

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 1 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1014	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	2.12.16		
1-1038			Heat loss appears to be very low, many good sustainable features, most well integrated but not all fully described	Design judges enjoyed historical research on red paint, however they felt that the daylighting strategies were overly complicated, and still there was too much uncontrolled direct solar gain. Sustainable features were not well integrated with design.
1-1046			Novel approach in incorporating heating/cooling collection and distribution systems but many details are not indicated	Heroic design concept, yet not developed structurally or materially. Design judges felt that angled room spaces would not work well, and they worried that the daylighting strategy wouldn't be successful.
1-1070	Citation for Comprehensive Analysis of Technical Strategies.		Good description of design process using parametric eQuest runs, good use of sustainable materials including thermal mass, intriguing use of ventilation towers, power generation is questionable but concept is interesting, full ventilation scheme not well documented, overall documentation is commendable but could have used more description of building features on boards	Design judges felt that these boards were clear and easy to read. The entry displayed a lot of process, and good integration of technical elements. However the design components of the entry felt over-engineered. This entry would have benefited from more "design".
1-1079	Failed Technical Judging		Exterior shading strategy appears reasonable but would have been unnecessary if buildings had been oriented on the west-east axis, No description of ventilation included.	

Challenge 1 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1088	Failed Technical Judging		No separate technical documentation with no indication of how it affected the design. The ventilation scheme has interesting strategies but not fully executed, nice sawtooth clerestories, but other daylighting strategies may not be workable	
1-1098	Failed Technical Judging		There was no clear indication of how eQuest calculations influenced design. The strategies listed on the boards don't appear to match eQuest calculations. Ventilation strategies are not well explained and appear unrealistic. No explanation of the screen or its functionality.	
1-1105	Citation for Daylight Analysis Processes		Good consideration of climate issues, design board showed good analysis and comparative experiments driving design choices, not clear on what advantage the curved wall gives.	Design judges were impressed by the demonstration of repetitive daylight analysis presented on the boards. However they felt that the analysis was somewhat disconnected from the design. The curved wall was interesting but it felt disconnected. The open court as attractive, and the design judges liked the elevations.

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 3 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1116			<p>This entry is praised by the technical judges for the particular attention and thought given to selection of sustainable materials, calculations indicate single pane aluminum windows but wall details indicate something else (low-e, etc.), east/west fins need more analysis, as shown they would allow excessive glare.</p>	<p>The design judges felt that even though the materials analysis was nice, the design did not get far enough beyond that point. The design feels chunky. Shading on the west fenestration would have allowed significant glare. Vertical fins appear to be on the wrong side of the window to actually shade west light.</p>
1-1119	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	10		
1-1129	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	10		
1-1130	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	25		
1-1145	Failed Technical Judging		<p>Excessive glazing on west, lobby will be severely over heated and over lit, east elevation glazing appears appropriate but inadequate for the entire day</p>	

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 4 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1148			<p>"Sponge" concept appears appropriately adaptive to the climate and building use, daylight and ventilation analysis appears to be appropriately translated into the design</p>	<p>The design judges felt that the planar use of materials was attractive. This entry could have been developed into a pre-fab strategy. They liked the internal courtyard concept but were concerned that it would feel too deep. The design judges felt that the daylighting strategies would not be successful, for example at the lecture hall which would have had unacceptable glare at both the front and the back.</p>
1-1151	Failed Technical Judging		<p>Calculations appear to be weak and are not tied to the design. The ventilation arrows appear to be random. Roof shading structure is innovative but doesn't quite come together. Nice use of local materials, however. Adobe walls are unnecessarily thick for this climate.</p>	
1-1152	Failed Technical Judging		<p>Calculations make incorrect assumptions and design solutions not consistent with calculation results. The ventilation strategy is not defined.</p>	
1-1167	Failed Technical Judging		<p>Ventilation and daylighting strategies are not well developed. The giant roof concepts may be effective at reducing solar heat gains but judges weren't convinced. The entrant appears unclear on the concept of heat pumps.</p>	

Challenge 1 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1169	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, calculations difficult to comprehend. Narrative doesn't describe appropriate strategies.	
1-1180			Technical analysis was acceptable and design was technically workable. Technical judges were impressed by water system.	Design judges were impressed by the whimsical overall idea. However they did not feel that it was adequate to carry the design. The use of the living machine as a shading device was deemed impractical to the design judges.
1-1183			Calculations appeared to be correct, and the entry had good use of exterior shading strategies and vegetation. Technical judges questioned the durability of the wood lattice. East glazing may cause glare in morning. Also room name labels in the plans would have been helpful.	This entry was one of the design finalists. The design judges were attracted to the lattice concept, however they worried about its life span. The L shaped plan was also attractive, but the judges felt that the lack of differentiation of the façade on different sides of the building was a negative. Perhaps there was over-reliance on the lattice for shading control. The plans and sections were well laid out, but the boards were difficult to read. Text color was a poor choice.
1-1187	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	17.22		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 6 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1193			<p>This entry displayed good energy performance, but it could have been significantly better without the excessive glazing, especially on the west. The attempt to mitigate solar heat gain may be workable, but shouldn't be necessary with different fenestration design. This entry had good use of modeling to affect design, especially for daylighting design.</p>	<p>The design judges recognized that this entry displayed good use of simulation tools and a good process description. However, they objected to the dark massive facade. They also felt that the double skin was overkill for this climate.</p>
1-1198	Failed Technical Judging		<p>This entry mentions the use of recycled materials. But it lacked required calculations. No references in calculations to the design. And the passive cooling strategies are not well described.</p>	
1-1199			<p>Energy simulation indicates good energy performance. The high amount of concrete may exceed the benefits of thermal mass.</p>	<p>The design judges noted the strong design idea in this entry, but felt that it was not appropriate for this benign location. They felt that the massive opaque facades were not necessary and contributed to making this entry feel disconnected from the landscape. This impression was reinforced by the graphic design of the boards. This design did not acknowledge the barn.</p>
1-1206	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.14.16.19.22.2 3.25		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
 Sept. 9, 2008

