

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER CAMPUS PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of March 14, 2002

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, March 14, 2002, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Deb Coffin, John Crittenden, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Bill Kaempfer, Terry Kleeman, Jeff Lipton, Lisa Lucio, Mary Ann Myer, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Joyce Nielsen, Sarah Schupp, Richard Wobbekind, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Edo Cohen, Noel Cummings, Steve Jones, Duane Martinez, Uriel Nauenberg, and Steve Thweatt.

Guests present were: David Cook, Parking and Transit; Todd Mead, Civitas; Pam Lingenfelter, Arts and Sciences; Jim Marshall, ITS; Tony Patinella, American Campus Communities; Jerry Peterson, Academic Affairs; Paul Schultz, OZ Architecture; Bob Sievers, Environmental Studies Program; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; and Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Lipton, seconded by Herbstreit, the minutes of the meeting of January 10, 2002, were approved. There was no meeting in February.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Kaempfer introduced three new members: Deb Coffin, Sarah Schupp, and Richard Wobbekind. Kaempfer reported that at the last meeting of the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) the program plan for relocation of track facilities to CU-Boulder South was approved. He also reminded members that the Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) meetings are open to any interested members of the BCPC. HRAC meeting notices and minutes are distributed to BCPC members. Bill Deno, HRAC Chair, said that he would be pleased to see more student participation, whether by BCPC student members or other interested students.
3. **WILLIAMS VILLAGE PHASE I NEW SCHEMATIC DESIGN** -- Simpson noted that information had been distributed to members explaining why a new development team had been selected for this project. The presentation today shows the work of the new developer, which came in second in the original selection process.

Although the developer has changed, the location of the project remains the same. The type of units is unchanged. The flood conditions will be improved, but only some of the work will be in this first phase. Two soccer fields will be relocated on the site. Different from the earlier scheme is the massing of the structures. Instead of four L-shaped buildings, there will be two H-shaped buildings in a stepped massing of three to six stories. The center of the buildings are higher and there is more open space between the buildings and the parking structures. The parking structures, however, will not be built in this first phase, which will have surface parking only.

Bartlett asked if the transit stop had appropriate turning radii for buses. Simpson said it did, and could even accommodate the new articulated buses. He added that the City might add RTD stops off U.S. 36. Wobbekind asked about the height of the buildings; Simpson said that the towers would be about 75 feet high and that some mechanical equipment could be housed there. He added that the building would be fully sprinklered. Bartlett asked about the Bear Canyon Creek floodway. Simpson said that the floodplain includes some landscaped areas, but it is not where buildings are located.

It was moved by Crittenden, seconded by Lucio, to approve the new schematic design. The motion was unanimously approved.

4. **ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES BUILDING FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Deno introduced Bob Sievers of the Environmental Studies Program. Sievers reported on the needs of the academic and research activities of the Environmental Sciences programs, which are now housed in several locations. He noted that 10% of CU students major in something environmental. The proposal is to construct a building to house these several programs in the Grandview area west of 13th Street between University and Grandview Avenues. The project would be done in phases. The first phases would have surface parking; later phases must include other arrangements for parking. The full build-out would be 200,000 GSF.

Funding would be a three-way split: state, cash, and private. Herbstreit said that he had done a preliminary financial analysis and felt that this project is feasible. Debt will be financed through increased ICR revenues. Crittenden asked if the funding were based on the assumption of more new grants? Herbstreit said that his study was neutral in that area. Nielsen asked about ICR redistribution and whether this proposal had been presented to the Research Cabinet.

Nielsen also asked about the IBS proposal, which had been planned for this site. Deno said that IBS still plans a new facility, but that the site has moved north of Grandview Avenue. Bartlett asked if 13th Street would be retained. Deno said that as planned it would not, as was indicated in the Grandview Micro-Master Plan. It will be converted to a pedestrian way over time. Jim Marshall of ITS asked the number of occupants in the proposed building. Deno said it had not been determined yet, but would be in the program plan. Kleeman noted that if 2/3 of the building were devoted to academic purposes, would it be out of the 10-minute class change? Cook asked about the timing; Deno said that on the current schedule the facility would be occupied in 2009.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Lipton, to approve the feasibility study with the provisions offered in the staff recommendation, adjusting wording in the third provision and adding a new fourth provision as below. The motion was unanimously approved.

