

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 1 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1010	Failed Technical Judging		Sunroom glazing is excessive, clerestories would be more viable with less window area, no apparent ventilation strategy, good use of bio swales	
2-1012	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	13.14.15.25		
2-1021	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, west and east glazing area is too large and insufficiently shaded/protected	
2-1080	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	17		
2-1095	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	17		
2-1097	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	13.16.25		
2-1109			Roof overhangs and awning should be larger to be more effective	This entry was one of the finalists in design judging. It was a nice attempt to use the Mission Revival Style in a modern building. The water color renderings were very nice. However, the resolution between the 3 floors was undeveloped. The design judges wondered how loads would be carried though the building. The entry also appeared to be weak on its energy analysis.

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 2 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1125			Entry meet the technical submission requirements. But the judges were worried that it displayed far too much east and west glazing with none on north and south. This glazing strategy is not responsive to climate (e.g. hottest part of day and "worst" solar gain occurs between 2 PM and 4 PM)	Design judges felt that the massing of this entry was good, and that it displayed good use of sustainable materials. But there was too much unshaded west glazing.
2-1128	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	16.23.22.24.25		
2-1136			Entry displayed thoughtful incorporation of water reclamation and heating system, good use of HEED to guide design, would have liked to have seen more of graphs	The massing of this entry was appropriate for a residential site, however the design judges felt that the facades needed more development. Fenestration choices were questionable.
2-1137			Good use of HEED analysis. Judges were impressed by claimed 77% better than California Title 24 requirements.	The scale of the massing and the design language of this entry were inappropriate for this site. They would have been more successful in another location. The fenestration appeared to significantly limit views, and the exterior decks were too small to be usable.
2-1138	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not workable, cross ventilation not workable in all areas. The entry had excessive glazing. Judges would have liked to see other HEED charts, since they were unable to assess the HEED results with the materials submitted.	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 3 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1139	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	13.16		
2-1140	Failed Technical Judging		HEED calculations appear to be extremely good but the design of the building doesn't reflect the performance indicated. The ventilation strategies were not workable, windows may be insufficient	
2-1141			This entry displayed very high energy performance based on HEED analysis. The judges recognized that the entrants had made a very good attempt at mitigating solar gain, but they remained worried about the west facing windows.	The design judges liked the balcony arrangements in this entry, but they wanted to see more description of the systems design. The boards were very hard to read. Putting the perspective behind the plans and sections was an unfortunate choice.
2-1156	Failed Technical Judging		This entry displayed excessive west glazing and the proposed method of mitigation was inadequate	
2-1168			This entry displayed good use of HEED to guide design for minimal cooling and heating energy requirements, although the technical judges would have liked to see less heat gain in summer. They felt that there was a good distribution of glazing between south/west facades	This entry was one of the finalists in the design judging. The design judges praised the strong, simple and elegant plan. However they felt that the choices made in the façade were appropriate for a more urban site and not appropriate for this location.

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1173	<b>Citation for Vertical Sun shading Response</b>		The innovative design features were well integrated with building design though not all details may be workable (e.g. motors/gear train for movable brise soleil)	The design judges liked the attractive fun design. The layout and organization of the plan was rational. However the presentation felt greater than human scale & not livable. It didn't feel residential. The judges were impressed by the vertical sun shading strategy, however.
2-1186	Failed Technical Judging		This entry displayed excessive east and west facing glass. The proposed shading devices would not have been adequate.	
2-1197	Failed Technical Judging		Excessive south solar gain through clerestory windows. Access to rooms not indicated.	
2-1218	Failed Technical Judging		Excessive west glazing will cause extreme solar heat gain. It cannot be adequately mitigated as designed.	
2-1283	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated.	
2-1285	Failed Technical Judging		Daylighting strategies not shown, ventilation strategies not shown, water efficiency measures not indicated. Solar screen appears to have marginal value.	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 5 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1286			West façade vertical shading devices are not correctly oriented, will allow excessive solar gain and glare during summer afternoons. The glazing on 3rd floor east would need shading	The design judges recognized that the entrant made a good attempt at solar shading, although the results of the shading study were not clear to them. They also noted that the west vertical shading was on the wrong side of the windows. Finally they thought that the boards were somewhat undeveloped in terms of design.
2-1289	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not workable, wind catcher air flow path appears unrealistic, daylighting strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1290			Distribution of glazing may not be optimal, ventilation appears workable, clerestory strategy may be workable despite depiction of direct beam northern sun angles	The design judges praised the internal organization of the plan, it was logical and well organized. However they did not find the extreme crenulations of the façade pleasing.
2-1293	Failed Technical Judging		The technical judges recognized the interesting concepts but found that they were not workable, ventilation strategies not workable, daylighting strategies not workable	
2-1294	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 6 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1295	Failed Technical Judging		Nice job of upgrading envelope and showing energy savings, however this is not enough. Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, some daylight angles shown without any details, sustainable materials not indicated	
2-1297	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	12.14.16.17		
2-1298	Failed Technical Judging		Triple-glazed windows are overkill for this climate, window placement (according to narrative) is not based upon daylighting, ventilation, or other energy concerns, ventilation strategies not shown/workable, daylighting strategies not shown/workable, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1312	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, may have ventilation features but are not shown, wind direction is incorrect, potentially good application of fins on west but natural ventilation may be inhibited	
2-1313	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown. Judges questioned rational of massing configuration.	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 7 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1315	Failed Technical Judging		Winds are mostly from southwest, not northwest, excessive glazing on west, ventilation strategies not shown/workable, daylighting strategies not shown, results of calculations not incorporated into design, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1317	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	9.12.13.16.21.25		
2-1319	Failed Technical Judging		Excessive west and east facing glazing, ventilation strategies not shown, ventilation strategies not workable, daylighting strategies not shown, results of calculations not incorporated into design, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1320			Ventilation strategy and daylighting appears workable	Design judges liked the black and white layout. However the design appeared to have several flaws: the elevations did not appear to agree with the plan. The design feels too massive for the site.
2-1322	Failed Technical Judging		Daylighting strategies not shown, ventilation strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 8 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1327	Failed Technical Judging		Excessive glass on east, west, and atrium roof that will cause glare and overheating, ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1338	Failed Technical Judging		Good use of reclaimed materials, but other important items such as ventilation strategies not shown and daylighting strategies not shown	
2-1340	Failed Technical Judging		Glazing appears excessive, even with overhangs and fins, ventilation strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1346	Failed Technical Judging		Interesting but reasoning unclear in use of tetrahedron space-frame concepts	
2-1349			This entry displayed many interesting energy and water features that appear to be mostly well integrated	This entry was one of the finalists in the design judging. The design judges praised this entry for having "the works". However the plan appears to be too tight to be workable. Also the climate is not dry enough to warrant the use of an evaporative cooling tower. Some judges also felt that the design was too strong to be attractive.

