

2004 Leading Edge Competition
August 31, 2004

Technical Judging Legend:

- A – No Evidence of calculations being used to show iterative design.
- B – Calculations incomplete.
- C – Calculations incorrect.
- D – Evidence of design being influenced by energy analysis.
- E – References/described systems inadequately illustrated or integrated into the design.
- F – Calculations used inappropriately.
- G – Calculations don't substantiate design scheme.
- H – Inappropriate use of design elements.
- I – Applications of elements inappropriate for culture.

* For locating your Entry #, please use the **middle 3 numbers** given to you at the time of registration. For example: If your number is 01-001-03, it will show in the table below as simply "001."

Challenge 1 Competition Results

*Entry #	Judges Comments				
001	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	G	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Passive systems are not adequately documented.				
002	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good calculation narrative.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for the Use of PV for Shading and Aesthetic Articulation. The judges were pleased by the use of PV in this project. Several felt that the outdoor space was well designed and would support real human activity and comfort. However the water collection system was impractical in an environment that gets only 5 inches of rain a year.				
003	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section and Detail Floor Plan.				
005	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E, G, H	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations don't substantiate Daylight Factor of 2.5.				
006	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS

	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good calculations – baseline using ASHRAE.			
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> The wind towers and the use of evaporative cooling in the project impressed the design judges. However several felt that the design was overbuilt for the site. The supergraphics and the scrim felt overdone. The use of the berm and partially undergrounding the project had some benefits for thermal control, however the reduced daylighting potential for the project was on balance a greater negative.			
007	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Elevation and Detail Floor Plan.			
011	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Exceptionally detailed and good technical documentation.			
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Exception Integration of Engineered Passive Features. This project displayed good use of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) analysis. The judges were also impressed by the calculations of the cooling tower flow, and the exploration of the cooling skin. One judge praised the reinterpretation of a loggia. However aesthetically, several judges felt that the overall form was problematic and the floating element was ponderous.			
012	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Technical Calculations.			
014	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	H, I FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Nice presentation of Calculations. Inappropriate use of PVs to power classroom lighting. Excessive use of “magic arrows”.			
019	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations are good, evaporative cooling workable, but exiting air not thought through. High mass counteracts cooling towers. Night ventilation not through and could be described better.			
023	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Disqualified - 37,000 ft. exceeds program requirements.			
025	Initial Screening:	FAIL		

	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section.				
028	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Energy 10 and LEED checklist not described.				
030	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Doesn't show how embodied energy calculation improved building. "Screen" not described.				
031	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C, E	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate use of "magic arrows". Calculations look reasonable. Roof "R" values incorrect.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> First Place. This design was one of the judge's favorites. It displayed good strategic use of sustainable features. The boards were clear and presented the design in a pleasing fashion. The choice of form was very good and would fit on the campus. The passive features were well chosen and designed.				
033	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Base case non-local code compliant. PV used to light classrooms, but should have probably used daylighting. West windows not sufficiently shaded – low sun angle not controlled.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Second Place. The judges praised the aesthetics of this project and felt that it was in keeping with the college campus context, and the adjacent buildings. The bilateral lighting and cross ventilation was well designed in this earth-sheltered project. The wind scoops were also praised. The weakness of this project was in the level of sophistication of the technical analysis; the entry would have been stronger with better analysis. In addition one judge noted that more daylighting would have better than using PV for powering lights.				
034	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C, E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> "R" value incorrect for the low-E Case.				
037	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good Energy 10 analysis, but no description of "ground loop" or daylighting. Schematics illegible.				

040	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No daylighting data on Energy 10. Good integration of passive and active systems.	
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Utilization of PV Shaded Courtyard As a Social Center. This was a very pleasing presentation that incorporated many passive and sustainable elements. The solution had tremendous clarity, the plan was well ordered, and the courtyard design was commendable. However, all the elevations were not included on the boards and some judges worried about massing issues in the elevations that were not shown. Slots with glazing were interesting but problematic because of glare issues. The office space as designed did not seem to be appropriate for faculty offices. Some judges worried that the 3-layer roof system would be too opaque.	
041	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: H, I FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No description of daylighting in classrooms. Inappropriate use of kal-well roof.	
043	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Base case not Title 24 compliant (which is illegal in California). Non-local code compliance, therefore energy savings overstated.	
050	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: D, E PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No narrative on pre-cooling systems.	
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Innovative Integrated Cooling Strategies and Naturally Conditioned Outdoor Spaces. This design displayed an excellent description of an iterative design process. Some very interesting ideas were discussed, and the judges liked the low scale of the project. This entry was considered for second place along with two other entries. But the graphic presentation was difficult to follow, and important information was displayed in very small elements. The relationship of the roof plane to the occupied space in particular was not clearly described.	
051	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Other electricity reduced without documentation.	
053	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i>	

