

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

Minutes of the Meeting of March 13, 2003

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, March 13, 2003, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

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

Members absent were: Jennifer Marson, and Brian Moll.

Guests present were: Hal Bruff, Law School; Cindy Carlisle, Board of Regents; Gary Chadwick, Recreation Services; Jeff Dodge, *Silver & Gold Record*; Herb Kienle, Recreation Services; Rob Kohrman, Central Administration; Jill Krantz, GreenPlay, LLC; Rob Layton, Design Concepts; Nan Lu, Recreation Services; John Meyer, Recreation Services; Dave Philipps, *Colorado Daily*; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; and Michele Van Pelt, Budget and Finance.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Lucio, seconded by Tegen, the minutes of the meeting of February 13, 2003, were unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- As there were several guests and first-time attendees, Kaempfer asked everyone to briefly introduce themselves.
3. **FY 2004-2005 STATE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST** -- Kaempfer said that the BCPC needs to recommend a prioritized list of capital construction funding requests this year, even though no state appropriations are expected. Rob Kohrman from Central Administration said that the situation with the legislature was "fluid from one day to the next," but that the campus should submit a list of no more than four projects. It's unlikely that any will be funded this year, and perhaps one will be funded next year. He said that the campuses need to consider creative funding sources.

Thweatt handed out the Planning Office's recommendation for this year's request, which included a report on last year's prioritization. He noted that this year's recommendation reflects last year's final prioritization by Central Administration: Business, ATLAS, Law School, and Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure.

Kleeman asked why new tennis courts were being built when there is no funding for the Law School (to be built on the site of the existing varsity tennis courts). Lipton said that there were some environmental issues to be dealt with at the existing site, and it may take up to a year to move them. When the new law building is funded, the site needs to be cleared and ready. Hal Bruff, Dean of Law, speculated that when potential donors see the old tennis courts being demolished, they would be more likely to give money.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Lucio, to recommend the same priority that BCPC approved last year, before Central changed it (Business, Law, ATLAS, IT).

Because Kohrman and several members said the amount of non-State funding was a factor in prioritization, Newsome-Suits gave a brief report on the private fundraising status of the three projects with a cash component:

- ATLAS -- Of the \$6.1 million fundraising goal, over \$2 million is available from gifts and pledges; outstanding pledges are for over \$1 million, for a total of over \$3.3 million from gifts, pledges and outstanding pledges. \$3 million is currently available from federal funds, for a total of \$6.3 million in cash funds.
- Business -- Of the \$10.3 million fundraising goal, nearly \$600,000 is available in gifts and pledges; outstanding pledges are for over \$200,000; \$5.9 M is available from a written commitment, for a total of \$6.7 million in cash funds. More than \$5 million additional dollars have been requested in outstanding proposals.
- Law -- Of the \$12.7 million fundraising goal, just under \$2 million is in gifts and pledges; \$4.7 million is in outstanding pledges for a total of \$6.6 million in gifts, pledges and outstanding pledges (Dean Bruff updated this to \$7.2 million). A total of \$5.6 million will be available from the student tuition differential, for a total of \$12.2 million in cash funds.

Kleeman, seconded by Nielsen, offered a substitute motion: that the priority be ATLAS, Business, Law, IT. Kaempfer asked what affect these projects would have on providing classrooms. Simpson said seven in Law would return to central scheduling; ATLAS would have some; Business would have six new, including a 100-seat lecture hall. Thweatt said that this factor was not used in the prioritization, but that it could be next year.

A vote was taken on the substitute motion (ATLAS, Business, Law, IT) and was defeated on a vote of 2 in favor, 9 against, and 2 abstentions.

A vote was then taken on Bartlett's original motion (Business, Law, ATLAS, IT) which passed 10 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

4. **FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR RENOVATION OF EXISTING OUTDOOR SPORTS FIELDS AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW FACILITIES** -- Lipton noted that having well-maintained and useful recreation fields are important. The campus, however, is unable to provide sufficient funds to maintain these facilities. No net new fields have been added in 30 years, while there has been an increased participation in organized activities. Extended hours could provide more access and good artificial surfaces would help with water conservation. Fields at CU-Boulder South have been included in the study since CU-Boulder South is only an 8-minute bicycle ride from campus, and is served by several RTD routes. Also, fields at CU-Boulder South were approved by the BCPC as part of the *Campus Master Plan*. They would be created in areas used for flood detention, as is commonly done in other parts of the metro area.

This project would not compete for capital funding, as it would be provided through a student fee, very tentatively scheduled to be voted on in April.

