

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

**Minutes of the Meeting of April 12, 2001**

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, April 12, 2001, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: William Arndt, Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Tom Carson, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Mary Hillesland, Terry Kleeman, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Jessica Lorentz, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suitts, and Steve Thweatt

Members absent were: Jim Baily, John Crittenden, Archie Demarest, Larry Drees, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Joyce Nielsen, and Dan Pabon.

Guests present were: Bob Barkley, Chemistry and Biochemistry; Jeff Dodge, Silver & Gold Record; Michael Doyle, CommArts; Steve Gottesman, H+L Architecture; Myrna Hall, CU Foundation; Deborah Haynes, Fine Arts; Steve Hecht, Facilities Planning; Tad Koch, Chemistry and Biochemistry; Susan Krane, Fine Arts / Gallery; Rob Kohrman, CU System Administration; Pam Lingenfelter, College of Arts and Sciences; Mike Martens, Facilities Management; Jim Marshall, Information Technology Services; Kevin Peters, Chemistry and Biochemistry; Joe Roy, Parking Services; Alan Rudy, Fine Arts / Gallery; Bobby Schnabel, Academic Affairs; Len Segel, Downing Thorpe James Architects; and Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Carson, seconded by Bernard-Walker, the minutes of the meeting of March 8, 2001 were unanimously approved. Arndt expressed his thanks to Lynda Smith for once again taking minutes in his absence.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Lightner asked Rob Kohrman from Central Administration to report on the status of Legislative funding. Kohrman said that there was an on-going conflict over funding prisons versus higher education. \$59 million was approved, however, including Boulder Campus requests for Law, Business, and ATLAS. The IT Infrastructure request may not get funded until March of 2002. Lightner noted that President Hoffman had been working with legislators to advocate for CU System funding. \$5 million in controlled maintenance funding for CU-Boulder has been authorized.
3. **CEC REPORT** -- Thweatt said that he had attended the last Chancellor's Executive Committee meeting. The program plan for an addition to the Alumni Center was approved with the recommendations suggested by the BCPC at the March meeting.
4. **EKELEY SCIENCES MIDDLE WING RENOVATION PROGRAM PLAN** -- Thweatt noted that the costs in the program plan were higher than those estimated in the feasibility study. He said it was because of electrical and mechanical needs that came to light during the program planning process, which is not to be unexpected when working with renovations of 30 year old buildings. Another change is that the program is now entirely for teaching space. The request is for 90% state funds, with 10% to be raised from gifts and grants. Bartlett asked if this renovation will add to the already complex array of mechanical equipment on the roof of Middle Ekeley. Thweatt said the roof appearance is a concern, but it is an existing condition and this project will try to not make it worse.

Lightner asked about the funding split. Herbstreit said he was surprised that there was a fundraising component at all, as projects like this -- undergraduate academics -- had in the past been 100% state funded. Thweatt said that now the state likes to see some participation by the institution. The department Chair is confident the money can be raised, and there may be some naming opportunities for the larger labs. Kohrman said he would work with the CU Foundation for an appropriate split on the funding.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Nauenberg, to approve the program plan with the conditions for approval set forth in the staff recommendations. He proposed a third provision concerning the roof. The three conditions are:

- The feasibility of raising \$1.2 million in private contributions should be validated by a representative of the CU Foundation.
- In recognition of the possibility that all of the anticipated contributions of \$1.2 million may not be available when needed to meet construction obligations, plans should be made to fund the financing cost associated with any short-term borrowing. These costs are estimated to be as much as \$200,000.
- A study of the visual aesthetics of the equipment on the roof of Middle Ekeley should be included in this project, with the results reported back to the BCPC.

The motion including the three conditions was unanimously approved.

5. **GRANDVIEW RBS RESEARCH BUILDING FEASIBILITY STUDY --** Deno explained that the proposed structure would replace the facilities at 1221 and 1229 University, former Greek houses that most recently housed the Division of Continuing Education. It would be the first development in Grandview Terrace under the terms of the agreement with the City. The structure would be a multi-tenant facility, built and financed by the Research Building System. Deno said that the financial elements of the feasibility study were not complete and he would come back in May with that part of the study.

Lightner asked if proposed tenants would be able to pay high enough rent to finance the facility. Lipton explained that the cost would be spread through the entire RBS system. Herbstreit added that this project could incur a substantial amount of debt. Some participation by the CU Foundation is possible. Nauenberg asked if there would be any retail components. Lipton said it is possible. Carson asked if there would be an instructional component, and if not, why shouldn't the building be in the Research Park. Lipton replied that the main proposed tenant, the Institute for Behavioral Science (IBS) has a lot of interaction with uses on the main campus. This is exactly the kind of development ideally suited for Grandview.

Deno noted that this project would help create a new "entrance" to the campus at Broadway and University. He has done some character sketches to help visualize this building. Although it would be very large, the character and scale of the existing buildings would be present, at least along the facade. The second phase could include the renovation of the former church building on Broadway.