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1351	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown/workable, daylighting strategies not shown/workable, results of calculations not incorporated into design, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1352	<b>Second Place</b>		This entry met the basic technical requirements, but the judges noted that the "Trombe walls" are not really Trombe walls: they should only be on the south and not on north. The solar analysis also was hard to follow, and appeared to confuse solstice and equinox sun angles.	The design judges praised the accessible and fun design of this entry. It displayed good integration of the inside and outside and the renderings were very compelling. This entry could have placed higher, however the technical flaws were too significant.
2-1353	Failed Technical Judging		Stack vent operation was not indicated on plans, some rooms appear to not have windows or daylight, daylighting strategies not shown/workable, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated, results of calculations not incorporated into design	
2-1355	<b>Citation for the Use of a Playful Form in the Agricultural Context</b>		This entry met the basic technical requirements. Ventilation and daylighting may be adequate. However the judges noted that heat gain may be excessive from the skylights.	The design judges praised the use of the cylinder form in this entry. It created a strong tie to the precedence of the site. While it was somewhat overbearing in plan, the designers succeeded in creating fun places to hang out for the most part.

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
Sept. 9, 2008

page 10 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1406	Failed Technical Judging		Evacuated tube solar collectors may be overkill, flat plate should work okay, ventilation strategies not workable, daylighting strategies not workable, mechanical ventilation (for outdoor air) should be incorporated (with low infiltration) with heat exchangers	
2-1407	Failed Technical Judging		This entry displayed excessive glazing on east and west without sufficient shading	
2-1408			Technical requirements are met. The sun penetration analysis appears appropriate and design reflects the analysis. The judges noted the cool roof.	The design judges noted that the overall massing & outdoor spaces were attractive. However they noted that more windows were needed in the bedrooms and bathrooms. Placing the stair on the south to block solar access was an unfortunate choice.
2-1409			This entry met the basic technical requirements. The ventilation/daylightng strategies appear workable. However the impacts of the HEED analysis are not clear.	Some design judges liked the angles in the plan, but others were not attracted to the stylistic choices the designer made such as the sloped roofs. Overall texture and scale of the design were reasonable. But access to views was not well resolved.
2-1410	Failed Technical Judging		Daylighting scheme inadequate, too much glare and heat gain, ventilation scheme is barely adequate	
2-1411	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	13.16		

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1413	Failed Technical Judging		Daylighting strategies not workable, ventilation strategies not shown, results of calculations not incorporated into design, could have been optimized further.	
2-1414			Exceptionally clear design concepts and descriptive design rationale that follows technical analysis, no apparent south facing glazing so winter solar gain is not optimized	Design judges felt that the massing of this entry was too chunky. The repetitive façade felt too institutional.
2-1415	<b>Second Place</b>		Good use of solar analysis to influence design, some potentially dark areas	The judges praised the excellent massing and good allocation of indoor/outdoor space in this entry. The scale is appropriate, and the materials choice is also good. The west elevation was weak in some judges view, also some judges felt that the design was a bit too urban for this particular site.
2-1418			While this entry met the requirements for the technical judges, they felt that the presentation was confusing and left them with some doubt whether the ventilation would work.	The judges praised the unusual combination of living and horse areas in this plan. They also liked the west façade. However they felt that the monolithic stair tower was an unfortunate choice unless it was being used for stack ventilation.

