

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 1 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
--------------	--	----------------------------	------------------------

The evaluation process was the following:

1. Entries are reviewed to verify that they met the submission requirements in Section 4 of the Competition Program. Entries that did not meet the requirements or that were otherwise incomplete were disqualified and not judged.
2. Technical Judges evaluated the entries. Those that adequately handled technical issues were passed.
3. Entries that passed the technical judging process were advanced to the design judging.

1-1002	FIRST PLACE	Good use of technical analysis to influence design; well-written narratives provide good insight to design process	This entry presented an elegant solution to the program with sophisticated architectural design. The rendering of the entry area was excellent. The judges felt that this was a building design that would draw people in to the museum both because the building elevation makes such a strong statement and also because the circulation was well thought out. The boards were also graphically appealing.
1-1016	Disqualified	--	--
1-1034		Good use of passive design elements, such as shading devices; very creative evaporative envelope cooling system; however, technical analyses do not appear to support design decisions	This entry made it to the second round of design judging. While the building projected a good sense of entry, the judges were ambivalent about the style. One remarked that the design looked more like an art museum rather than a nature museum & interpretive center. Some judges questioned the use of concrete in this location and suggested rammed earth as an alternative. The accessibility of the space appeared limited by the

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 2 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
			repeated use of stairs. The use of icons on the boards was nice.
1-1046	MERIT CITATION FOR COMPREHENSIVE USE OF ANALYSIS TOOLS	Energy performance simulation reflects excellent consideration of various design alternatives. The physical model and daylighting simulations were very helpful in informing the design	This entry included intriguing sketches that the design judges found compelling. While the design presented a dispersed plan, that would have been flexible to use and occupy, the judges felt that the layout was too inefficient and the circulation flow would have been confusing. The design was difficult to follow from the plans to the elevations on the boards.
1-1048		A well-intentioned effort, but technical calculations do not appear to inform design. In addition the design is underdeveloped. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging	--
1-1067	Disqualified	--	--
1-1088	Disqualified	--	--
1-1090	Disqualified	--	--
1-1094	Disqualified	--	--
1-1095	Disqualified	--	--

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 3 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1100		The simulation analysis clearly played a strong role in the final design; in addition, good analysis of site conditions were influential and present in the design	The tumbleweed metaphor in this building is an interesting proposal but the concept was not developed adequately—the design appeared cartoonish, like a spaceship landing on the site. The graphics made the design look more like a cold climate building rather than one that is open to the environment in this mild climate.
1-1103		Good execution on technical report; calculations done well, but board presentation does not indicate an appropriate design. Not forwarded to design judging.	
1-1106	Disqualified	--	--
1-1108	Disqualified	--	--
1-1109	SECOND PLACE (TIE)	The simulation analysis clearly played a strong role in the final design; in addition, good analysis of site conditions were influential and present in the design. This entry was one of the best uses of E-Quest software.	The design judges were pleased by the compact design of this entry and the use of the PV shading element to mark the entry was a very nice gesture. The sunken outdoor classroom was also a nice design element. The boards were relatively clear graphically, but some judges found the relationship between the site plan and the building plans difficult to understand.
1-1110		Strong technical analysis that has clearly influenced the design. The	The design judges found that this entry seemed to present a kit of parts that were not well integrated into a

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 4 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
		technical judges praised the very professional presentation of the technical report.	cohesive whole. The living roof spaces were nice. However, the circulation was confusing, and appeared to rely on too many elevators.
1-1117	Disqualified	--	--
1-1123	Disqualified	--	--
1-1137	Disqualified	--	--
1-1139	Disqualified	--	--
1-1159	Disqualified	--	--
1-1161	Disqualified	--	--
1-1163	Disqualified	--	--
1-1148		The technical judges found that this entry had good consideration of space conditioning loads and daylight with reasonably good calculations	While the presentation of this entry was complete and the use of icons on the boards was good, the design judges felt that the form of the entry was not appealing and appeared to be overly complicated for a building of this use.
1-1165		Potentially a good design but was not sufficiently developed nor described in the entry. The technical judges had	--

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 5 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
		particular concerns with shading on west side that appears inadequate; no apparent mention of ventilation strategy. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	
1-1166	Disqualified	--	--
1-1175		Analysis does not seem to be well represented in design; boards have very low amount of content devoted towards energy saving strategies. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1181		Good use of technical analyses; documentation of benefits of new design measures is excellent; however, those measures don't appear in the design. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1189		Good consideration of various passive design measures; and technical analysis included good use of psychometric chart. However, implementation of those measures	--

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 6 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
		appears to be implausible as described. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	
1-1191	Disqualified	--	--
1-1192	Disqualified	--	--
1-1200	Disqualified	--	--
1-1203	Disqualified	--	--
1-1206		Technical requirements are met, but do not support the submitted design. Elements such as PV panels are referenced, but not shown in the plans or elevations. Shading canopy appears to be redundant given the use of large windows shading devices. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1208		Good discussion of design decisions and material choices; design has clearly been influenced by the technical analysis; good technical presentation on boards	The design judges found that the orange peel metaphor was somewhat heavy handed, but liked the application of copper mesh. They noted that interior spaces in circular buildings must be handled carefully, otherwise they become impractical, such as the extreme pie-shaped