	Calculations/Energy 10 simulation illegible.				
054	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B, C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Energy efficiency features unclear.				
057	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E, H	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Building elements not described (i.e. “sun sponges”).				
058	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Drawings and narrative difficult to read. Movable screens may work but are not very reliable. Night flush of mass is not fully developed.				
060	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B, F	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good explanations of energy calculations. No attempt at daylighting.				
062	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Neat technical evaluation. Heavy-handed approach to problem statement.				
065	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	G	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Ventilation scheme not very strong. Daylight Factor too high. Confusing technical analysis (unclear/mislabeled).				
066	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No space cooling/heating. Light shelf may be inappropriate.				
067	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Interesting use of cooling tower. Numbers too low for heat gain. Nothing about ventilation.				
068	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D, E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No description of daylighting or underground gravel storage. Calculations suspect.				
069	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> E-Quest illegible – could be clearer. Calculations complete.				

	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> This entry was one of the finalists in the judging. However it suffered from a lack of clarity in the presentation. The roof plan showed one roof with little modulation, and yet the floor plans showed almost individual buildings. The design would have benefited from more relationship between the roof and the floor plans. The judges worried that in this hot dry climate, this scheme had too much exposed surface area.			
070	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing building Section.			
071	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Cooling okay. No description on lighting. Doesn't address evaporative coolers in classroom.			
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> The evaporative cooling tower dominated the sustainable aspects of this design, however some judges felt that it would not be adequate to cool the whole area. In contrast other sustainable features of this design were not well developed. The daylighting scheme was unusual, but the lack views from the interior to the exterior compromised the success of the daylighting.			
072	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No narrative on Energy 10. Daylighting isn't properly analyzed. Questionable values and effectiveness on truss and building structure. No demonstration of energy efficiency in design.			
073	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Base case assumed too high of efficiency.			
074	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Daylighting isn't properly analyzed. Movable fins can be effective if they work (but are not entirely reliable). Night radiant cooling appropriate. Could have done something more simple if different orientation (i.e. fixed shading devices).			
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Courageous Use of Dynamic Façade and a Radiant Cooling Roof. The dynamic wall in this design was interesting, but contentious. Some judges worried that the effect would be overly brutal. The use of a radiant night sky cooling system was interesting.			

078	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E, G, H	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No sun penetration study. No description of daylighting.				
080	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section.				
082	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> E-Quest doesn't indicate that solar controls were modeled.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> This entry displayed good use of shading and outdoor circulation, but the passive strategies were not well developed. The classrooms do not appear to have adequate daylighting. Some judges thought that the interior spaces would not have aesthetic character.				
091	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan, Wall Detail and Calculations.				
092	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan.				
098	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E, G, H	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good wind diagram. Shading for lower level windows inadequate. Solar angle goes into windows. Plans drawn incorrectly. Potentially interesting elements.				
112	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> West louvers not described. Unfortunately analysis for the windows was only down on the south window. West window would have shown excessive heat gain and would have resulted in different masonry choice. Ventilation scheme not adequately explained. .				
114	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good calculations. Needs more explanation on the daylighting aisle.				
	Merit Citation for Use of Earth Sheltered Form. This entry showed good integration of daylighting into a subgrade location, but it suffered from presentation boards that were not adequately legible for the judges to understand the project. The water-integrated fenestration was intriguing, but the lighting analysis seemed to show that it was not working				

	adequately.		
116	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Wall Detail.		
117	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan, 1 Section and Calculations.		
120	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Calculations.		
121	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A, B, E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No description on PVs and missing calculations.		
133	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A, H FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No narrative on technical analysis. No adequate daylighting on lower levels.		
134	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A, B, C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Daylight analysis does not influence design. Building appears to be using high amounts of energy.		
135	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: G, H FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate use of monolithic wall. Building appears to be off-site in Perspective drawing.		
139	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: B FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Only 2 Calculations are provided – missing third.		
140	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Wall Detail.		
142	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section and Calculations.		

144	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Extensive research and solution to solar glare problems. Water through glass may not be very effective.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> The presentation boards appeared to be somewhat incomplete for this entry. Better elevations would have been desirable. Some judges felt that the hovering pods as designed would be overwhelming. The slit window fenestration hamper views and are not effective for daylighting.				
146	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Wall Detail.				
149	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D, E	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Questionable daylighting amount on lower levels. Insufficient explanations of roof-top vegetation and pools.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> This entry was unique among the entrants judged by the design judges. But some of them were concerned about the underground design. In addition several felt that this design would conflict with other buildings on the campus.				
151	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Arrived 6/15/04 – after receipt of entries deadline.				
152	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section.				
155	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Potential good daylight scheme but views are not appealing or conducive to learning. Calculations are non-responsive.				
170	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Wall Detail.				
171	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Only Heavy handed approach to shading which is not integrated to the building. Didn't make connection to all elements.				

