

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

Minutes of the Meeting of June 14, 2001

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, June 14, 2001, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Tom Carson, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Terry Kleeman, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Joyce Nielsen, Steve Thweatt, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Archie Demarest, Larry Drees, Mary Hillesland, Bill Kaempfer, Jessica Lorentz, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suits, and Dan Pabon.

Guests present were: Mel Branch, Engineering Administration; Jeff Dodge, *Silver & Gold Record*; Lisa Lucio, Staff Council; Terry Mayer, CU Foundation; Joe Roy, Police and Parking Services; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; and Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services.

1. **MINUTES** -- In the minutes of May 10, 2001, Chair Lightner's name was misspelled in one place. On page 2, the second paragraph should read, "... seconded by Kleeman ... " Lightner asked that the reference to the proposed addition to the stadium, indicating "visible structure," be clarified to indicate that what would be seen are exposed structural elements such as those on Mile High Stadium or Coors Field in Denver. With these corrections, on a motion by Lipton, seconded by Crittenden, the minutes were approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Lightner noted a change in the agenda: the Business Building Schematic Design would not be presented at this meeting because it had not been approved by the Design Review Board. There will be a special DRB meeting to consider it, and it will be on the agenda for BCPC in July, which means that there will be need for a July and August meeting this summer. Lightner reported that in discussions with Provost DiStefano, the Provost has decided that it would be inappropriate for Lightner to continue as a member of the BCPC, as he will be rostered 100% in the University System, rather than at campus level. Lightner will, however, finish his term as Chair. He will work with the Nominating Committee to help select a new Chair.
3. **GRANDVIEW RBS RESEARCH BUILDING FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Lipton noted that this study had been reviewed by the BCPC in April, but full approval was delayed because the financial portion was incomplete. Herbstreit explained that the funding scenario for this proposed building was unusual. It is proposed to use Indirect Cost Recovery funds (ICRs) to facilitate the financing. He handed out a report with the financing plan. Kleeman asked if raising the front-end costs could lower the interest. Herbstreit said there was no point because the funds would come from the Federal government. Jones asked if any donor funds were anticipated; Herbstreit said no. Carson asked if rent on other RBS buildings would increase. Lipton said probably not. Similarly, Lightner asked if other on-campus renters would see a change in their other costs, not just rent. Lipton said this is just one of several RBS projects; prioritization issues would be dealt with more fully in the program plan. Lightner encouraged the RBS system to develop a process to get community input.

Lightner asked about the size and phasing of the proposal. Deno said that the concept was developed for a larger area, including a full block bisected by an alley. This proposal considers only south of the alley. Expansion could occur on the north half of the block. Bartlett asked about the architecture. Deno said it would not copy Klauder, but might use some of the same colors and materials. The approach instead is to emulate the scale and form of the buildings currently on University Avenue. Carson said it should be recognizable as a CU building. Lightner asked that belowground floors be considered further, and that a map be included with the feasibility study.

It was moved by Carson, seconded by Jones, to approve the feasibility study with the following conditions as recommended by staff:

- (1) Construction will not occur until demolition or otherwise disposal of 1221 and 1229 University buildings occurs. The schedule will be finalized when the site becomes available.
- (2) The facility program plan should address in detail all issues and requirements that might affect neighboring programs.
- (3) The Program Plan should identify, to the extent possible, the likely tenants for the proposed space, as the mix of tenants will directly impact the anticipated revenue sources (i.e., ICR) for the project.
- (4) The Program Plan should include an expanded financial analysis that addresses potential revenue sources, anticipated funding shortfalls and a sensitivity analysis based on key assumptions such as growth in the research base, the effective rate of F & A recovery, and building depreciation componentization.

- 4. HUMAN-CENTERED ENGINEERING LABORATORY FEASIBILITY STUDY --** Phil Simpson introduced Mel Branch, Associate Dean of Engineering, who spoke about the project. A space needs assessment for the Engineering Center in 1999 identified the potential for expansion of the center. This project would support the development of engineering solutions to address individual and societal needs, and would use many of the concepts developed in the Integrated Teaching and Learning Laboratory and the soon to be completed Discovery Learning Center. Herbstreit said he was comfortable with the financial plan, although he would like to know more about the inclusion of federal funds. Cummings said he is doing a classroom utilization study; he suggested Engineering work with him, especially on class labs. Bartlett expressed the need to maximize land use. Carson asked if a site in the Research Park was being considered. Branch said it was a possibility. Carson asked if the building could be built taller; Simpson said that cost substantially increases after about five stories; that is usually the limit for cost effectiveness. Lightner asked that references to funding from the Coleman gift be deleted, as that funding will not be available until 2006 or 07. Deno said that the program plan should make clear how this facility would differ from the ITLL, the DLC, or ATLAS.

Bartlett asked that proposed staff recommendation #5 be amended to consider long term needs and Deno proposed a recommendation #6. With these additions, and on a motion by Lipton, seconded by Herbstreit, the feasibility study was approved with the following conditions:

- (1) The "source of funds" analysis be updated and more detailed at the time of future presentations to reviewing bodies.

- (2) The feasibility of raising \$20.6 million in private contributions should be validated by a representative of the CU Foundation.
 - (3) The feasibility, timing, and potential restrictions of an anticipated \$10.2 million from federal sources should be confirmed and incorporated in the financial analysis.
 - (4) In recognition of the possibility that all of the anticipated private contributions and federal funds will not be available when needed to meet construction obligations, plans should be made to secure short-term borrowing and fund any associated financing costs.
 - (5) A site and use selection study shall be conducted as a part of the initial programming efforts and presented to BCPC when available. Consideration shall be given to the long-term needs of the College.
 - (6) The program plan should more clearly define the goals of the program, especially those that that differ from yet complement the ITLL and the DLC.
5. **WILLIAMS VILLAGE HOUSING UPDATE** -- Simpson reported that the consultants are working on the Master Site Development Plan and Design Guidelines and he showed a large display board with the current concepts. Although there was consideration for creating water features based on the existing Bear Creek, there are no longer any plans to make changes to the more or less natural creek flow and the development east of the creek is not part of this initial phase of development. There have two community meetings and comments from those meetings are being considered. Parking is a major concern. Bernard-Walker asked if bicycles were being considered; Simpson said they were. Herbstreit asked more about the neighborhood process. Lipton said that a Memorandum of Agreement would be developed with the City, as had been done for the Research Park.
6. **CU-BOULDER SOUTH REVIEW SCHEDULE** -- Baily said that Shapins Associates is heading a consulting team for this project. The DRB saw the first analysis of the site at their last meeting. Shapins will refine that, and it will be presented to the BCPC at the August meeting in addition to the usual reviewing groups. Lipton pointed out that finding a site for the tennis courts relocation is the driving factor in the development of the plans at this early state.
7. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** -- Baily noted that the Campus Master Plan has been out of print during this period of its adoption, but that it will be complete soon and all BCPC members will receive a copy. It will also be updated on the web site.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by William Arndt.