Kleeman asked about restricting vehicular traffic on University Avenue to help it be more pedestrian friendly. Deno said that the City has looked at the options, but would likely be opposed to completely closing the street, as there are already so few north-south routes in

the center of town. Lipton added that closure would severely restrict the larger traffic system. Lightner asked about a possible pedestrian overpass. Deno said it would be studied, but with the change in topography would probably not be along University but more likely over 17th Street. There may be opportunities for underpasses, which are more likely to be used by pedestrians. Lightner asked why this was the first project proposed for Grandview. Lipton said that there are two more in the early stages of planning, but this was first because the facilities at 1221 and 1229 University are currently empty and unrentable. No vote was taken on this item pending the financial component to be provided at the May meeting.

6. **ATLAS CENTER SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW** -- Deno said that this would be the first project on the proposed “superblock” site, (the block including the Hunter and Sibell Wolle buildings). ATLAS will be built on a portion of the footprint of Hunter. He noted that this Schematic Design presentation had been made in front of the Design Review Board the previous Friday with positive reaction. Bobby Schnabel, ATLAS Director, said four goals of the design were to be a building that is exploratory, that is interdisciplinary, that is at a crossroads of campus flow, and will be warm and welcoming.

Deno introduced Len Segel (Downing Thorpe James Architects) and Mike Doyle (CommArts) who presented maps, drawings, and a model of the proposed building. Doyle noted that this is the first development in the “superblock” so they looked at the full site in their planning. ATLAS will have three entrances: from the Central Campus Walkway, on the northwest corner near 18th Street, and a service entrance on the south side.

Lightner asked if there would be a handicap drop-off on 18th Street; Doyle said there might. Carson emphasized the importance of relating to bus stops near the Telecom Building and near the LASP Building. Lightner asked whether the building would block sunlight on the Central Campus Walkway. Doyle replied that in the summer it would actually provide a little more light, because of architectural set-backs. The building will have about 65,000 sq. ft.

Segel showed a floor plan of the main floor indicating two large classrooms (one general purpose and one for Film Studies), demonstration classrooms, a large lobby, and a café. Lipton asked about the location of air intake shafts. Segel said they would be on the 2nd floor on the west side, well away from the street and fumes from shuttle buses. Hecht asked if the intake were far enough from the Fine Arts Kiln. Segel said it was.

Kleeman asked about pedestrian flow through the building. Roy asked about bicycle parking and urged that the existing handicapped parking spots be retained. Bartlett asked if there was enough space in the auditoriums to allow for rear projection. Jim Marshall from Information Technology Services said that the projection equipment was still being studied. Carson asked if there was enough elevator capacity. Segel replied that the freight elevator would be open for public use and that would satisfy the need. He pointed out that there would be classrooms only on the first two levels. Kleeman asked about cost estimates. Segel said that estimating is scheduled again after Schematic Design, and he feels that they will be within the budget. Kleeman asked if there would be any outdoor space on the fourth floor. Segel said that budgetary constraints eliminated a public open space. There will be a small balcony off a second floor conference room, and access to space near the tower to set up displays, but no large-scale outdoor terrace.

It was moved by Carson, seconded by Lorentz, to approve the ATLAS Schematic Design with the request that the design team further study issues dealing with 18th Street, elevators, internal pedestrian flow, furniture in public areas, possibilities for vertical expansion, and bicycle parking. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. **CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST LIST FOR FY 2002-03** -- Thweatt referred to copies of the Planning Staff recommendations which had been made available to members. He noted that the first four projects are continuations of projects already underway. No. 5 is the Center for Visual Arts, which has an approved program plan. No. 6 is the Ekeley Middle Wing renovation, which is going through the normal approval process, with the program plan having been approved earlier in this meeting. There is an additional request for funds to do a facility systems assessment of Norlin Library. The CCHE now requires such documentation on renovation projects. This will be an expensive study, due to the age and complexity of the Norlin building. Another request labeled "Environmental Design Capital Renewal" should be changed to simply "Capital Renewal" as it has not yet been decided if the Environmental Design Building will be selected for this first request in this new category. Most projects have a cash component; Koenig is the only fully-cash funded request.

Kohrman said that funding may be limited for new projects this year, but that it is advisable to have several new projects ready for the 2003-04 cycle.

Myrna Hall of the CU Foundation reported briefly on the status of fundraising for the various projects. About half of the private portion of ATLAS is funded; they are working with donors. Law has raised \$6 million with a \$12 million goal. Several individuals and law firms are being cultivated. Kohrman noted that there is a portion to be raised from student fees. The foundation is talking to lead donors for Business. The Center for Visual Arts had some preliminary donors, but there is still work to do. Fundraising for Ekeley is not fully underway as the Foundation was waiting to see how the program plan came through. Now that it is approved, donors will be contacted. An early lead donor has come forward for the Alumni project. Lightner thanked Hall for the work of the CU Foundation in support of capital construction projects.

Lightner suggested voting on the priorities in two parts. Therefore it was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Carson, to accept the priorities 1-4 as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

It was then moved by Carson, seconded by Bartlett to accept projects 5-8 as presented. Kleeman asked if the Capital Renewal project could focus on Hellems. Thweatt said the criteria for selection had not been fully set up. Lightner asked for a presentation on the proposed process at a future meeting. Deborah Haynes of Fine Arts spoke about the health and safety hazards in the existing Sibell Wolle facility; Kevin Peters of Chemistry and Biochemistry noted that Ekeley has similar problems. Lightner called for a vote and the motion was approved unanimously.

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