page 7 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1214	Failed Technical Judging		<p>This entry suffered from weak documentation, discussion was limited to only a few sustainable elements. Air movement through the building was not shown except for certain inlet and outlet elements, some good daylighting strategies (light shelves, skylights) were used, but judges felt the building would be over lit despite narrative's comments</p>	
1-1215			<p>Technical judges found the movable shell approach interesting and innovative. However descriptions of other sustainable elements in this entry are weak.</p>	<p>This entry was a finalist in the design judging. The design judges liked the transparency and connections between the indoors and outdoors that this entry afforded. However They felt that there would be problems with heat gain with this entry. Also the design judges found the sliding roof to be impractical. When would it ever be opened, since the glare and overheat would be problematic without it closed.</p>
1-1221	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	10.11.13.14.19.2 1.25		
1-1222	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.25		
1-1224	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.12.13.16.19.2 1		
1-1232	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.16		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 8 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1238	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.15.16		
1-1239	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.25		
1-1240	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	16.25		
1-1241			The technical judges recognized the many interesting design concepts in this entry. The ventilation strategy may be workable, but is not clear, especially the use of evaporative cooling. Also the calculations appeared to have a units problem, and to be off by several orders of magnitude.	This entry was a finalist in the design judging. The judges liked the interesting roof. However they felt that the plan was too forced.
1-1242	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.25		
1-1243	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.25		
1-1244	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.14.15.16.25		
1-1245	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.16.25		
1-1246	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.12.25		
1-1247	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	16.25		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 9 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1248	Failed Technical Judging		Design process is difficult to follow, results of technical analysis don't appear to influence the design. The cooling system has some interesting elements, but the strategy for it's operation is unclear. There is no evidence of appropriate daylighting design	
1-1249	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1250	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.16.25		
1-1251	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.16.25		
1-1252	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	16.25		
1-1253	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	12.13.14.16.23.25		
1-1254	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.15.16.25		
1-1255	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.19.25		
1-1256	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.15.16.25		
1-1257	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	16.25		
1-1258	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.16.25		
1-1259	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.14.25		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 10 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1260	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.21.25		
1-1262	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1263	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.12.13.16.25		
1-1264	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.16.22.25		
1-1265	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.19.21		
1-1266	Failed Technical Judging		Design doesn't support fresh air ventilation into rooms. Extensive use of unshaded glass will cause solar overheat. Technical analysis is incomplete.	
1-1267	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.15.16.17.19.21.22.25		
1-1268	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.25		
1-1269	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.12.13.14.25		
1-1270	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	25		
1-1271	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.17		
1-1272	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	12.13.14.16.25		
1-1273	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	25		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 11 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1274	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.16.25		
1-1275	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.13.14.16.25		
1-1276	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.25		
1-1277	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	12.13.16.25		
1-1278	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.16.25		
1-1280	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.16.25		
1-1297	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	25		
1-1302	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	25		
1-1303	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.15.16.22.25		
1-1304	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.19		
1-1305	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.16.24.25		
1-1306	Failed Technical Judging		The design is not well organized, and choices of the space plan are not supported by description of energy conservation strategies. There is no description of overall energy options and any innovative choices made.	
1-1307	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 12 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1309	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.25		
1-1310	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	11.14.15.16.23		
1-1357	Failed Technical Judging		<p>This entry had good use of green building materials and nice development of measures for parametric energy modeling runs. But the judges questioned the resulting 0.20 W/sf lighting, especially with the use of incandescent lamp fixtures. The glazing appears to be excessive on east and south elevations. The modeling results (before and after) do not appear to be correct. The data appears too small and the results don't translate into design.</p>	
1-1358	<p style="text-align: center;">Citation for Integration of On Site Energy Generation.</p>		<p>The technical judges recognized the natural ventilation strategy has some good basic concepts but the details of the air flow are not clear, same issue with solar control, nice use of straw hay bales and rammed earth</p>	<p>The design judges praised the use of on site energy generation & PV in this entry. They particularly like the atrium shading with PV. However, they felt that skewing the building orientation in the direction of the prevailing breezes was unnecessary and made the design much more difficult.</p>

