

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

Minutes of the Meeting of October 3, 2002

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 3, 2002, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Maren Additon, Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Kevin Boyer, Deb Coffin, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Terry Kleeman, Jeff Lipton, Lisa Lucio, Brian Moll, Mary Ann Myer, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suits, Suzanne Tegen, Steve Thweatt, Richard Wobbekind, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Jana Milford and Joyce Nielsen.

Guests present were: Kelly Fox, CU System Budget Office; Rob Kohrman, CU System Budget Office, and Pam Lingenfelter, Arts and Sciences; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Jones, seconded by Lucio, the minutes of the meeting of August 8, 2002, were unanimously approved. There was no meeting in September.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Chair Kaempfer introduced three new members: Maren Additon, replacing John Crittenden as Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and Kevin Boyer and Bryan Moll, representing the UCSU.

There was not a quorum at the August meeting. For two items discussed, a strong favorable consensus of BCPC members present was conveyed to the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) when that body reviewed those items. Kaempfer suggested that formal votes now be taken.

Therefore, it was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Herbstreit, to approve the Program Plan for the Acquisition of 1777 Exposition Drive. The motion passed unanimously.

It was moved by Jones, seconded by Bartlett, to approve the Hellems Capital Renewal Project request. The motion passed unanimously.

Kaempfer noted that he had attended the August 20 meeting of the CEC when these two items were approved.

3. **BY-LAWS REVISIONS** -- Herbstreit reported that work on revising the By-Laws has been going on for some time. A draft was presented to the BCPC in August, but there was not a quorum, so action was postponed. He noted that the version distributed for this meeting incorporated the changes suggested by the group in August. He also said that Bartlett had two major areas of concern to be presented to the group for discussion.

The first issue concerned the timing of approval of Schematic Design by the BCPC and the Design Review Board (DRB). Bartlett feels that the review by the BCPC should always precede the review by the DRB. Thweatt noted that the DRB reviews projects on all four campuses, and only meets every other month and a directed sequencing of reviews could cause delays. Nauenberg asked if design changes requested by the BCPC slow down the

process. Thweatt said not usually; if the change is something the DRB needs to review, it can be done by fax or telephone. Kaempfer suggested that it might be beyond the scope of the BCPC By-Laws to bind the process of another group (the DRB). Thweatt said that his office would resist the proposed change, as the process takes too long already. Bartlett responded that he felt that “planning” should always come before “design.” Deno spoke about the difference between Conceptual Design (the first step) and Schematic Design. All of this is preceded by Program Planning, with which the DRB is not involved. Thweatt noted that the BCPC looks primarily at land use issues. DRB is architecturally driven, and the overlap is small.

Wobbekind felt that designs often appear to be nearly complete by the time BCPC sees them, that “the train’s left the station,” and BCPC’s input is not taken seriously. There was discussion of a project several years ago, a proposed science library. There was a perception that the design was well underway, when as Simpson explained, the DRB was involved in the programming stage because the land use issues were complicated. That project, in fact, never reached approval and never entered the formal design phase.

Kaempfer said the BCPC needs to more fully understand DRB’s role. Deno said he thought the By-Laws as written are ambiguous, indicating that BCPC and DRB shall review the Schematic Design but not specifically prescribing the order. Lucio felt these details should not be in the By-Laws -- that there should be flexibility. Lipton said that the DRB has also asked to see things first, and formally changing the BCPC process would put the Planning Office in a difficult situation.

Herbstreit asked for a sense of the members concerning the inclusion of specific language on this matter. A majority of 8 to 5 said it should not be explicit.

Bartlett’s second issue concerned BCPC’s approval of feasibility studies, program plans, and conceptual plans. He suggested that a provision be added to the By-Laws such that BCPC approval would expire after 36 months if the project had not moved forward. Lipton noted that CCHE requires program plans to be resubmitted after 36 months. Jones suggested using “must be re-affirmed” rather than “will expire.” Coffin noted that there were cost implications of re-writing documents. Lipton noted that it was important that documents be kept up-to-date if there was a fundraising component. Herbstreit asked if there were consensus approval for revising wording on this subject. There was unanimous support for this revision.

Herbstreit said his By-Laws subcommittee would reconvene discuss these two issues as well as smaller grammatical changes. The By-Laws will be brought back to a future BCPC meeting for final approval.

4. HOUSING LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN: INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION

-- Simpson said that in January the Housing Department hired a consultant to look at all of Housing’s outdoor areas, and prepare a master plan for landscape replacement or other improvements over time. All areas of campus housing were studied, except Williams Village, since extensive planning has been done for it as a separate project.

The goals were to unify housing sites with an overall theme, but to make specific recommendations for the individual neighborhoods. Each site was analyzed, using satellite

photos of each building. A theme was developed -- “peaks to the plains” -- which reflects the way in which several eco-systems are adjacent in the Boulder area. This was then applied to the individual buildings, with the tallest part of the structures compared to the mountains, thicker vegetation nearer the buildings, eventually leading to the grassy open spaces, similar to the Colorado plains.

Deno asked about the social aspects and the use of the outdoor spaces. Simpson said that is one of the next steps but that it would be planned within the framework established in this analysis. Bartlett noted that pedestrian routes in housing areas often serve the larger campus community and Housing should not be expected to pay for all the improvements. Lucio asked how the often chaotic and unplanned vegetation growth would be avoided in the future. Simpson said that sustainability and appropriateness of planting would be a part of this new plan, which was seldom taken into account before. Coffin said that the department is working on ways to directly fund landscaping projects. Arndt asked if Housing was using ditch water; Coffin and Lipton said that the transition is underway.

5. **REFRESHER SESSION ON HOW BCPC WORKS: “BCPC 101”** – Thweatt gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the basic function and purpose of how BCPC fits into the larger campus process. He said that he would post the presentation on the BCPC web page. [It can now be viewed at <http://fm.colorado.edu/planning/bcpc/BCPC101.pdf>].
6. **QUARTERLY REPORT OF PLANNING PROJECTS** – Baily gave a brief overview of the current report, which was recently posted on the BCPC web page. He noted that it lists projects by phases, which coincide with the process described in Thweatt’s presentation. He noted that there are two significant conceptual studies underway: a transportation master plan and a utilities master plan, including a micro-master plan for the eastern part of the Main Campus.
7. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** – Bartlett noted that the cornerstone for the original library building (now the University Theatre) was laid in January 1903, on the same day as the cornerstone for St. John’s Episcopal Church at 14th and Pine Streets. Bartlett has been in touch with library administration about possible commemorative events for the centennial in January.

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