

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

**Minutes of the Meeting of November 9, 2000**

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, November 9, 2000, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Kate Fowler, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Stephen Lester, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Joyce Nielsen, and Steve Thweatt.

Members absent were: William Arndt, Al Bartlett, Tom Carson, Archie Demarest, Dan Pabon, and Brook Stableford.

Guests present were: Andy Barnard, Sink Combs Dethlefs Architects; Jon Burianek, Intercollegiate Athletics; Steve Carr, MCD Biology; Gary Chadwick, Recreation Services; Jeff Dodge, *Silver & Gold Record*; Steve Hecht, Facilities Planning; Terry Kleeman, ASC Planning Committee; Joe Roy, Parking and Transit Services; Lynda Smith, Facilities Management; Richard Tharp, Intercollegiate Athletics; and Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services.

Lynda Smith, Assistant to the Executive Director of Facilities Management, took minutes in the absence of William Arndt.

1. **MINUTES** -- Concerning the minutes of the meeting of October 12, 2000, Nauenberg asked that the paragraph at the bottom of Page 2, have a sentence added at the end of Baily's comment stating that "The Micro-Master Plan does not include information on how the structure would be funded and what impact there would be on parking charges." Baily concurred with this change, noting that level of specificity comes later as part of project information. It was moved by Drees, seconded by Lipton, to accept the minutes with this added sentence. The motion was approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Lightner had nothing to report as there had been no Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) meeting and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) meeting would be discussed later.
3. **FACILITIES MICRO-MASTER PLAN, DEPARTMENT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS** -- Discussion began with Thweatt defining the difference between master planning (which includes land-use principles, conceptual use, potential physical expansion sites, density issues, transportation circulation concepts, and utilization of outdoor space) and program planning (which address the specific proposed use and detailed financials). The Athletics Micro-Master Plan addresses three specific geographical areas and is not a specific program plan.

Lipton moved to approve the Plan with conditions listed in the staff recommendation, which had been made available before the meeting to members. Hecht explained the added conditions based on input from BCPC members since the last meeting.

Crittenden inquired what authority micro-master plans usually have and Baily answered that they provide planning guidance at the campus level. The *Campus Master Plan*, on the other hand, is approved by the Board of Regents and compliance with the plan is required

by state policy. Lipton also offered that a micro-master plan helps understand competing needs, does not obligate us to do anything specific, and helps ensure that facilities are allocated appropriately on campus land. Nauenberg said that he thought this commission should have input from various campus communities before rendering a decision, adding that the faculty doesn't know about this micro-master plan. Lipton agreed that input is valuable but there has been the opportunity for input; to say that the faculty and the BFA have not been made aware is inaccurate. Lightner asked to move forward and members agreed.

Hecht briefed the commission on the minor changes which have been made based on comments received since the last BCPC meeting. Nauenberg asked what the plan says about Carlson Gymnasium. Baily replied that Dean Spear of Arts and Sciences has indicated he would like to convert Carlson to an academic facility if space is vacated, which is the long-term consideration.

Lightner asked if there were any further questions for clarification. There being none, Lipton restated his motion to approve the Micro-Master Plan for Athletics and Crittenden seconded the motion.

Lester proposed an amendment to the motion concerning the relocation of the Recycling Center and other facilities. Lipton accepted it as a friendly amendment and assured Lester that his concerns would be addressed as the planning moved forward. Lester's motion was added to the motion as condition #11.

Newsome-Suitts found the wording of proposed condition #10 confusing. Baily questioned whether condition #10 really was intended to apply to all floors of the Stadium as stated. Hecht said that it applied to the ground level and first floors only, and wording to this effect was added in two places in #10, and accepted by Lipton as a friendly amendment.

Nauenberg asked Lipton how long it would take to move the tennis courts to a new site so that the Law School project could begin. Lipton estimated within 18 months.

Lightner asked for a vote on the motion with conditions and amendments; the motion was approved unanimously. A copy of the approved motion is attached to these minutes.

4. **CU-BOULDER SOUTH PLANNING REPORT** -- Lipton continued his presentation on CU-Boulder South planning from the October meeting. The presentation included background information (acquisition, purchase price, acreage) and the projects to be implemented in the next several years (athletic and recreations fields and facilities, a cross-country training course, and pedestrian and bike paths that will be available to the public). Other issues addressed included reclamation, wetlands, drainage improvements, and flood issues.