172	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No calculations. Flaws in ventilation scheme.		
174	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: G, H	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Embodied energy calculation doesn't show impact on design.		
178	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: A	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Text incomprehensible/difficult to read. No narrative or summary.		
179	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No summary included with Calculations.		
180	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: A	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Difficult to correlate Calculations with building system.		
181	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations are not consistent – slightly questionable as related to the design.		
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Strong First Moves in Massing and Space Organization to Provide Passive Conditioning for All Spaces. This entry intrigued several judges in that the relationships between outdoor and indoor spaces, the cross ventilation, and the daylighting were strong. The three wings appeared to be a successful solution to the program. But the big wall bisecting the design was not well integrated, and appeared to have little function. In addition there appeared to be discrepancies between the plans and the sections.		
182	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: A	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Difficult to correlate Calculations with building system.		
182	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No calculations. Not well documented.		
183	Initial Screening: PASS	Technical Screening: D, E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i>		

	Calculations okay, however too much West sunlight coming in to the building. Over reliance on grid, with not else to design.			
184	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan.			
187	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Perspective.			
189	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and one Elevation.			
190	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Narrative could be more descriptive. Truth window not shown (would be nice to see). Strategies workable but none of them could handle cooling – would need assistance from fans or pumps.			
191	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate use of water over porous brick to cool. Classroom ventilation scheme with low/high not as effective as description. West glazing inappropriate and not adequately shaded.			
193	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations based on LAX weather climate which is the opposite of the Palm Desert area. Passive cooling partially effective. Illustrated “stacks” not described.			
195	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, G FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Daylighting Calculations don’t substantiate design scheme.			
196	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Appears that Evaporative cooling is only on the 1 st floor. “Earth tubes” are not fully described or illustrated.			
197	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Use of “magic arrows” in ventilation scheme.			

	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> This entry used a very strong circular form which was both the strength and the weakness of the project. The judges worried that the circular form inhibited resolution of the interior spaces and did not link well with the surrounding campus.			
198	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing building Section.			
205	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations okay.			
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Integration of Ventilation Towers to Condition Classrooms and Shared Office Spaces. This entry was a bold attempt with shared outdoor spaces that felt like a good centerpiece for the campus. The integration of the ventilation towers was very good. But the overall massing was too monolithic for the campus context. Some judges felt the design looked too much like an arena or a circus tent, neither of which are good metaphors for a college administration building. In addition the 5 inches of annual rainfall is not adequate for the rain water collection system.			
216	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Interesting concepts but do not work out. Orientation of building makes it bad for heat gain and daylight.			
217	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No referenced base case. Appears to have significant heat gain on windows.			
218	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan.			
219	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B, E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Difficult to read. Heat loss was not done for the entire building and missing Heat Gain Calculation.			
222	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Elevations.			

223	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing second building Section. Does not follow submission format requirements.		
224	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Wall Detail, Section and Calculations. Does not follow submission format requirements.		
225	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan and Calculations. Does not follow submission format requirements.		
226	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Calculations. Does not follow submission format requirements.		
227	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Calculations. Does not follow submission format requirements.		
228	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: F FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations okay with good narrative. Strategies on sun shade not clear and it appears that the wrong conclusion was made. Design not responsive to climate.		
231	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Wall Detail and Calculations.		
232	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A, B FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Excessive use of “magic arrows”.		
238	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Electrical lighting reduction could have been influenced by daylighting. Use of exterior shades are not adequate and are of marginal use on the North Elevation.		
245	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: E FAIL

	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good use of heat loss in building envelope and calculation methods to consider alternatives. References/described systems inadequately illustrated or integrated into the design.			
257	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan, Wall Detail, Sections and Calculations.			
259	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan, Wall Detail and Calculations.			
262	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan, Elevations, one Section and Calculations.			
263	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Wall Detail, Elevations, Perspective and Calculations.			
269	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Elevations and Calculations.			
271	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> UA does not show sufficient Heat Loss.			
272	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B, E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate use of “magic arrows”. Minimal documentation.			
273	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	I FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No ventilation. Design not appropriate for climate.			
274	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Evidence of calculations being used to show iterative design with the exception of sun shading.			
275	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	H FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate use of design elements.			

276	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Use of “magic arrows”. Air resistance tables are not accurate.				
277	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B, C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No description on Calculations. Difficult to read. Los Angeles weather data in appropriate.				
278	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Creative approach but is not responsive to the climate.				
279	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Neat Calculations. Analysis of Calculations is good. An “A” on technical narrative.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation For Clarity of Technical Analysis. This entry displayed excellent technical analyses and was one of the technical judges favorites. The design judges praised the sculptural use of daylighting; an appropriate choice in the desert. However they were troubled by the use of the circular forms and felt that important space planning issues were not well resolved.				
289	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Creative approach but is not responsive to the climate.				
290	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No evidence of ventilation on upper floors.				
	Merit Citation for Underground Classroom Scheme with a Compelling Above Ground Office Element. This entry was considered for second place along with two other entries. Overall the entry was a reasonable proposal with a compelling above ground element. There was a nice linkage between technical and design components, integrating both passive and active elements. However the judges were troubled because the rendered image was out of scale. The stairs to the underground portions were inadequate and the ramp, while not show in an elevation, appeared to be overly ponderous.				
299	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Received entry 6/22/04 – after receipt of entries deadline.				

