

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

Minutes of the Meeting of April 11, 2002

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, April 11, 2002, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

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

Members absent were: Steve Jones and Uriel Nauenberg.

Guests present were: Paul Abood, UCSU Environmental Board; Andy Barnard, Sink Combs Dethlefs Architects; Barbara Bintliff, Law Library; John Bruning, Physical Plant; Sara Brush, UCSU Environmental Board; Jon Burianek, Intercollegiate Athletics; Paul Caldara, Utilities Generation and Distribution; David Cook, Parking and Transit; Jack DeBell, CU Recycling; Jim Green, CASA; Steve Hecht, Facilities Planning; Kris Kaufman, UCSU Environmental Board; Jim Marshall, ITS; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; Chris Ricciardiello, Carter & Burgess; Mike Shull, CASA; Alexandra Taylor, UCSU; Will Toor, Environmental Center; Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services; Sue Wallace, Housing; Stephany Westhusin, City of Boulder; Tracy Winfree, City of Boulder, and Diane Yates, Carter & Burgess.

1. **MINUTES** -- Arndt said that he had incorrectly phrased a section of the minutes dealing with the Environmental Sciences Building Feasibility Study. It should read: "Kleeman asked why, if the building were to be two-thirds academic, more space would not be devoted to critically needed classroom space. Deno said that the building was out of the ten-minutes class change circle, as it is currently calculated." With this change, the minutes were unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Kaempfer introduced new members Edo Cohen and Duane Martinez. He then reported on the recent Chancellor's Executive Committee meeting at which time the feasibility study for the Environmental Sciences Building was approved to go into program planning. Kaempfer reported that he passed along the comments on the use of ICR funds from the last BCPC meeting.
3. **INTERMEDIATE PROCESSING FACILITY RELOCATION SITE PRIORITIZATION** -- Lipton noted that the program plan for expansion of Folsom Stadium was approved about a year ago. Ultimately, that expansion might require relocation of the Grounds Building, which also houses the Intermediate Processing Facility (IPF). A committee was formed to look at possible relocation sites. It was determined to separate the Grounds function from the IPF. Grounds will likely be located on the East campus near the site of the proposed Facilities Management Building.

The IPF Relocation Committee reviewed 15 sites, and agreed on four possible sites for final consideration -- two on the Main campus and two on the East campus.

Hecht further explained the process. He noted that only a site selection recommendation was being determined at this time. Eventually, a full program plan will need to be prepared. Intercollegiate Athletics will support in-kind replacement of the IPF. He said that various criteria were used to evaluate each of the 15 sites. The four sites recommended by the committee are #4: northeast of

Coors Events/Conference Center, #6: east of the Regent Drive AutoPark, #8: East campus, east of the south half of parking lot 568, and #10: also east of parking lot 568, but north of the existing storage sheds at the northeast corner of the parking lot. The Planning Staff recommendation is Site #8.

Jack DeBell, Director of Recycling, distributed another handout that recommended one of the two Main campus sites (#4 or #6). He explained that such a site would provide room for future expansion and better access for student workers. He said that it was compatible with land use plans and there was already another service unit (Environmental Health and Safety) in the area. DeBell said that the Environmental Center was opposed to any East campus site, because they believed it would be hard to get student workers, even after the shuttle bus (the Stampede) is in operation. Will Toor, Director of the Environmental Center, said that the East campus site could cause up to a 25% increase in the recycling budget. The possible lack of student help could then require classified staff, which would also cost more.

Kaempfer asked if the Stampede stops had been set up. Cook said yes, there would be one in front of the ARCE building on Marine Street. Cook asked if the IPF could be incorporated into an expansion of the Regent Drive AutoPark. Hecht said it had been done elsewhere, but not specifically investigated here. Lipton responded to several questions about the timing. He noted that it is all contingent upon Athletics funding; the best case would be 3-5 years, but it could more likely be 5-7 years. Bartlett commended the students for their efforts towards this project.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Bernard-Walker to recommend Site #6.

Lipton noted that Facilities Management offices moved to the East campus in the fall. They have 20 student assistants, none of whom seem to have a problem with the location. He added that space on the Main campus is tight, and that Recycling would benefit more from an East campus location, including potential programs such as increased composting.

Crittenden asked why a commitment to a location was needed at this time. He was concerned about making a decision without a full understanding of the financial implications. He asked DeBell how a composting program would be accommodated on the Main campus. DeBell replied that it could be done independently on the East campus. DeBell also noted that his preferred site could also benefit from some combined efforts with the adjacent Environmental Health and Safety programs.

Bernard-Walker said that the decisions were based upon site availability and future growth potential. She noted no conflict now or in the future with academic uses at the two proposed Main campus sites. Cummings said that the biggest concern for him is the financial impacts. Newsome-Suitts noted that everything being discussed is usually part of the program planning analysis. Herbstreit noted that since his office moved to the East campus, he has had no trouble hiring or keeping student assistants. Martinez questioned the need for the IPF to move at all, disagreeing with the comments that expansion of Folsom Stadium was a "higher and better use" of the existing site. Thweatt said that although the Main campus sites would probably not be appropriate for actual classrooms, there are secondary academic uses, such as support facilities and parking. Lipton suggested that Herbstreit do an independent financial analysis of the proposed sites.

