

**UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER CAMPUS PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the Meeting of October 8, 2009

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 8, 2009, in the Provost's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Maren Additon, Noel Cummings, Thomas Higginbotham, Larry Hill, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Kambiz Khalili, Paul Leef, Michael Lightner, Karen Lorimer, Keith Maskus, Steve McNally, Russ Moore, Daniel Omasta, Joseph Rosse, Phil Simpson, Cindy White, and Rich Wobbekind.

Members absent were: Steve Bruns, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Greg Lundgren, and Jerry Rudy.

Guests present were: Anthony DeLaRosa, UCSU; Carlos Garcia, UMC; Casey Jones, Parking & Transportation Services; Howard Kramer, Disability Services; Tom McGann, Athletics; Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planning; Sean Phoonswadi, E-Board Liaison; Jason Pickel, Whiting Turner; and Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planning; Megan Rose, Facilities Planning; and Robin Suits, Facilities Planning.

1. **MINUTES** - Maskus asked for a motion to approve the minutes of September 10, 2009. Kramer said he would like to make a change on page 3 - line 4 to say "Kramer pointed out disability issues with the elevators creating an obstacle to safety and accessibility. For example, in a fire or other emergency, the elevators would shut down and a wheelchair user would not be able to evacuate the building independently"; the change was noted and will be made. McNally moved to approve the minutes, Lightner seconded the motion; the motion was unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** - Maskus did not have a chair's report. He mentioned that Lightner and Wobbekind's membership had been renewed until August 2012.
3. **UPDATE ON CAMUS PEDESTRIAN SAFETY** - Jones presented an overview of pedestrian safety on campus. He listed areas of concern:
 - Compact, pedestrian oriented campus with restricted service vehicle access creates a climate ripe for accidents between pedestrians, bicyclists, skateboarders and vehicles
 - The University risk exposure is elevated when multiple transportation modes occupy the same physical space
 - Sidewalk parking and driving detracts from the physical beauty of CU
 - Service and worksite access needs are important but often conflict with safety and aesthetic objectives
 - Increase in biking / skate boarding results in increased modal conflicts

Jones showed a map of reported bicycle accidents on campus for a three year period; near misses are not reported but are also important to note when dealing with campus safety. Lightner asked Jones to clarify what constitutes accidents; Jones said the map shows accidents reported to CU Police. Rosse asked if it includes accidents with cars and pedestrians on streets and sidewalks; Jones answered that it indicates bike accidents only, including bike versus pedestrian accidents. Hill asked if it includes Engine Alley service vehicles and pedestrians; Jones said it shows only bike versus pedestrian accidents, not bicycle versus vehicles. Lightner suggested that it would be important to also study the incidence of accidents at peak hours, working hours, and non-working hours. Jones acknowledged that this study is not all inclusive so is not a completely accurate assessment of true bike / pedestrian safety issues.

Jones said that a pedestrian safety committee was formed in 2006 which includes administrative units, Facilities Management, Parking and Transportation Services (PTS), and the CU Police Department. It is an ad hoc committee charged with finding ways to improve bicycle / pedestrian safety on campus. They are taking a three pronged approach to improve safety on campus - education, engineering, and enforcement. They would like to reduce the amount of vehicle travel on sidewalks. Posting advertisements in local newspapers was suggested but it seems that students may not read newspapers much in this computer information age. Engine Alley has been declared a fire lane prohibiting vehicles from parking there. This has reduced vehicle traffic but opened a clear path to students using it for biking and skate boarding. In the past, a dismount zone was in place in much of the core of main campus, but this was met with great resistance and even confrontations, which made enforcement a challenge. To try to enforce safety for bicycles and pedestrians they have instituted some policies, although enforcement proves challenging. They have reduced worksite and access permits, restricted movement in core areas, restricted movement adjacent to core areas during class change, made the speed limit 10 mph in pedestrian safety zones between 7:30 am and 5:30 pm and 5 mph during class change, and added fire lane citations. These changes have not exactly been embraced or followed. They have also added 1,300 bike spaces; there are 12,000 active bicycle registrations.

