



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University Of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Rick Epstein (by phone, for afternoon sessions only), Victor Olgay, Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (ex officio), and Andre Vite, Tom Goodhew, and Amy Kirtland, 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 9:00 a.m.

9:00 - 9:30

SharePoint Update

Presenter(s): Christian Boman, University Information Systems

Mr. Boman provided an update to the Board regarding the recent upgrade to the University's SharePoint software and the Design Review Board site.

9:45 - 10:15

Study Session – CU Anschutz Medical Campus/CU South Denver

Presenter: Andre Vite

Mr. Vite provided a brief update to the Board regarding upcoming projects at the Anschutz Medical Campus ("Anschutz") including interior refit to open office space at Building 500 and other buildings at Anschutz, the CU Denver Wellness Center and the CU Denver Academic Building. Also briefly discussed were the bollards proposal for Anschutz and the signage proposal for the Liniger Building at CU South Denver.

10:15 - 11:15

**CU Anschutz Medical Campus Tertiary Monumental Signage –
Design Development Proposal**

Architects: Dig Studio, Denver, Colorado

Presenters: Bill Vitek, Dig Studio
Todd Kreinbrink, Dig Studio

Others

Present: Chad Caletka, Dig Studio

Description: Design Development Presentation for three monumental signs intended for the western portion of campus will be presented

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

Suzann Ruedeman, Project Manager, Assoc. AIA, Denver – Anschutz Medical Campus and Mackenzie Pett, Planner, Office of Institutional Planning, Denver – Anschutz Medical Campus

Design Development Presentation to the DRB:

Mr. Vitek and Mr. Kreinbrink presented the final plans for the tertiary monumental signage proposed for the western portion of Anschutz. The two blade signs did not change in height or length from the concept design presentation made on August 13, 2015. The CU logo has been updated. The general locations for all of the signs have not changed, but the placement of each sign has been adjusted as needed in order to obtain the best placement. Mr. Kreinbrink noted that the design of the arc sign currently proposed for the corner of East Montview Boulevard and Peoria Street had been modified slightly as requested by the Board on August 13, 2015, and crossed a telephone line. The use and potential relocation of the telephone line will need to be determined.

The Board discussed the chain link fence along Peoria Street and expressed a desire for the entire length of fencing to be removed but understood that it was not located on university property so such removal was not under the university's control.

Mr. Kreinbrink described the proposed landscaping for each location and indicated that the proposed materials are similar to existing landscaping for signage at Anschutz. The Board requested that the proposed materials be reviewed to ensure the expected growth patterns would not be in conflict with the visibility of the signage.

Mr. Kreinbrink also noted that in order to accommodate the proposed signage placement for all three locations, a few existing trees, many of which are in poor health, will need to be removed.

To help prevent the spread of grass and weeds between the proposed landscaping and the existing grass, the Board suggested that a 6" to 8" concrete mow edge be used in lieu of the proposed metal edging.

Proposed lighting fixtures were also discussed. It was noted that the sources for water and electrical service will need to be determined, and, if necessary, submetering and/or cost sharing will be investigated. The Board suggested that, if possible, the brushed finish of the aluminum lettering be done horizontally rather than vertically as a horizontally-brushed surface will better reflect light. The Board reviewed the photometric light distribution shown in the presentation, and asked the team to review the proposed design light level, which appeared excessively high.

Since the DRB meeting on August 13, 2015, two members of the Board visited the site to view the suggested placement of the proposed signage.

Ms. Ruedeman noted that a meeting with the Veterans' Administration ("VA") would need to be scheduled in order to discuss the signage proposal including the specific proposal for the VA blade signage to be located at the intersection of East Montview Boulevard and Quentin Street, the removal of the trees and sections of the chain link fence, and water and electrical service and usage.

Winters moved to approve the design development for the tertiary monumental signage proposal for the western portion of Anschutz as presented. Olgvay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

11:15 - 11:30

Liniger Building Exterior Signage Proposal – CU South Denver

Architect: Andre Vite
Presenter: Andre Vite
Description: Revisions to the M3 and M4 signage will be presented for DRB comments prior to submission to Shea Properties later this month.

In response to the Board meeting of August 13, 2015, Mr. Vite noted that after additional discussions with CU South Boulder leadership, the two vertical banners on the east side of the Liniger Building will remain as they are for the time being.

Upon an inquiry by the Board regarding potential lighting of the proposed M3 Theater Arch aluminum signage, Mr. Vite indicated that there is currently no lighting for this location nor is lighting proposed for this location. In the future, if lighting were to be added, it would likely be ground lighting rather than internal signage lighting.

