

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

Minutes of the Meeting of May 9, 2002

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, May 9, 2002, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Deb Coffin, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Terry Kleeman, Jeff Lipton, Mary Ann Myer, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Steve Thweatt, Richard Wobbekind, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Carina Bernard-Walker, Edo Cohen, Lisa Lucio, Duane Martinez, Joyce Nielsen, and Sarah Schupp.

Guests present were: Hal Bruff, Law School; Paul Caldara, Utilities Generation and Distribution; Scott Carter, CU Foundation; David Cook, Parking and Transit; Kelly Fox, CU System Budget Office; Pam Lingenfelter, Arts and Sciences; Dick Monson, Utilities Generation and Distribution; Dan Sher, College of Music; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services.

- 1. MINUTES --** Arndt noted two corrections in the minutes of April 11, 2002: (1) Under "guests present" Barbara Bintliff should have been listed as a representative of the Law School, and (2) Robin Newsome-Suitts asked that the following statement be added to the minutes in the section on Capital Construction Requests to better reflect the statements she made: *"I believe there are two factors that the legislature considers important when prioritizing capital projects: the number of beneficiaries, or the number of students and faculty that will benefit from a project, and the amount of cash raised to match state dollars. I think that while ATLAS has the largest number of students and faculty that will benefit, Law has the most cash raised and the most cash at risk if the project is not funded soon."*

Kaempfer said that much of what was reported in the April minutes concerning the Capital Construction Request was inaccurate because it was based upon incorrect information made available at the meeting. The recommended priority (Business, Law, ATLAS) was represented as being the final order from the previous year but was inaccurate. That was the order that was approved, however. To help clarify the situation regarding private fundraising for these three projects, Kaempfer invited representatives of each to give short reports. Hal Bruff, Dean of Law, said that the project needs to raise \$19.3 million of which \$11.9 has been funded through student tuition differential, donated, or pledged. Rich Wobbekind said that the Business project needs \$10.4 million. \$6.6 million has been committed; requests for \$5 million are in process. Scott Carter of the CU Foundation said that the ATLAS project needs \$9.1 million and has \$6.4 million given or pledged, including \$3 million in Federal funds.

As the minutes of the April meeting did not specifically indicate the prioritized order of project, Kaempfer suggested that a correction be made at this time. It was therefore moved by Bartlett, seconded by Jones, that the minutes specifically note that the approved priority was Business, Law, and ATLAS. With this change, and those requested by Bintliff and Newsome-Suitts, the minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Having corrected the formal record of the April meeting, Kaempfer said that it was now necessary to deal with the decision that was made based on incorrect information. Thweatt asked if the recommendation was made based on the previous years' rankings or on the current private funding status. Kleeman said he thought the priorities should be based upon dollars raised and the impact of the project on students. Kaempfer asked about CEC action. Thweatt said the CEC had made their endorsement based on the BCPC approval, thinking it was last year's priority ranking. Whatever happens today, this will go again to the CEC.

It was moved by Myers, seconded by Kleeman, to rescind the previous action (i.e., last month's approval) as based on erroneous information. The motion failed on a vote of 2 in favor, 5 against. Therefore the approval of the priority ranking of Business, Law, and ATLAS will stand as the BCPC's recommendation.

Kaempfer noted that the proposed revisions to the By-Laws will be distributed soon for member's consideration, and will be discussed and voted on at the next meeting.

Kaempfer said there was a discussion at the Council of Deans regarding timing of projects. In the past a feasibility study approval by the BCPC and CEC usually triggered the start of a program plan process. From now on, there may be a delay in program planning after a feasibility study is approved. Nauenberg asked what sort of documentation is needed to solicit donor funds. Baily said that projects can seek funds based upon a feasibility study or a Micro-Master Plan, as in the case of Intercollegiate Athletics. Dan Sher, Dean of Music, noted that his feasibility study could be a "test case" in this new process. Another consideration is that funds may need to be raised to pay for a program plan. The Chancellor or Provost will make the final decision on when a program plan process shall begin.

3. **COLLEGE OF MUSIC FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR BETTER FACILITIES** -- Sher said that in 1997 the College had a 10-year re-accreditation review, and a self-study was done last year. Both reports looked at salary structure and the need for more and better space. Needs were compared to benchmark information collected by a firm which has programmed several music facilities for comparable institutions. Sher noted that there is good potential for private funding in the arts.

Baily reported that he had met with faculty, staff, and students in the preparation of the feasibility study under consideration. There are three major components in the feasibility study: (1) A new music theatre, (2) vertical expansion of the Imig Building, and (3) improvements at Macky Auditorium. He noted that any of these three components could occur separately, but it would be best if they happened in order. The new building for a theatre is best located near Imig and is proposed to be on the site of parking lot 204, but further study needs to be done on this area, particularly regarding parking and access. Baily noted in his PowerPoint presentation that all the costs in the feasibility study are projected to the year(s) proposed, so he showed both current and projected cost data.

Jones also asked about alternative sites for the theatre, one of which might include the site in Grandview currently under consideration for the Environmental Sciences Building. Baily said there were other sites, but they all were problematic. Wobbekind concurred that there were transportation issues that needed to be addressed around the Lot 204 site.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Lipton, that the study be approved with the provisions suggested in the staff report, with the language changed from “lot 204 . . . ‘reserved’ for the College” to “‘considered’ for the College”

Sher said he needed a definite site to use for fundraising. Kaempfer noted that the BCPC cannot designate land use. Kleeman asked why all of the music programs could not be accommodated in one new building. Baily said that the Lot 204 site was too small to accommodate everything, and there are few sites that large. Also, doing the project in a single building would “put all the eggs in one basket,” which would complicate fundraising. Wobbekind asked about replacing the parking from Lot 204. Baily said that the compensation for lost parking is part of the budget. One possibility would be to add new decks to the Euclid Avenue Autopark. Sher again expressed his concern about not having a specific site; Thweatt said that this minor change in wording should not affect fundraising. Cook asked what would happen if the transportation studies now being undertaken would find this site to be inappropriate. Thweatt said that there is enough time to consider changes in the future, since this project is not in the current master planning cycle (through 2008).

The question was called, and the motion was passed all in favor, one against.

- 4. UTILITIES MASTER PLAN: UPDATE** -- Thweatt reported that the site evaluation study for seven potential Power Plant sites was being developed, using criteria discussed at an earlier BCPC meeting. He said the process was far from complete, but was being presented today for feedback to help continue the analysis. Thweatt showed PowerPoint slides of the matrix used for evaluation.

Nauenberg asked when this decision as to location needed to be made. Dick Monson, the Director of the Power Plant, said not until 2004 or 2005. A phased approach is being used to eventually move from the existing plant to all new by 2020.

Bartlett asked if the potential site near the Coors Events/Conference Center was in conflict with potential expansion of the Center. Baily said it was not; discussion with Athletics representatives indicated that it would in fact benefit future air-conditioning of the Center and its possible addition. Kleeman asked about alternative technology, much of which is already available. Lipton said that it was not efficient to make plans based on technology that had not yet been developed, but that using the phased approach, future technology could be taken into account at appropriate stages. Lipton asked if the Observatory could be relocated. Baily said that there is little actual research done there anymore, but that it is convenient and heavily used for undergraduate education.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Nauenberg, that the BCPC feels that Site 6 (East of Regent Autopark) and Site 7 (Northeast of Coors) merit further detailed study, including effects on neighboring residential uses. The motion was approved unanimously.

- 5. HOUSING LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN** -- Due to the lateness of the hour, this item was postponed until the next meeting.

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