

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

Minutes of the Meeting of August 9, 2001

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, August 9, 2001, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Tom Carson, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Jeff Lipton, Joyce Nielsen, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Edo Cohen, Archie Demarest, Terry Kleeman, Michael Lightner, Jessica Lorentz, Lisa Lucio, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suits; Steve Thweatt, and Tara Turner.

Guests present were: Andy Barnard, Sink Combs Dethlefs Architects; Barbara Bintliff, Law School; John Blanchard, Matrix Design Group; Hal Bruff, Law School; Jim Bryant, CU Foundation; Jon Burianek, Intercollegiate Athletics; Gary Chadwick, Recreation Services; Curtis Cox, Davis Partnership Architects; Jack DeBell, Recycling Center; Jeff Dodge, *Silver & Gold Record*; Steve Hecht, Facilities Planning; Lance Klein, Davis Partnership Architects; John Lanterman, The Planning Group; Jeannine Malmsbury, News Services; Lynn Moore, Davis Partnership Architects; Ann Moss, Shapins Associates; Jerry Peterson, Graduate School; Steve Pouliot, Washington Infrastructure Systems; Ron Ried, Administration; Joe Roy, Police and Parking Services; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; Paul Tabolt, Administration; and Dick Tharp, Intercollegiate Athletics.

Vice Chair Jones presided in the absence of Chair Lightner.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Lipton, seconded by Carson, the minutes of the meeting of July 12, 2001 were approved as distributed.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Jones announced that one item, the track facility feasibility study, had been withdrawn from the agenda. He reported that volunteers were still needed for the BCPC Officers Nominating Committee. Members agreeing to be on the sub-committee were: Bernard-Walker, Carson, Jones, Lipton, and Nauenberg.
3. **WOLF LAW BUILDING SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW** -- Simpson introduced consultants from Davis Partnership who made the presentation. Lynn Moore presented the site planning. There is an existing grove of mature trees along Baseline that they will try to save. Parking eliminated in the existing lot will be replaced in a new lot west of the new building. Curtis Cox explained that the building is basically L-shaped, with stepbacks on the upper floors to give the building less bulk. The site slopes to the east, so the eastern side will have a walk-out garden level. Dean Bruff and Barbara Bintliff, the Law Librarian, said that they were pleased with the layout of the building, which is designed to be expandable to the east.

Bartlett asked if the building would have limestone trim; Cox said yes. Kaempfer asked about the layout of the faculty offices; Cox said the specific layout had not yet been finalized. Carson said he thought the building was "beautiful" and thanked the design team for involving the Department of Housing, whose facilities are immediately adjacent. Arndt asked if there might be

temporary construction access from Baseline to avoid truck traffic on Regent Drive and Kittredge Loop. Cox said it would be considered.

On a motion by Bartlett, seconded by Carson, the schematic design was unanimously approved.

4. **CU-BOULDER SOUTH CONCEPTUAL LAND USE ASSESSMENT** -- Jones noted that this was the first public presentation of the assessment work done on the CU-Boulder South property. He said there would be several public meetings to follow, including an open house at Coors Events/Conference Center on September 12. Lipton noted that no formal action was being requested of the BCPC at this time; this is simply the first draft of the framework plan indicating what future use of the land may be possible. He said that this will be returned to BCPC in the fall as an action item. In the future, they will return with development plans. He said that the purchase of this property was and remains controversial. The CCHE has approved only outdoor uses of this land before 2008.

Baily introduced Ann Moss of Shapins Associates, the lead consultant firm. She said that significant portions of the site may be developable in the future. There is good access to public transit, and a planning goal is to not add impacts to the already stressed Table Mesa Drive. An easement providing access on the west to Highway 93 was part of the purchase. Moss showed maps indicating topography, geological conditions, water tables, vegetation and wetlands. She said the property was formerly a gravel mine -- top soil was removed, gravel mined, and the top soil replaced 10 to 14 feet lower. There are historic wetlands (i.e., before the mining), and others created by the mining. Other portions are in floodplains. These designations were the starting point for determining which area could be developed. There are nearby City utilities, and the University owns shares of adjacent irrigation ditches.

John Blanchard of Matrix Design Group explained the potential for flooding around the property and on portions of the property.

Arndt asked if studies had been done of wind velocities; Moss said no, but they were planned. Bartlett asked about the controversy concerning the existing berm. Blanchard said that the levee (berm) has to be certified by the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA). That process is underway. Baily added that many people once felt that the levee should be removed, restoring the natural floodways of South Boulder Creek. Recent studies, however, indicate that the levee is necessary to prevent flooding, especially in the Keywaydin neighborhood.