It was moved by Myers, seconded by Lucio to commit the question to committee for an in depth analysis of the financial and environmental impacts of each site recommendation. Herbstreit said he

could probably complete such a study by September, which would also ensure that student members of the BCPC would be back on campus. The motion was approved 12 in favor, one abstention.

4. **28TH STREET REDEVELOPMENT SCHEMATIC DESIGN** -- Baily reported that the BCPC had seen this project in early development about a year ago. The DRB saw it the previous Friday. It is a City of Boulder project, but input from the University is being sought because a significant portion of it is adjacent to the campus, and the University will be requested to grant a revocable license to the City for portions of a new pedestrian/bicycle path.

Baily introduced Tracy Winfree, City of Boulder Transportation Director. She explained that the project was in three segments. Citizen groups have been involved in various meetings and design charettes. She introduced Diane Yates from Carter & Burgess, the design consultant. Yates explained that since last May more artwork had been added to the project. The regional transit stop south of Colorado Avenue has also been upgraded. Chris Ricciardiello of Carter & Burgess explained that the stop would have multi-use paths separated by a bridge. The design would continue on the east side of 28th Street and the Stampede stop eastbound on Colorado will be at an enlarged pedestrian island.

Bartlett asked if these plans had been coordinated with CU plans for this area. Baily said that there were opportunities to enhance CU signage and other graphics. Wobbekind noted that traffic coming off the Turnpike onto 28th Street is often at a very high speed. Ricciardiello said that efforts would be made to mitigate the speed. The improved 28th Street will have curb and gutters, making it look more like a city street than a highway. Bruning asked about operational maintenance responsibilities. Baily said that there were three parties involved: the City, the University, and RTD. Talks are on-going concerning maintenance. An agreement similar to that for the Boulder Creek Path is anticipated. BCPC members commented favorably on the project and said they hope it proceeds.

5. **CENTER FOR ASTROPHYSICS AND SPACE ASTRONOMY (CASA) PROGRAM PLAN** -- Lipton explained that this project has come up quickly because of a grant situation. Funds have been received but the existing facilities cannot support the research involved. Proposed is a 4,700 GSF addition to the northeast of the building. HVAC and telecommunications systems in the entire building will be upgraded at the same time. The cost of the addition is \$1.93 million, to be paid by cash funds of the University and reimbursed by grant money. Simpson explained that the funding authorization from the State could be expedited under S.B. 202 in the 2002-03 Long Bill.

Bartlett asked if there would be room for additional expansion after this project. Simpson said there would be; this is in full compliance with the *Campus Master Plan*. Kaempfer asked for clarification about the \$1 million advance from campus funds. Mike Shull of CASA said that the ICR funds would cover this. Herbstreit said it was his understanding that the \$1 million was a campus contribution; the \$930,000 will be from departmental ICRs. Lucio asked what would happen to the space after the project is completed. Shull said that there were other grants in the works for projects that would make use of this space.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Lucio, that the program plan be approved with the understanding that \$1 million is a campus contribution and that any shortfall in the funding would be covered by CASA. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. **TENNIS COURTS SCHEMATIC DESIGN** -- Thweatt noted that the move of the Kittredge Tennis Courts to CU-Boulder South has already been approved. The university is currently in dispute with Boulder County concerning flood regulations. A lawsuit has been filed, but the university has concurrently sent an application to the county. Thweatt introduced Andy Barnard for Sink Combs Dethlefs. Barnard showed a map of the site with the general layout of the new tennis courts. He noted that the DRB had seen these plans, was in support, and asked for some refinement. He also noted that at this time there would be no water or power at the site. Crittenden asked if there would be a fence. Barnard said yes, there would be a 12-foot fence around the courts and a lower fence around the complex.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Lucio, to approve the Schematic Design. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. **FY 2003-04 STATE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUESTS** -- Simpson said that there was only one University System project funded for FY 2002-03: the Main / Cragmoor building project at CU-Colorado Springs. The legislature also reduced some funding from the FY 2001-02 allocation. He said that revenues would likely be low for 2003-04, but a recovery looks hopeful for 2004-05. There is some concern that donors for unfunded projects may want their money back. The criteria in prioritizing this years list has been the availability of cash and donor funds, the program need, and the previous ranking. The only new project added for this year is a Capital Renewal project for Hellems.

Kleeman asked about comparative impacts of funding or not funding projects. Simpson said that all three of the top projects had backfill implications. Newsome-Suitts said that ATLAS has the most impact. Law, however, has more cash on hand.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Bernard-Walker, to approve the proposed list with a note that the BCPC regrets the lower ranking of other projects that have serious health and safety implications.

Kleeman offered an amendment, seconded by Nielsen, to change the ranking to ATLAS, Business, Law. Wobbekind noted that the change in priority last year was done by the Legislature; they are likely to change the recommended priority again. Baily noted that both the Business and Law projects would benefit the campus library system. Martinez noted that the ATLAS site is now empty and ready to be built on. Deno said that the ATLAS would have campus-wide use. Newsome noted that the gift from the Wolf family to name the new Law Building might be at risk if funding is not forthcoming.

A vote was taken on the amendment: 3 in favor, 5 opposed; the amendment failed. A vote was taken on the original motion: 7 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention; the motion was approved.

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