The lessons learned from implementing these changes show that they must have an incremental, comprehensive approach. They must begin with greatest risk issues, and gain administrative support and student involvement to tackle them. Until six months ago, there were no students on the pedestrian safety committee. The Vice Chancellor has recommended to the Chancellor that a task force be formed with a broad participation representing the entire campus, including students. The focus of this group's work will likely be to evaluate use of dismount zones, broader enforcement, modal segregation, funding, behavior modification, and improving reporting mechanisms. To help with reporting near misses and incidents not generating police reports, PTS will have an on-line form

available on its website soon. Lightner believes that modal segregation is a real challenge that could lead to more accidents. He asked Jones to address snow clearing. Omasta asked what students are on the task force. Jones said John Wanberg, Teresa Nguyen, Priscilla Carlson, and Alexis Smith along with two students with disabilities came to the last meeting.

Wobbekind said that frustration builds on the fringes of campus and it creates serious safety issues, especially around construction; he suggested that the task force needs to also address the arterials. Jones commented that state law requires that bikes must enter cross walks at pedestrian speed. Omasta suggested that enforcement is not the solution – behavior modification and education is needed to address safety issues. Jones said there needs to be a forum for broader communication; PTS is currently working with the E-center to figure out better ways to communicate.

4. **MASTER PLAN UPDATE** - Simpson informed everyone that the *Campus Master Plan* is updated once every ten years. They take a broad view with fifty years in mind; the update is required by the state. The *Flagship 2030* strategic plan is now in the assessment phase. The *Campus Master Plan* is in the initiation phase – groups have been set up to identify issues. They had conversations with deans, faculty, the City of Boulder, and students on a wide variety of topics to identify issues. Then they compiled the majority view, which is the view held by most of the people that were interviewed, and the minority view, a unique view that indicated areas that need additional investigation. Lightner asked if this is an aggregate of everyone's views to try to identify issues. Simpson said it was – they tried to collect major issues to study.

The task force topics are:

- Recreation, Open Space and Athletics
- East Campus Vision
- Academic Needs and Space Utilization
- Transportation
- Sustainability
- Living/Learning Environments
- North of Boulder Creek
- Community Partnerships

In the planning and development stage, the task forces meet to prepare task force results reports, inventory, and analysis. The last phase is the review, edit, and adoption phase which will go to the Board of Regents and state for approval with a completion date of 2011. CCHE adopted the last *Campus Master Plan* in March of 2001.

Lightner asked Simpson to describe the process for choosing members for the groups. Simpson said the deans and Chancellor DiStefano suggested names of

people who they thought knew about each task force topic to serve as the chair and then they solicited others from the BFA, Provost's office and the city. Lightner suggested that he be explicit with bullet points about the selection process in the presentation. White said it would have been helpful to let Arts and Sciences know the importance of the request for members. Simpson said he sent e-mails to everyone.

Simpson asked the deans and faculty what they thought the biggest challenge facing the university is. The dominant response was that the biggest challenge is aligning our aspirations with our resources. Meeting the growth goals (3,500 more students) will be hard on students and faculty. Meeting the climate commitment goals is very important as we head towards sustainability. Both the City of Boulder and the University think it is important to work together. Moore asked if there was a roster available. Simpson said they will post one on the *Campus Master Plan* website. Phoonswadi asked if the committees are full. Simpson said they do need more students on each task force. Jones asked how the task forces work together. Simpson said they have at least two from Facilities Planning on each task force and they will coordinate with everyone. Lightner pointed out that data gathering and working with facts is crucial and wondered if the data was going to every task force. Simpson said every task force will be working with the same data and it will be posted on the website; the facilities task is integral to all task forces. Moore said everyone on the task forces needs to look at accurate factual information. Maskus said the task force chairs will oversee this. Kramer asked how they gathered the committee members. Simpson said he solicited members from the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA), Provost's office and City of Boulder. They tried to make sure there was an even balance of the people involved because of their position. Simpson said they will have experts come to committees to talk about issues; if people have issues that they would like to share, they should go to the website and make suggestions. Higgenbotham asked which students were on the transportation committee; Suitts said Christine Thai and Daniel Omasta are on this committee.