Nielsen noted that the use of this site for athletics and recreation should be maximized. She noted that this presentation seemed to be about maximizing the buildable area. Lipton said that it needed to be determined early on where permanent structures could one day be built, even if there are no plans for such structures. Nielsen also asked why the tennis courts weren't shown. Lipton said that location of specific facilities will be returned to BCPC in the future. Herbstreit compared this to the purchase of the Muhr Ranch in 1955. This is the property that is now the Research Park, which was left essentially undeveloped for over 30 years.

Crittenden asked if Option 5 of the Taggart flood study had been adopted. Lipton replied it had not, and that this plan may be modified as future flood studies and flood mitigation measures are decided.

5. **EAST FOLSOM STADIUM IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM PLAN** -- Steve Hecht noted that this is the same project for which the BCPC approved a feasibility study earlier. Proposed are club seating and private boxes -- along with support facilities. This was included in the Intercollegiate Athletics Master Plan. Hecht said that a committee of Stadium Building occupants had been organized to discuss mitigation strategies for this project, including construction impacts and staging. A design/build process is the most responsive to campus needs in this case.

Hecht introduced Andy Barnard of Sink Combs Dethlefs, consultants who prepared the plan. Barnard showed several diagrams of the proposed facilities, which will be higher than the existing east side of Folsom Stadium. The private suites will be at the top. The next level down will be the club seats, one third of them outside. Also on this level will be support services and mechanical equipment. At the lower level, the existing ramp will be extended to the east, with new concession and restroom facilities. Parking will be under the ramp. Also part of this project is the relocation of the existing Grounds/Recycling Facility, which will (1) help provide for some lost parking and (2) help prepare for future phases. Lipton said studies for the relocation are underway.

Bartlett asked if the new spaces would be heated. Barnard said they would be fully winterized, and would in fact provide a large amount of space for meetings and other functions year-round. Bartlett also asked if the space under the new facilities could be filled in as functional square footage. Barnard said it could be designed for that potential. Nielsen asked if the PAOS group, which is planning to move into space vacated by Facilities Management in the Stadium Building, had been involved in the mitigation planning. Hecht said they were, and he would add Nielsen to the committee if she wished. She also asked about "full bar services" proposed for the boxes, and the perceived "double standard" with the liquor ban in the stadium. Lipton reminded that this project had not been designed yet, and that the BCPC will see it at schematic design. He also noted that PAOS would eventually have their own building in the Grandview area.

Jack DeBell, Director of CU Recycling, expressed concerns about the needs of the recycling program and whether they would be negatively impacted by the removal of the Grounds Building. Lipton said that the process to relocate this facility has only started, and that nothing would be demolished before a suitable new site was developed. Kaempfer emphasized the need to design for potential future infill.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Herbstreit, to approve the program plan with conditions recommended by staff. Kaempfer proposed a fourth condition, and Bernard-Walker proposed a fifth. Lipton accepted these additions as friendly amendments. The five conditions are:

- (1) That the mitigation strategies and procedures be further developed, refined, and implemented as part of the design / build team contract.
- (2) That Athletics shall replace any parking lost in existing parking in Lot 378 and provide interim parking and shuttles (if necessary) during construction.

- (3) That the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics investigate and propose other uses for the suites and club seats by the University community.
- (4) That potential infill of understories be considered in the design phase.
- (5) That Intercollegiate Athletics fund an immediate site selection study for the relocation of the Grounds/Recycling operations and review the space and financial requirements of the relocation.

The motion was approved all in favor, one abstention (Nielsen).

6. **BP VISUALIZATION CENTER SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW** -- Baily said that this project was located in the south part of the Nuclear Physics Laboratory on the East Campus, which was built in the 1950s as the Cyclotron. The use is similar to “virtual reality.” Most of the work is internal, but there will be some changes to the exterior, most notably a new entrance on the west side. Baily introduced Jim Bryant, the project coordinator, and John Lanterman, landscape architect. Lanterman said the new entrance offers views to the Flatirons and good access to the existing parking. A small patio with some seating will be added. The existing Facilities Management “boneyard” will be moved and the area will be re-seeded with native grasses.

Baily said that the Design Review Board has seen and approved this plan. Cummings asked about future building footprints in the area. Baily said that in the long term Discovery Drive may be extended from the Research Park over a new bridge, and this use might be served by it. Facilities Management service uses may be relocated to the west of this building which has been taken into account although site arrangements are not finalized. Because of flood issues, no building will be built south of this one. Bartlett asked how this project was funded. Bryant said by BP Corporation and private donors. Bartlett asked about the flood issues; Baily said that Love & Associates, flood consultants, had reviewed and approved the plan. DeBell asked about the schedule. Bryant said that 80% of the interior was done; the exterior changes will occur within the next six weeks.

On a motion by Herbstreit, seconded by Lipton, the schematic design was unanimously approved.

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