and 0.4 Watt/SF in other spaces are sufficient and could provide for a 30% to 40% reduction from the current study.

- Explore changes to the specifications listed for glass as glass technology has also improved. It may be possible to fine tune the specifications on the west and south sides where there are heat gain issues as different glass could allow for a lower shading coefficient and on the north and east sides, brighter glass could provide for better daylighting. These changes, if made, should also be included in the energy model. While such modifications will present themselves in an energy model as slight improvements, they will make larger improvements in internal comfort, should be essentially the same aesthetically, and should be possible with a minimal increase in costs.

- Investigate further the proposed changes to the laboratory ceiling planes and slopes included within the Daylighting Innovations report as these recommendations could provide a significant opportunity to improve the distribution of light in the laboratories and could make this space more comfortable with minimal or no increase in costs. An entire laboratory ceiling wouldn't necessarily have to be at a slope but rather could be articulated through the use of a bay or through sectioning. Since the laboratories are being shelled now, the installation of the ceiling wouldn't be required immediately. However, the coordination of the mechanical, structural and architectural systems should be developed now so when the shell is built out in the future, the recommendations can be put into place without any additional expense.

Architecture:

- To the degree possible given existing budget constraints, explore articulating the canopy at the entry in the west courtyard in order to aesthetically create a stronger and grander expression for a front entry way and investigate if it would be possible to add a little more relief by slightly recessing the windows.

- Relocate the seating wall in the west courtyard currently located to the north of the sidewalk leading to the entry way to the south side of the sidewalk along the north edge of the planter and consider fine tuning the planting strategy along both sides of the bench wall to provide for a broader canopy base, widen the planting area immediately next to the south building wall adjacent to the sidewalk and include additional plantings in the area along the west wall to the left of the sidewalk.

- In the northeast courtyard, explore ways to reduce the scale of the courtyard and simultaneously divorce the bicycle parking structure element from the courtyard element so that one becomes a functional component that is tied to the sidewalk and the street while the other becomes more of a courtyard-oriented element with more people space.

- Investigate adding an additional step into the building from the west courtyard entry so that the entire west courtyard is accessible and the sidewalk leading to the entry way does not exceed a 5% slope.

Site Design/Landscape:

- Explore the inclusion in both the northeast and west courtyards as many electrical bollards as possible as not to do so at this time, even with the budgetary constraints, could be short sighted and a disservice to the users of the space since the timing for the next phase of construction is unknown.

- While studying the suggested elements of the northeast courtyard, explore with campus landscape architects the separation/buffer/connection of the bike shelter structure to the rest of the plaza using a variety of different structural or landscape materials.

- Coordinate with campus landscape architects on refinements to the planting palettes, i.e., detail of the plant specifications, detailed placement of plant materials, the seasonality of the plant material selection, and details regarding irrigation, etc., for many of the areas discussed including but not limited to the entryways next to the building and the courtyards.

Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

The Board thanked the design team for its efforts, and the public meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.