300	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	F	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Heat Gain not fully addressed. Window pop-outs in appropriate to climate and sun angle. No base case on Heat Gain through windows.				
301	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Elevation.				
303	Initial Screening:	FAIL			
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Elevation.				
304	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D, E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Solar collectors not shown or fully explained. Orientation not appropriate. Imaginative use of materials.				
305	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, F	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Ventilation not described. Interesting features but have questionable performance ability. Judges did not understand comparison to a New Zealand climate.				
306	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D, E	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Technical analysis not shown in design scheme.				
307	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D, H	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Presentation difficult to interpret. Inappropriate technology depicted.				
325	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations incomplete.				
330	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No description. Missing Calculations. Non-responsive.				
331	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No base case.				
363	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E	FAIL

	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Appropriate approach to cooling vs. heating. Good strategy. Ventilation and nigh scheme flush not clearly depicted.		
367	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A, C, E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Too much Heat Gain. Inadequate sun control of South. Questionable value of curved North windows glazing as it would probably lost daylighting in the classrooms by being so far back.		
368	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: B, C, E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Creative approach but is not responsive to the climate.		
369	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan.		
370	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations do not make sense. No description of ventilation. Use of “magic arrows”.		
371	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan.		
372	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening: A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Daylighting too weak. Questionable ventilation scheme. Overuse of “magic arrows”.		
378	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan and Calculations.		
385	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Wall Detail.		
386	Initial Screening:	FAIL	
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Calculations.		
387	Initial Screening:	FAIL	

	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Perspective.			
388	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan.			
404	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan, Wall Detail and 1 Section. Does not follow submission format requirements.			
405	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B, D FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> CFD difficult to read. Interesting Calculations but no narrative or explanation.			
408	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan, 1 building Section.			
409	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Calculations.			
410	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one building Section and Calculations.			
412	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Sections, Detail Floor Plan, Wall Detail and Calculations.			
413	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section and Calculations.			
416	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate orientation. Inappropriate Heat Gain during Winter. Ventilation scheme not fully developed or described.			
417	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	H FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations okay. Daylight reflective grid does not enhance daylight			

	deeper into space.			
419	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Solar study only – no Calculations.			
423	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Most of the text and descriptions unreadable.			
428	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate orientation. Missing Calculations.			
434	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing one Section.			
448	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Site Plan, Elevations, Detail Floor Plan, Wall Detail and Calculations.			
452	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Calculations.			
454	Initial Screening:	FAIL		
	<i>Comments:</i> Missing Detail Floor Plan and Calculations.			
456	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Neat Calculations. Wrong conclusion was drawn in regards to the solar penetration of the East/West glazing.			
457	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Good technical analysis.			
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> This entry, The Mirage, was a fun idea, but overall the proposal was light on sustainable issues. Daylighting in the classrooms was not adequately addressed. The judges did not see how the auditorium was resolved.			
458	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	E FAIL

	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Very little narrative and drawings do not show enough information.				
460	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A, B, C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Calculations incorrect and incomplete.				
461	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Use of “magic arrows”. Air resistance tables are not accurate.				
479	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Ecological solution does not translate into courtyard scheme.				
481	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	D	PASS
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Neat technical analysis. Calculations okay. Thermal concepts have validity. Pool concept needs more development. Slightly problematic - needs wind rose.				
	<i>Design Judges Comments:</i> Merit Citation for Compelling Form Based on Natural Ventilation and Daylighting. The judges praised the choice to organize the floor plan to clearly take advantage of natural ventilation. But this entry suffered because the presentation boards were difficult to read and as a result the building design is not adequately conveyed to the judges. The water-cooling system appeared to be somewhat farfetched.				
482	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	A	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> No shading and direct sun on North facing windows. Inappropriate Heat Gain during Winter.				
483	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Inappropriate orientation. The number for cooling is too low for Heat Gain. Inadequate sun protection on West side.				
492	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> “Earth pipe” diagram incorrect and confusing. Environmental strategy does not adequately illustrate energy strategy.				
494	Initial Screening:	PASS	Technical Screening:	B, C	FAIL
	<i>Technical Judges Comments:</i> Heat Loss Calculations is incorrect and Heat Gain Calculation is incomplete. Doesn’t respond to climate.				

--	--