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 7 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
			offices in this design. The circulation appeared difficult with the judges questioning why any visitor would go downstairs.
1-1213		Technical analysis seems detached and not instrumental in informing the design in any constructive way. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1219	Disqualified	--	--
1-1227		This entry displayed a good technical report, with conclusions that explain resulting design impacts; calculation results are evident in the design and board presentation.	The design judges felt that this entry was too conceptual and that detail and clarity of design were lacking.
1-1237	Disqualified	--	--
1-1238	Disqualified	--	--
1-1245		The use of building simulation analysis is commendable in this entry; however, the results of the simulations were not shown to influence the design. This entry was not forwarded	--

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 8 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
		to the design judging.	
1-1246		Adequate simulation analysis was evidenced, although documentation of the resulting design changes could be much stronger; boards are not effective at demonstrating the role of the analysis in the design. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1247	MERIT CITATION FOR DESIGN TOOL INTEGRATION AND USE IN A CLEAR AND CONCISE PRESENTATION	Excellent use of simulation tools as described in an outstanding design narrative. The judges also praised the creative implementation of solar shading and ventilation strategies.	The design judges praised the wing section metaphor of the PV element, however, they wondered why it wasn't carried through to the entry of the building. The use of the galleries to shade the courtyard was also praised. Elevating the building above ground was a somewhat controversial choice, as this gesture evokes buildings in tropical climates (which isn't appropriate in Southern California), and probably would overly shade any riparian vegetation proposed for underneath.
1-1251		This entry made a strong effort to solve the solar and wind conditions at this site. The technical analyses are adequate, but should be used more to influence design decisions.	The design judges praised the creative use of the daylighting analyses on these boards, but found them overly complicated and difficult to read. The design was difficult to tease out from the over designed presentation.

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 9 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1256	Disqualified	--	--
1-1262		Good technical analysis method, but the results are not clearly reflected in the boards or resulting design. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1264		Fun design that excites the imagination, but pushing the design metaphor this far exacerbates the space conditioning problems instead of solving them. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1271	Disqualified	--	--
1-1272	Disqualified	--	--
1-1279		The entrant performed all five calculations in the technical section. The connection between the calculations and the design was weak.	The programmed spaces inside this building were not well resolved with the circular design. The judges found this entry difficult to decipher as the text was too small and the narrative did not appear to be integrated with the design.

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 10 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1294		Calculations and analyses are generally adequate; however, the findings do not seem to influence the proposed design. Many of the sustainable measures referenced on the boards may be viable, but should be documented more thoroughly. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1308		Technical analysis does not support the resulting design. Santa Ana wind mitigation seems excessive for the amount of hours the conditions would exist. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	--
1-1316	Disqualified	--	--
1-1327	Disqualified	--	--
1-1331	Disqualified	--	--
1-1348	Disqualified	--	--
1-1353		Disqualified due to having 2 calculations. Submitted calculations	--

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 11 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
		were inadequate and did not translate to design. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	
1-1355		Very strong technical analysis methodology, with clear documentation in the report and on the boards.	The form of this design was overwhelming and the interior did not appear to be well developed as a result. The exterior elevations (or lack of them) did not support the building plans. The sense of entry to the museum was not developed. Arrows in plans were confusing, were they human circulation or air circulation? Plans appear to show unshaded south-facing glass
1-1375	SECOND PLACE (TIE)	Daylight treatment in this entry appears very strong. Technical analysis results are a somewhat weak. Many good strategies are described and discussed, but could have been better represented in the design.	The arched north-facing element was very interesting and evoked airplane hanger images for the design judges. The element would be visible from a distance and would draw people into the building. The building would give a nice sense of arrival to visitors, with interesting landscape in the courtyard. There were some concerns about circulation on the second floor and the uncovered walkways, but overall the judges found the articulation of the parts of the building to be pleasing.
1-1387		The technical judges found that the entry had an excellent, thorough narrative and that the design responds well to the challenge questions. The north arrow was wrong on the site	The design judges liked the long East-West axis of this entry, but they found that the design was otherwise not very interesting. The circular stair under the cone was not a pleasing gesture. They also felt that the courtyard did not adequately link to or extend into the landscape.

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 12 of 12

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
		plan.	
1-1395	Disqualified	--	--
1-1406		Very nice boards with strong graphic elements being used to explain energy saving strategies; very nice use of psychometric chart on board.	The design judges also noted the nice graphic presentation on the boards. However, they found the building design to be overly conventional for a museum, and thought that more should have been done with the water park theme.
1-1433	Disqualified	--	--
1-1449	Disqualified	--	--
1-1450	Disqualified	--	--