Simpson noted that although this is a feasibility study, it has more depth of information because of the student fee issue. If the BCPC approves this study, it will go to the CEC, the Student Recreation Board, and the UCSU Legislative Council before the student election. If approved, it would then go into program planning, and would return to the BCPC for review. Rob Layton of Design Concepts and Jill Krantz of GreenPlay gave a PowerPoint presentation of the study. They presented comparisons with other similar institutions, and

the results of surveys of students. Most students surveyed felt that improved recreation facilities would be desirable. Tegen asked if the students who were surveyed knew that they would have to pay for these improvements. Krantz said yes, but no dollar amounts were discussed.

Layton presented two scenarios -- near term (1-4 years) and extended (5-8 years). The extended scenario would not be part of the initial student referendum. The near term scenario would include a bubble over the tennis courts at the Student Recreation Center and improvements to Franklin, Farrand, and Kittredge Fields, new fields at CU-Boulder South, and new basketball courts east of the Coors Events/Conference Center. The extended scenario would include Business Field (but not until the Business building addition is funded), Williams Village and further development at CU-Boulder South.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Herbstreit, to approve the study with the conditions recommended by the planning staff.

Kaempfer asked if the Observatory had been consulted about the proposed night lighting; Lipton said not yet, but it would be during the program planning phase. Coffin asked about the lighting. Layton said that the needs for the basketball courts would be different than those for the larger fields (Farrand and Franklin). He noted that lighting technology has become very sophisticated, reducing "spillover." Coffin asked if the Residence Hall Association had been consulted. Chadwick said not yet, but that they would be as part of the program planning phase. He also noted that the proposed lighting curfews were negotiable. Jones asked about noise issues and the potential of injury on the artificial turf grass. Layton said that such surfaces have been installed in many places in the greater metro area, and injuries may in fact be reduced. He said that some artificial turf users had commented that surfaces tended to be hotter when it is very sunny. Jones also asked about the cost. Layton said the near-term proposals would cost about \$9.7 million. Student fees of about \$20 per semester would cover this cost.

Wobbekind was concerned about the height of the light poles. Layton said that they could be 45 to 75 feet. The taller the poles, the fewer that are needed. Layton said that Farrand Field, for instance would need 4 to 6 poles. Wobbekind asked if they would be on all the time. Layton said no, they would be lit only when needed, and could be controlled remotely. Milford asked about the number of parking spaces needed for the facilities at CU-Boulder South. Layton said that the specifics had not been determined, but that the number could probably be less than shown in the diagrams in the study. Layton also noted that neither lighting nor permanent structures are proposed for CU-Boulder South in this study. Bartlett expressed concern if vehicles drive on the artificial surfaces.

Bartlett, Kleeman, and Nielsen also asked if the proposed basketball courts east of the Coors Events/Conference Center would conflict with any expansion of Coors or with the proposed Utility Plant. Layton said that the plans at Coors were only diagrammatic, and would be refined. Baily said that the program plan needs to be coordinated with Intercollegiate Athletics and the Utility Plant needs. He thought that there would likely be room for basketball courts at Coors, but maybe not as many as proposed, and said the text will be revised to make this clear.

Baily said that this study was consistent with the *Campus Master Plan* with a few minor corrections. He also noted that the College of Music needs to be consulted on plans for Farrand Field along with the adjacent residence halls. Kevin Boyer of UCSU said that the new types of artificial turf are actually better than real grass. Upgrades to Farrand Field would be an asset to the campus, making the space more pro-student. Newsome-Suitts said she thought it was good that this project would not need to use more irrigation water. Layton agreed, noting that the existing grass fields often need time to recover from over-use. David Cook asked about the energy consumption of the lighting. Layton said it was about 250kw per field per hour (noting that it would not be during peak hours). Nielsen questioned the importance of the lighting, and asked if alternatives could be considered.

Coffin suggested a third provision be added to the recommendations; Nielsen suggested a fourth. Both were accepted by Lipton as friendly amendments. A vote was taken and the following motion was approved on a vote of 11 in favor, 2 abstentions.

BCPC recommends approval of the feasibility study with the following provisions:

- (1) That an illumination plan be required in the program plan to indicate spillover light at each field proposed to have lights.
- (2) That operation of lights be restricted to the hours before 11:00 p.m. in residence hall areas and 10:00 p.m. in areas adjacent to other neighborhoods.
- (3) That neighboring campus users, residential and academic, be consulted concerning lighting and hours of lighting.
- (4) That alternative methods of meeting the needed hours without lighting be seriously considered.

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