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 13 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1359			The technical judges praised the innovative adaptive re-use of barn. This entries calculations were somewhat weak and it was not clear how they impact the design. The ventilation strategy could have been stronger, such as the Tomol concept.	The design judges acknowledged the amount of work in this entry, however, they felt that the architectural design was over scaled and wouldn't fit into this site.
1-1366	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.15.19.25		
1-1367	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	10.14.15.16.17		
1-1360			Daylighting analysis appears to have influenced the design. This entry had a good overall concept, but the ventilation strategies were somewhat weak. Some judges questioned the use of celoscreen to block direct beam daylight.	This entry was a finalist in the design judging. The design judges liked that there was daylighting into all the interior spaces, and also the open court space. But the hardscape felt overwhelming, like a narrow street, and the clerestory windows facing south were controversial. The organic form also felt too dominant on the quality of the interior spaces. Finally the graphic design of the boards made them difficult to read. Lettering was too small, elevations were not labeled, and white lettering on light green was a poor choice.
1-1369	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	10.14		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1400	Failed Technical Judging		The technical analysis presented in this entry was not successful. There was no apparent difference between the 5 eQuest parametric runs. The design had excessive west and south glazing that was not well shaded. Entrant does not appear to understand this climate.	
1-1405	Failed Technical Judging		This entry made no explanation of energy options and choices made, design doesn't convey energy benefits, design doesn't show ventilation benefits	
1-1431	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	16.25		
1-1432	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	25		
1-1433	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.14.16.19.25		
1-1434	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	14.25		
1-1435	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.25		
1-1436	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1437	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	16.25		
1-1477	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 15 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1478	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.25		
1-1479	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1480	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1481	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.22		
1-1482	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1483	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	13.16.25		
1-1495	First Place		This entry displayed good use of calculations to optimize the design and shading devices, good use of west facing louvers (vertical)	The design judges found that this entry to be an excellent example of site appropriate design. It displayed excellent integration of indoor and outdoor spaces, very good treatment of west side glazing. The shading devices were excellent and would control the solar gain. They also praised the upper story plaza and the feeling it would give occupants. Finally the graphic design of the entry board was very pleasing and easy to read, and it included a nice presentation of design options.
1-1500			This entry presented a thoughtful selection and use of materials that balanced energy use with embodied energy. The ventilation strategies were not well described but could work well with cross ventilation.	The design judges found the renderings of this entry interesting, but felt that important design information was missing . There was inadequate development of the exterior façade.

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
Sept. 9, 2008

page 16 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1517			This entry used calculations to influence design by revising windows and insulation. However, the natural ventilation strategies are not defined. The atrium space benefits from north facing clerestories, and the use of the green roof is good.	Design judges found that the façade was overly simplistic and not adequately articulated. The industrial look could have been mitigated by the treatment and shading of the windows. The floor plans were not well proportioned. The interior courtyard was a good gesture that could have been further developed.
1-1519	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies and daylighting strategies not adequately explained in the entry.	
1-1531	Failed Technical Judging		This entry presented insufficient documentation of design and approach	
1-1532			The technical judges found that this entry had many innovative features thoughtfully applied, and adequately discussed.	The design judges felt that the use of courtyards and terraces in this entry produced nice relief to the otherwise closed off building. They felt that the façade design didn't respond to the site and that the building would be too separate from the environment in this relatively benign climate.
1-1533			While this entry presented a nice technical analysis, the presentation of boards was difficult to follow. The technical judges felt that the orientation of the metal profile may allow excessive heat gain in the summer.	The design judges did not like the "cold" aesthetic presented on the boards. They also felt that the proposed fenestration control for daylighting would not be successful.

Challenge 1 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition
 Sept. 9, 2008

page 17 of 17

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see notes below)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
1-1538	Disqualified. Did not meet submission requirements	1.2.8.11.12.13.1 6.25		
<p>Note: The following is the key to the Screening Comments Column.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Wrong number of boards, or boards not arranged vertically. 2 - Boards too heavy or thick 3 - Boards more than 1/2" thick 4 - Items project from surface or boundaries of board 5 - Board design not informative 6 - Presentation medium smears 7 - Mounted materials not securely attached to boards 8 - Board arrangement not indicated on back. 9 - Registration numbers not marked on boards and additional materials. 10 - Identifying marks present on boards. Anonymity not maintained. 11 - 500 word narrative not on face of boards 12 - Narrative does not discuss sustainability or energy efficiency 13 - Narrative does not address subjects in Part 1 of Technical Requirements Section 14 - North Arrow not clearly marked on all plans 15 - Scale not clearly indicated on all plans and sections. 16 - Energy efficient and sustainable elements not clearly labeled. 17 - Site Plan not shown, or shown at wrong scale. 18 - Floor plans of all levels not shown, or shown at wrong scale. 19 - Detail floor plans not shown or shown at wrong scale. 20 - Two elevations not shown or shown at wrong scale. 21 - Two cross sections not shown or shown at wrong scale. 22 - Wall section not shown or shown at wrong scale 23 - Perspective drawing not shown 24 - Supporting drawings graphs and diagrams not shown, or not adequate. 25 - The correct number of Technical Requirements not shown or not adequately 				