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1421			<p style="text-align: center;">This entry met the minimum requirements for the technical judging, however the judges felt that there was excessive west glazing, even with scrim. The cross ventilation appeared workable.</p>	<p>This was one of the finalists in the design judging. The judges found the material suggestions and research to be interesting and praised the roof top terrace. However they felt that the façade was unreasonably massive, and that the rendering style did not support the design presentation. The small windows on the east side were questioned.</p>
2-1427	Failed Technical Judging		<p>Did use calculations to inform design, no evidence of heating system, excessive glazing on west will get excessive direct sun in summer afternoons, especially with horizontal slats (vertical may work better), daylighting strategies not workable, light tubes too long to lower floor, cross ventilation appears workable but stack effect shafts could work better with more passive approaches</p>	
2-1453			<p style="text-align: center;">This entry met the minimum requirements of the technical judging. However the judges were concerned that there was excessive glazing on the west and east. Even with shading devices there will be overheating and glare (unless someone is constantly controlling them), good cross ventilation</p>	<p>This entry was a finalist in the design judging. The Design judges felt that there was nice distinction of space and good technical diagrams in this entry. However they found the solar screen design to be troubling. The west elevation was not successful, and some interior spaces would be rendered un-usable.</p>

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1454	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated, difficult/confusing to understand, trombe wall not explained, triple glazing is not required in this climate.	
2-1472	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, Daylighting strategies not shown, excessive west glazing, fins oriented in incorrect direction	
2-1475			This entry passed the minimum technical judging. The judges noted that the west angled windows probably would be better if they faced northwest. The cross ventilation should be workable.	The design judges praised the external spaces and the separation of the horse room and living areas in this entry. However, they felt that the fenestration design was not practical and that the lack of windows in the kitchen would lead to a dark unpleasant space.
2-1540	Failed Technical Judging		Potentially interesting use of cooling towers, but orientation is unclear. The presentation is unclear as to intent of design.	
2-1542	Failed Technical Judging		Daylighting strategies not shown, note that radiant heating is an HVAC system, not a passive system, ventilation strategies not shown/not workable, not clear how ventilation would work	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1543	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, only brief mention of cross ventilation, daylighting strategies not shown	
2-1544	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not workable, window placement doesn't appear to accommodate workable ventilation	
2-1547	Failed Technical Judging		Calculations are incorrect, no roof load, cooling load too low, not enough information to assess energy or sustainability benefits of design, ventilation strategies not shown, ventilation strategies not workable, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1548			<p>This entry met the minimum technical judging requirements. The judges did note that some areas with excessive west and east glazing with no apparent shading, cross ventilation in most areas.</p> <p>The judges also objected to the inappropriate use of redwood siding.</p>	<p>The design judges praised the interesting, quirky, and playful shape of this entry. The physical model was nice too. But the massing was not appropriate for the site.</p>
2-1549	Failed Technical Judging		This entry was failed because the drawings were not adequately labeled and the design intent was unclear.	

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
 Sept. 9, 2008

page 15 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1550	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, results of calculations not incorporated into design, sustainable materials not indicated, water efficiency measures not indicated	
2-1551	Failed Technical Judging		This entry presented insufficient information to understand the technical design intent.	
2-1552	Failed Technical Judging		Ventilation strategies not shown, daylighting strategies not shown, calculations incorrect, delta T is not included, insufficient information on boards to understand design strategies	
2-1553	Failed Technical Judging		Excessive glazing, calculations incorrect	
2-1554	Failed Technical Judging		High mass unshaded west walls are not workable in the summer and will cause overheating, ventilation strategies not shown, calculations inadequate, results of calculations not incorporated into design, daylighting strategies not shown	
2-1465	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	16.17.24		
2-1470	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	10.16		
2-1490	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	16.17		

## Challenge 2 Judging Results

2008 Leading Edge Student Design Competition  
 Sept. 9, 2008

page 16 of 16

Entry Number	Results	Screening Comments (see below for key)	Technical Judges Comments	Design Judges Comments
2-1541	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	15.16.17		
2-1545	Disqualified. Did not meet Submission Requirements	5.14.15		
	Note: The following is the key to the Screening Comments Column.			
	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 features 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 - Two elevations not shown or shown at wrong scale.			
	20 - Cross section not shown or shown at wrong scale.			
	21 - Perspective drawing not shown			
	22 - Wall section foundation through roof, not shown or incomplete.			
	23 - Supporting drawings graphs and diagrams not shown, or not adequate.			
	24 - A Technical Requirement Task not shown or not adequately documented.			