Brandes moved to approve the exterior signage proposal for the Liniger Building as submitted, noting that in the future, as the function, programming and use of the Liniger Building evolves in such a way that modification of the exterior signage would be required, that the Board hereby requests to be included in the review of any exterior signage improvements. Olgvay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Mr. Vite indicated that the next step would be to obtain approval for the signage proposal by Shea Properties.

11:45 - 12:00

Bollards at Biosciences 2 (Consent Agenda) – CU Anschutz Medical Campus

Architect: Andre Vite
Presenter: Andre Vite
Description: A proposal for bollards to be installed to the east of Biosciences 2 to protect the building and pedestrians from westbound traffic on Montview Boulevard will be presented.

Mr. Vite presented a proposal to install cement-cast bollards of various sizes in an area of the sidewalk on Ursula Street between Montview Boulevard and East 21st Avenue near the Biosciences 2 Building. The bollards will be installed on a temporary basis. It is anticipated that they will be in place for approximately five years and will cost approximately \$4.4K.

The Board liked the playfulness and frivolity the bollards presented but discussed concerns regarding visibility for pedestrians and vehicles, potential pedestrian trip hazards and snow removal. Mr. Vite was asked to investigate the available lighting for the area to ensure the bollards will be sufficiently lit when needed.

Regarding snow removal, Mr. Vite indicated that likely, pedestrian pathways would be cleared of snow which could be packed around the bollards and allowed to melt if needed.

The Board, by consensus, directed Mr. Vite to move forward with the bollard proposal with a suggestion that the bollards be cast in a contrasting color to help improve visibility.

12:45 - 1:30 Study Session – CU-Boulder

The Board reviewed with CU-Boulder campus representatives the two CU-Boulder agenda items the details of which have been incorporated into the meeting notes below.

1:30 - 2:30

Carlson Gymnasium Renovation Introduction

Architects: GKK Works, Denver, Colorado and
THA Architects, Portland, Oregon

Architect

Presenters: Steven Schonberger, AIA, Associate Principal, Higher
Education, GKK Works, Denver, Colorado and
David Keltner, AIA, LEED AP, Principal, THA Architects,
Portland, Oregon

CU-Boulder Campus

Presenters: Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning,
Architect
William “Bill” Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of
Planning, Design and Construction
Amy Kirtland, Architect – Facilities Planner

Others

Present: Stacy Lindholm, Architect, GKK Works
Heath Meisner, Landscape Architect, Civitas, Denver,
Colorado

Description: David Gross, Project Architect, GKK Works
Pre-Design Discussion re: Renovation of Carlson
Gymnasium for Academic Use

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect – Facilities Planner; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect; Amy Kirtland, Architect – Facilities Planner; Ida Mae Isaac, Senior Project Coordinator, Facilities Planning; and Stephen Graziano, Project Manager, Facilities Management.

Project Introduction and Pre-Design Discussion:

The Board began this presentation with an informal study session with the campus participants.

Mr. Goodhew provided background regarding the Carlson Gymnasium (“Gymnasium”) located on the CU-Boulder campus including a history of the Gymnasium, former and current uses, annual campus funding, potential future uses, etc. He noted that the budget for the total project costs is \$32M; \$22M of this budget has been allocated toward construction. The proposed timeframe anticipates breaking ground in approximately May 2017. Additionally, he discussed the selection process regarding the architectural team for the renovation project and the anticipated selection of additional project leadership (i.e., a construction manager, etc.).

Mr. Goodhew, Mr. Haverly, Ms. Kirtland and the Board also discussed anticipated strategies for moving forward with this project, the scope of the master plan, potential concerns regarding the master plan and concerns expressed by surrounding neighborhoods.

The architects selected for this project joined the meeting. Mr. Schonberger reviewed the goals and vision for the project and additional history regarding the Gymnasium. Mr. Keltner noted that across the country, there has been a resurgence of renovation of older buildings on university campuses and discussed the desire of the team to retain as much of the exterior and interior existing building structure as possible while still meeting the needs of the campus.

Mr. Schonberger and Mr. Keltner described the anticipated renovations to the Gymnasium; challenges regarding ingress, egress and pedestrian circulation; specific exterior and interior areas of the Gymnasium; deferred maintenance and utility issues; and traditional vs. non-traditional classroom and other uses.