Crittenden asked about the timetable for reclamation, and what constraints needed to be considered. Lipton responded that field construction could start right away, once planned and designed. Tharp raised the question of what the flood concerns would be if the City of Boulder and not the University owned this area: Would flood containment be an issue? Does the berm direct the flood? Lipton responded yes to both questions. Lester asked if the campus had considered donating or dedicating any of this property for environmental

concerns. Lipton said that has already in effect been done with 50 acres of wetlands. Lipton will continue to update the BCPC on the process. Lightner asked the sequence of what BCPC will see. Lipton said that is currently being established with the consultants.

5. **REPORT ON CCHE ACTION ON THE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN --** Baily said that CCHE staff recommended approval of the *Campus Master Plan* with eight conditions. President Hoffman then requested deferment of a vote until the next CCHE meeting on January 9, 2001, so that University and CCHE staff can share information regarding the proposed conditions.
6. **UPDATE ON CCHE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROCESS --** Thweatt said that it is now looking more hopeful that concerns addressed at the last CCHE Capital Construction Process meeting will be conceded by the CCHE. They are more willing to accept the suggestions we are offering. Lightner inquired when we could expect this to happen and Thweatt responded it would be early spring. Lightner asked about the implementation and Thweatt said that Ekeley would be the only program possibly impacted at this time.
7. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS --** Lipton commented that Amendment 23 (the K-12 initiative) passed in the recent election. He has heard that there may be no funding for new capital construction projects but that there might be funding for continuation capital construction projects.

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

**On November 9, 2000, the Boulder Campus Planning Commission unanimously approved the *Facilities Micro-Master Plan, Department of Intercollegiate Athletics*, with the conditions listed below:**

1. Throughout the process of planning, close attention shall be paid to minimizing construction impacts on the areas surrounding the construction.
2. A "source of funds" analysis be generated and a more detailed estimate of costs be available at the time of the Program Plan for each individual project.
3. Financial planning be undertaken to assure funding of non-project costs, including additional department operating costs, potential financing costs, and inflationary adjustments.
4. All facilities be seen as multi-use facilities available to serve the greatest numbers of students, faculty, staff, and community members.
5. Projects proposed to be located at CU-Boulder South must be very closely coordinated prior to, and during planning, with the Chancellor.
6. The future use of Parking Lot 169 for an athletic practice field / recreation play field is predicated on the relocation of the displaced parking spaces to an acceptable location(s) on, or close to, the main campus.

7. If any recreation fields are proposed for use as temporary construction staging areas, then Athletics shall make available for use a comparatively equal, centrally-located area to accommodate student recreation. The use of any recreation play fields for staging areas during construction shall not result in any permanent encroachment onto the fields.
8. The restoration of recreation play fields used as temporary staging areas shall be returned to a condition equal to, or better than, that found prior to construction and shall be part of the project costs.
9. Future use of areas or facilities now occupied by Athletics, such as Carlson and Potts Field, which are scheduled to be vacated as part of this Athletics Micro-Master Plan, should adhere to the recommendations contained in the *Campus Master Plan*.
10. Any currently occupied general-fund lower floor and first floor Stadium Building space that is vacated in the future should provide for shared use (i.e., concessions on game days and general-fund classrooms during the rest of the year). Any currently occupied non-general fund lower floor and first floor Stadium Building space, vacated as a result of completed projects proposed in the *Campus Master Plan*, should be utilized for the expansion and renovation of restrooms and stadium support functions.
11. In the Athletics Micro-Master Plan, the last sentence of Paragraph 7 on Page 4.7, shall be changed from:

*Current uses including the campus recycling center, Facilities Management Grounds Services, and Athletics grounds function would either be moved off the main campus or incorporated into the new construction.*

to:

*Current uses include the campus recycling center, Facilities Management Grounds Services, and Athletics grounds. These facilities will either be incorporated into the new construction or be relocated. Relocation sites for facilities not incorporated into the new construction will be determined through feasibility studies funded by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. In the relocation of the Intermediate Processing Facility (IPF), the four tenets outlined by UCSU and the Environmental Center will be followed. These are:*

- *The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics will replace CU Recycling's IPF "in-kind" with no financial impact to CU Recycling.*
- *The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics will ensure through the Field-house / Parking Structure Program Plan that the IPF building site will have ample capacity for anticipated recycling volumes for the foreseeable future.*

- *The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics will provide facilities and phasing to ensure no interruption in services provided by CU Recycling.*
- *Minimize the impact to material transport, student labor and educational access.*