Leef clarified that the outcome of the committees is not the master plan - we need a broad endorsement for the plan. We need to know what the pragmatic drivers are and how we technically achieve them.

White asked Simpson to talk about the phases of the master plan process. Simpson said phase I is complete and they plan to have task force reports completed by the early part of 2010. The next report on the master plan progress will be in December or January. Based on the task force reports, preparation of the *Campus Master Plan* draft will take place over spring and summer 2010. White requested that the time line and participating members be posted. Simpson said the committees are dominated by Arts and Sciences. White asked if there was room for faculty participation in the summer or spring. Simpson said they are still considering an outreach program and the process to implement

it. Rosse said there are people on the committees that are considering outreach. Leef said that they encouraged participation from diverse groups representing a broad constituency in the stake holders meetings with the deans. Lightner said the goal of making it as open as possible is wonderful and thought that some of the earlier comments need to be considered. He suggested that the meeting notice and agenda should be posted on the website to make it truly an open process. Simpson said that can be done. Lightner was shocked that all of the suggestions are supposed to be completed by December - he is concerned about the quality and depth of what they are doing. Simpson said that the task forces are meeting twice per month and have very qualified and capable people on the committees. White asked how large the task forces were; Simpson answered that there are between 14 and 18 on each task force with a total of about 130. Lightner commented that there are a lot of decisions that people are trying to make - especially regarding east campus - how can we press forward when there is an old plan and a new plan? By our admission we are at an interregnum between 1987 and now - how can we make sure it fits in with how we move forward? Maskus said that from January through November 2010, BCPC will be heavily involved. Simpson said it is not unlike the previous master plan process. The planning process is pretty well codified to make sure they come together. We have a good vision for five years. Lightner suggested that as we have plans that come forward, we should look at how they relate to the former plan.

5. **QUARTERLY REPORT UPDATE REVIEW** - Simpson gave an update of the Quarterly Report. He said this report is reflective of the new By-Laws which changed from having Feasibility Studies to Notices of Intent. Kittredge Commons renovation is the only project in the program planning process and is on its way for Regent approval. There are seven higher education state funded projects pending; we are not anticipating getting state funding for the next few years. University Theater ADA Improvements project is in the construction phase and came in under budget. Additon asked what the funding for Center for Community means - the line suggesting there is campus funding should be taken out; Simpson agreed. Maskus asked what will happen with Fleming after the Visual Arts Complex vacates it when it is complete. Cummings said Bill Kaempfer will decide. It will cost quite a bit to decommission Art and Art History - the walls have to come down. Wobbekind asked if consideration had been given to demolishing Fleming. It would also cost too much and there is no money for that. White asked it was possible to move Hellems, Ketchum and Guggenheim up on the list; she wondered if codes and safety are taken into consideration. Leef answered in difficult economic times the state prioritized projects that need work - the life safety and renovations governing board put Systems Biotechnology ahead of these buildings. Those buildings are not inherently unsafe. Omasta asked if it was possible to establish a revolving fund. Maskus said it depends on if students want to have a fee added to pay for it. The

state could cut funds if we develop a revolving fund; the state has said that they will not fund capital projects anymore and that we have to come up with a plan.

Leef said that the Design Review Board suggested using Wolf Law as an example for the new IBS building on Grandview complex. One direction would be to keep the same campus roof and use blonde brick. Hill said this could have some influence on the project.

6. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** - Lightner asked that the presentations be put on the BCPC website; Simpson agreed that they would be posted after the BCPC meeting. Leef added that anything we can do to enhance the communication would be beneficial. Kramer requested that they do a Buff Bulletin about the *Campus Master Plan*.

Lightner moved to adjourn the meeting, Leef seconded the motion; there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by Karen Lorimer, BCPC Secretary.