

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER CAMPUS PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of September 8, 2005

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, September 8, 2005, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Deb Coffin, Noel Cummings, David DiLaura, Robert DuRay, Kate Flanagan, Gary Gaile, Jud Hurd, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Jeff Lipton, Brad Long, Lisa Lucio, Mary Ann Myer, Joyce Nielsen, Phil Simpson, Suzanne Tegen, Richard Wobbekind, and William Arndt. Members absent were: Maren Additon, Barbara Bintliff, Bill Deno, Robin Newsome-Suitts, and Steve Thweatt.

Guests present were: David Cook, Parking and Transit Services; Pam Greager, Parking and Transit Services; Marilyn Hayes, Academic Scheduling; Karen Lorimer, Facilities Planning; Ann Mullins, Facilities Planning; and Peter Roper, Environmental Center.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Hurd, seconded by Lipton, the minutes of the meeting of May 12, 2005 were approved as written. There were no meetings in June, July, or August.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- As the committee had not met for several months, and because there were several new members, everyone was asked to introduce themselves. Kaempfer noted that one agenda item, the UMC Food Service Feasibility Study, has been pulled from the agenda. It will be brought to the BCPC in October.
3. **BCPC 101** -- Simpson made a presentation designed to introduce the workings of the BCPC to new members. He said that BCPC's main role was to review land use on the Boulder campus. It is advisory to the Chancellor, and uses the *Campus Master Plan* as its guide. The committee reviews program plans and approves the schematic design phase of projects. It is also involved in prioritizing the state capital construction requests every spring. The BCPC plays a role in the naming of facilities, memorials, and signage. Occasionally, the BCPC is asked to give input on policies such as the one governing roof-top antennae on buildings.

The Design Review Board (DRB) works in parallel with the BCPC, but the DRB's charge is to monitor architectural design. The DRB is advisory to the president, and reviews projects on all CU campuses. They too have a role in the preparation of the master plan, and sit on architect selection committees.

Simpson outlined the role of the BCPC in the process for a project. They review a feasibility study, prepared with the permission of the appropriate Vice Chancellor, and then forward it to the Chancellor's Executive Committee for approval to proceed to the program planning phase. When the program plan is complete, the BCPC similarly reviews it and forwards it to the CEC. After an architect is selected, and conceptual planning is complete, the BCPC reviews the next stage, schematic design. This is the last time a project is formally sent before the BCPC.

Hurd asked who does the financial review of program plans; Simpson said that Michelle van Pelt in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration does that review. Wobbekind asked who prepares the program plans; Simpson said that small plans may be

done in-house, but most are done by consultants in the private sector. Kaempfer commented that models and plans are often brought back to the BCPC for additional reviews, especially if major changes are made to the initial plans. Cummings asked about the change in the process if a project is not funded by the state, i.e., through campus cash funds or by donors. Simpson said that an expedited process is available for state approvals, but that the BCPC's role remains the same.

DiLaura asked who reviews feasibility studies; Simpson said that they are shown to appropriate campus groups (e.g., parking, recycling, etc.) and Facilities Management staff (e.g., energy, ADA, engineering) before presentation to the BCPC. Hurd asked about project initiation. Simpson said that the project would be discussed with the Vice Chancellor, who would then inform the Chancellor and others that studies were underway. Kaempfer noted that Deans used to initiate a feasibility study, but now Vice Chancellors must approve them. DiLaura asked how much detail is included in feasibility studies. Kaempfer said that feasibility studies were intended to be general, and indicate what was to be investigated in depth in the program plan. Kaempfer said that the BCPC often adds conditions to their approval of feasibility studies, asking that specific areas be fleshed out in the program plan.

Simpson reminded members that the "BCPC 101" presentation is on the BCPC web page at: <http://fm.colorado.edu/planning/bcpc/BCPC101.pdf>.

- 3. UMC BIKE LOCKERS** -- Simpson said that the bike locker proposal was for a pilot project, and was being put before the BCPC as a courtesy review for comment. He introduced Peter Roper from the Environmental Center. Roper said the proposal is to install about 20 lockers on the little-used bike parking area west of the UMC. These lockers would offer security for those who wanted to store bikes overnight, and could extend the bike season by providing protection from the elements. It would offer bike users more options, and would be cheaper than providing additional parking.

Roper said that the lockers would be managed by the Environmental Center in cooperation with Parking and Transportation Services. They would be coordinated with the existing Bike Station north of the Euclid Avenue AutoPark. The project would be financed by the Environmental Center. Damage would be covered under existing university insurance policies. Future revenues would be used for maintenance and repairs.

Hurd asked if lockers like these had reduced automobile traffic at other institutions. Roper said that he didn't have exact numbers, but that lockers seemed to be very popular at other universities. Mullins noted that the *Campus Master Plan* has language concerning bicycle parking. The preferred modes on campus are walking, followed by bicycles, public transit, and automobiles. This all needs to be integrated into the larger city and state systems.

Coffin asked about the amount of green space which would be taken up by bike lockers. She noted that the University of Wyoming has very little grass left around the residence halls and she doesn't want that to happen in Boulder. Roper responded that the pilot project would be in a spot that is currently underutilized for bike parking. Simpson said that the Transportation Master Plan for CU-Boulder is almost finished; this project needs to be checked against the plan, when it is available. Lipton asked about the cost of the lockers. Roper said that each one costs between \$1,000 and \$2,000. Lipton asked to see more detailed financial material about this project.

Cummings asked if there would be user surveys after the pilot project was in place; Roper said there would be. Lipton asked if there were other options, such as providing bike parking within parking structures or under roofs. Kaempfer asked why this wasn't being presented as a feasibility study; Simpson said it was because the project cost was below the required threshold. Gaile said that he thought the proposed lockers were "ugly" and asked why they were being put in a place where nobody wants to park their bikes now.

There was discussion about the use of these lockers: would users come to campus on public transportation, and then use their bikes to get around campus all day, or would they ride their bikes to campus, store them in the lockers, then walk to campus locations all day? Lipton noted that campus policy does allow bicycles to be stored inside campus offices.

Simpson said that he would work with Roper to look at the proposal and try to address the issues raised by the BCPC.

- 4. QUARTERLY REPORT OF PLANNING PROJECTS --** Simpson noted that there is a lot of activity this year, now that funding has been restored for several projects. He highlighted some of the projects in the Quarterly Report.

Intercollegiate Athletics has revived their project to construct a bubble over the practice fields. Biochemistry and Chemical Engineering is interested in a new facility for the Research Park. Changes are planned for the Coors Event/Conference Center to accommodate the basketball office. The costs could be between \$500,000 and \$1 million. The upgrade to the electrical feed has been completed, but a new vault needs to be completed at the Engineering Center. The Housing Department wants to do renovations to older facilities; Kittredge would probably be the first to be renovated. Planning is working with the City of Boulder on plans for a new North-South Bikeway; federal funding may be available. The Campus Transportation Master Plan is expected to be complete in October.

The process has begun to renovate food service areas at the UMC. A program plan will be finished in the spring for the first phase of renovations at Norlin Library. Planning for the Research Building in Grandview may be renewed. Two program plans are being reviewed: Middle Ekeley and the Visual Arts Complex. The Outdoor Recreation project is in the consultant selection phase. The Business Building addition and the IT Infrastructure projects are about to be restarted. Construction is well underway on the Wolf Law Building, the ATLAS Center, and the LASP addition.

Tegen asked about the extensive work on the retaining wall near 28th Street and Colorado Avenue. Simpson said that it is a City project. No university funds are involved.

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