- (1) In the next phase of approvals, include an expanded financial analysis that addresses potential revenue sources, anticipated funding shortfalls, and a sensitivity analysis based on key assumptions such as building utilization, potential of F&A recovery and financing parameters.
- (2) Address the fundraising capability of the Environmental Studies Program and the CU Foundation for this project, including an assessment of the probability of raising over \$13 million in private contributions.

- (3) Verify through discussion with appropriate parties the willingness and ability of the Boulder campus to commit future ICR revenues to this project for debt service obligations, and to cover projected funding shortfalls by the Research Building System.
- (4) Ask that all phases of the proposed facility be planned and constructed as examples of excellent environmental design and technology.

5. **CAMPUS ATM MACHINES: DISCUSSION** -- Lipton noted that there is little control over Automatic Teller Machines on the campus. Each installation is individually negotiated with the building tenants, and income goes to those separate tenants. Lipton showed slides of ATM installations, showing the wide variation in appearance and aesthetics. He said he would like to develop some policies to bring some uniformity to the situation. A policy was created a few years ago to cover a similar situation -- that of antennae and other appurtenances on buildings. He suggested that a committee be formed to look at the situation and make recommendations.

Crittenden suggested that safety be added to the list of criteria. Bartlett suggested that quality of performance also be included. He then asked about the policy for vending machines. Lipton said that most vending machines were indoors and were coordinated through Property Management. It was moved by Lucio, seconded by Bartlett that the BCPC set up a subcommittee for this project. The motion was unanimously approved. Deno and Crittenden volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

6. **CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION / QUARTERLY REPORT UPDATE** -- Simpson reported on the state budget situation which has frozen capital construction funds. If an allocation has been 25% expended, that portion of the project may continue. Under this provision, the Business, Law, and ATLAS projects may finish the design phase, and the UMC and Discovery Learning Center projects may finish construction. A request to finish Porter is pending. There are 20 active controlled maintenance projects. Six did not meet the funding level. Of these, two may be exempted. Fourteen projects will continue.

Baily reported on the current Quarterly Report of Planning Projects. He noted that there are several projects in the conceptual stage, some of them quite large in scope. There are also several projects in the program planning phase. Bartlett said that he would like to see an earlier discussion of projects in the conceptual phase. Baily noted that the Planning Office is trying in some cases to bring projects before the BCPC more than once (such as the Utilities Master Plan). Nielsen said that it is often difficult to assess projects on an individual basis rather than in the larger context of what may be happening concurrently. Simpson noted that this is the time of year when prioritized lists are submitted for funding from the state. The Planning Office will prepare this year's request based on last year's, keeping the funding freeze in mind.

7. **MOTION FROM BARTLETT RE: EAST CAMPUS** -- Bartlett offered the following motion, which had been distributed earlier to BCPC members:

The BCPC requests that a study be conducted in the near future involving representatives of the BCPC to make recommendations regarding the type of development that should take place on the remaining undeveloped land on the East Campus that will best serve the long-range needs of the University.

Should the remaining undeveloped land be reserved for continued development of the research park as was authorized in the 1980s or should it be reserved for student uses such as housing as was anticipated by the Regents when the East Campus was purchased in the 1950s?

Bartlett commented that even when the Williams Village project is completed, the campus would still need housing. Herbstreit felt that most of this was covered in the recent *Campus Master Plan*, and should be revisited the next time a master plan is done. Baily noted that several members of the BCPC had worked on the recent master plan as members of sub-committees. Lipton said that the Board of Regents had similar concerns about the use of the Research Park and had agreed to a broader range of uses. Bartlett withdrew the motion.

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