The Board thanked the design team for its efforts to retain the historical aspects of the Gymnasium while trying to meet the needs of the campus for flexible space. It expressed a desire that as the renovations and programming are developed, the historical design and uses of the Gymnasium be taken into consideration. That said, strategic design interventions that reflect the new innovative program of the building would be considered. The Board further mentioned the need to balance the building performance with the historical quality of the building. The new use, circulation patterns, and access need to be carefully evaluated to see how they affect the campus and the building. No Board action was required for this matter.

The Board briefly described the next steps for Board review which is the Pre-Design Development.

2:30 - 4:00

North of Boulder Creek Master Plan Progress

Architects: OZ Architecture, Denver and
Wenk Landscape Architecture & Planning, Denver

Architect

Presenters: David Schafer, AIA, LEED AP, OZ Architecture, Denver
Greg Dorolek, Wenk Landscape Architecture & Planning,
Denver
Eric Pearse, Wenk Landscape Architecture & Planning,
Denver

CU-Boulder Campus

Presenter(s): Amy Kirtland, Architect – Facilities Planner
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning,
Architect
William “Bill” Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of
Planning, Design and Construction

Description: Project Status Update

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect – Facilities Planner; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect; Ida Mae Isaac, Senior Project Coordinator, Facilities Planning; and Stephen Graziano, Project Manager, Facilities Management; and Steve Hecht, Assistant Director for Design and Project Management, Housing Administration.

Project Status Update:

The Board began this presentation with an informal study session with the campus participants.

Mr. Goodhew and Ms. Kirtland provided an update to the Board regarding the North of Boulder Creek Master Plan (the "Master Plan"), including a brief explanation of the planning activities that have been completed since the last formal meeting with the Board when the Boulder Creek Conceptual Master Plan was presented to the Board in 2013.

Ms. Osborne noted that regarding the master planning process, the DRB assumes an advisory role through all stages of a master plan. She also noted that if the Master Plan is substantially different from what had been included within the CU-Boulder 2010-2020 Campus Master Plan approved by the Board of Regents in 2011, then this updated Master Plan will also need to be approved by the Board of Regents in addition to further review by the DRB.

Mr. Goodhew acknowledged that this additional approval is anticipated. He also discussed the expectation of the approval and review process going forward. He noted that FEMA is in the process of reviewing the floodway and floodplain for the area which will, in part, drive the Master Plan process and timeframe. Current needs related to campus housing are also driving this process and were briefly discussed as were potential parking needs and proposed parking locations.

Ms. Reilly provided a brief update regarding physical connections between the area in discussion and the Boulder campus which were destroyed in the 2013 flood.

The architects selected for this project joined the meeting. Mr. Schafer provided an overview of the master plan goals and vision, including sustainability, land stewardship, diversity, connectivity, character, flexibility, and safety. He noted that the current Master Plan includes approximately 900 to 1,000 housing units; and briefly discussed the proposed housing needs; proposed athletics features; utility systems and irrigation needs; parking, transportation and pedestrian needs; proposed community spaces; a potential conference center option; and sustainability of the Master Plan neighborhood.

The Board indicated that in terms of review process, it felt that much of what had been presented to the Board was at a design development level and that the Board was not yet ready to comment on specific design criteria included within the proposal but rather only comment on the overall Master Plan design and framework. The Board encouraged the design team to utilize as much as possible the public edge of the Boulder Creek corridor and discussed potential changes to the neighborhoods as presented. Concerns expressed by the Board included access, circulation, parking, and potential floodway and floodplain designations. The Board inquired about the possibility for expanded connectivity especially to the existing campus, potential expansion of the Master Plan area neighborhood to the north, and encouraged the design team to consider the lifestyles and needs of the residents that may live within the Master Plan area and other users while thinking about the vision of the area. The DRB encourages the campus to work with the City of Boulder and neighboring property owners to develop the Master Plan.

The Board thanked the design team for its work on the Master Plan to date. It emphasized that the area incorporated within the Master Plan has the potential to become a unique, world-class development and should be planned as such so that the vision of the area drives the creation of the Master Plan to ensure that the most desirable components of the area are enhanced. The

vision components of the plan need to be more strongly and clearly identified. The Board suggested that the Master Plan area could become a gateway to the campus.

The Board and the design team discussed the process going forward and what the next steps should be. The Board indicated that it would continue to work with the design team on an informal basis. It was noted that the current campus housing needs and the upcoming FEMA review and the timing of both will need to be taken into consideration.

The public meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.