

Challenge 2 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 1 of 5

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.

2-1020	Disqualified	--	--
2-1021	Disqualified	--	--
2-1032	Disqualified	--	--
2-1033	Disqualified	--	--
2-1035	Disqualified	--	--
2-1049	Disqualified	--	--
2-1056	Disqualified	--	--
2-1072	Disqualified	--	--
2-1077	Disqualified	--	--
2-1078	Disqualified	--	--

Challenge 2 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 2 of 5

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1142		This entry had an overabundance of sustainable design elements discussed. The discussion was good. But the technical strategies are not focused enough in the design itself to pass technical judging.	--
2-1240	Disqualified	--	--
2-1241		The design solution is not adequately focused on sustainable design elements. This entry was not forwarded to the design judging.	
2-1261	Disqualified	--	--
2-1266	Disqualified	--	--
2-1274	CITATION FOR REUSE OF RECYCLED RUNWAY CONCRETE	Good technical report on solar shading; board graphics elements accurately represent technical strategies.	The judges were impressed by the use of broken runway concrete as a exterior wall material. Very nice. It was too bad that the rendering method used couldn't reflect the texture that the walls would have had. The use of curved glass (rather than straight glass in a curved wall) would have been very expensive. The solar chimney was controversial—several judges felt that it was too wide to function properly.

Challenge 2 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 3 of 5

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1276	SECOND PLACE	Good solar gain control analysis, both in report and visual board elements; graphic drawings and narrative reconcile very well; building energetics, especially natural ventilation, are very well considered	The design judges like the use of the wing shaped cross-section in this building—yielding a playful form, but noted that the design was rather undeveloped. They liked the interesting implementation of passive cooling and remarked that the design would have yielded the sense of another world down on the restroom level. Showing solar diagrams of the equinox in addition to the solstice was a nice touch.
2-1277	Disqualified	--	--
2-1283		Very good rigor on the technical analysis, but design doesn't reflect the stated issues; graphic elements on the boards not well thought out, making it difficult to interpret the technical design. This entry was not passed to the design judging.	--
2-1284	FIRST PLACE	Nice presentation and incorporation of sustainable and energy features. This entrant seems to really get it.	This two-story snack bar looks good, and the connection to the exterior eating area is very nice. This design gives the impression that it could be built quite easily. The use of vertical louvers was a successful choice. The function of the light scoop should have been explained better. The schematic elevations do not do the project or the design justice!

Challenge 2 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 4 of 5

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1286	Disqualified	--	--
2-1289	Disqualified	--	--
2-1290	Disqualified	--	--
2-1297		The design judges felt that this design was a good try, but ultimately was not successfully executed; many sustainable measures but were not fully integrated into the building and site; the design does not follow the technical analysis. This entry was not passed on to Design judging.	--
2-1300	Disqualified	--	--
2-1304	Disqualified	--	--
2-1306	Disqualified	--	--
2-1310		This entry discussed a grab bag of strategies. There was too much unshaded west facing glazing. Also there were excessive 'magic arrows' illustrating improbable air flow.	The design judges found this entry difficult to read and interpret. The diagrams and graphics were good, but the relationship between the floor plans was difficult to discern. The large cantilever appeared to be unrealistic.

Challenge 2 Judging Results

2005 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
August 7, 2006

Page 5 of 5

Entry Number		Technical Judge's Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1311	Disqualified	--	--
2-1313	Disqualified	--	--
2-1361		Nice and concise, yet thorough technical report; good exploration of daylight versus artificial lighting energy implications; yet the visual elements do not convey the thermal and solar penetration dialog with adequate accuracy (i.e.: glazing not drafted accurately); also, the thermal mass might be too much for this climate	The images of the slot canyons was very powerful, yielding an interesting idea for the shape of the building, however, it led to a design that appears to be singularly disconnected from the exterior and that has limited daylighting opportunities. The 3 ft high glazing puzzled the judges. Was it really your intent that no one, not even seated adults, could see out of the building?
2-1366	Disqualified	--	--
2-1374	Disqualified	--	--
2-1379	Disqualified	--	--
2-1423	Disqualified	--	--