

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

Minutes of the Meeting of January 12, 2006

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, January 12, 2006, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Maren Additon, Deb Coffin, Noel Cummings, Jud Hurd, Steve Jones, Lisa Lucio, Mary Ann Myer, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Fred Pampel, Phil Simpson, Steve Thweatt, Richard Wobbekind, and Karen Lorimer. Members absent were: Mel Cundiff, David DiLaura, Robert DuRay, Kate Flanagan, Gary Gaile, Bill Kaempfer, Michael Lightner, Brad Long, Joyce Nielsen, and Suzanne Tegen.

Guests present were: William Arndt, Facilities Planning; Mike Bohn, Intercollegiate Athletics; Ghita Carroll, CU Environmental Center; Gary Chadwick, Recreation Services; George Galida, Facilities Planning; Jeff Lipton, Intercollegiate Athletics; Mary Ann Martin, CU Environmental Center; and Moe Tabrizi, Facilities Planning.

Vice Chair Coffin presided in the absence of William Kaempfer.

1. **MINUTES** – On a motion by Jones, seconded by Thweatt, the minutes of the meeting of December 8, 2005, were approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** – Coffin had everyone introduce themselves to Fred Pampel, a new member who was appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Research.
3. **AIR-SUPPORTED PRACTICE BUBBLE FEASIBILITY STUDY** – Coffin introduced Jeff Lipton from Intercollegiate Athletics who introduced the Air-Supported Practice Bubble Feasibility Study.

Lipton shared some history about the original \$45 million field house and parking structure proposal which was introduced in 1997. The proposed Air-Supported Practice Bubble could serve as a temporary structure until the new Fieldhouse is constructed. Lipton suggested that this is the single most important proposal for Athletics and it is very practical to proceed with it now because it could take a long time to raise enough money to build a Fieldhouse. The purpose of the Air-Supported Practice Bubble Feasibility Study is to study the development of a temporary and seasonal indoor Athletics and recreational sports facility. It will be located on the existing synthetic turf practice football training fields. The training fields are located north of Boulder Creek and adjacent to student housing complexes. Although it is in the 100-year floodway the Bubble will be erected in October and taken down and stored in April before the flood season. The facility will cost \$2.4 million and will be paid for by gifts, some of which are already in hand. Lipton introduced Mike Bohn, Director of Athletics, and the project planner, George Galida.

Bohn gave some statistics to support this project. He too thinks that it is extremely important to the University's future. There are over 432 student athletes engaged in intercollegiate athletics at CU in addition to over 36 club sports involving over 1,400 students who participate in high level club sport competition. The University of Colorado has a nationally competitive football, track and field, women's soccer, golf and club sports programs with a history of successful competition with other schools from the Big 12 Conference and other top-level universities across the country, which allows them to attract

and retain the very best student athletes. Continued success is directly related to various teams' access to practice facilities regardless of climatic conditions. CU also has a large number of student athletes that participate at the club sports national championship level through the CU Recreation Services; they are also limited in their preparation for contests due to climate constraints and lack of indoor space availability.

The University of Colorado football program and other athletic programs exhibit potential which can only be enhanced by improved facilities. Since training and conditioning happens year-round for over 500 student participants, it is imperative that they have facilities to practice in.

During inclement weather the existing facilities are overcrowded and limited which hampers the year-round preparation for various athletics teams. Continued success is directly related to the various teams' ability to access practice facilities regardless of the weather. Sports teams are also affected by the lack of indoor practice facilities in the winter when athletes condition for the coming season, which a practice bubble would alleviate. Bohn believes that in order to maintain the competitive status that CU now enjoys, a practice bubble is necessary. There is no facility on campus that can provide the space required for quality football or soccer practices during inclement weather. Currently, Balch Fieldhouse, which was built in 1936, is used for general conditioning by various athletic teams (track and soccer) and various divisions of the on-campus ROTC program. It can also be used by various staff, faculty, and student groups during the winter months, which results in scheduling conflicts, to the detriment of all programs. The resulting competitive disadvantage to Athletics in general, and to football in particular is inconsistent with the mission of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Their mission is to be nationally competitive and to provide the Universities' athletes with the best facilities and a safe environment for practice. The football program along with other highly ranked athletic programs will be greatly enhanced by improved facilities. Bohn concluded that a Practice Bubble is necessary to the future development and success of competitive sports here at CU. Bohn opened the discussion up for questions.

Additon asked if there would be a charge to use the Practice Bubble. Lipton said he will work with the pricing structure, spreading expenses between all users with Bohn managing all resources. Cummings asked about the revenue from the existing Sky Box. Bohn said that the Boxes are bringing in money but the Club Seats beneath them are not.

Galida did a visual presentation to support the feasibility study. He began by sharing that the new expanded proposal scope will accommodate many more uses and participants than the original proposal in 1997.

Galida noted that the proposed bubble is a temporary, air-supported indoor practice structure which will be approximately 180 feet wide, 360 feet long, and 55 feet high (size necessary due to the number of participants, various types of practice ongoing simultaneously, and space separation required to accommodate coaches and players). It is planned to be erected on the West existing practice field from October to mid April and placed in storage when not in use. The structure would be in use for seven months of each calendar year and in storage for five months following April. This air-supported structure would be a single or double membrane made of coated PVC fabric which would be held in place by a structurally designed network of steel cables attached to a concrete foundation

surrounding the perimeter of the field. It would be erected by means of air blown into the structure by mechanical fan units located alongside the exterior of the bubble; air could be heated as necessary. These systems have redundant backups if failure should occur in order to maintain pressurization of the structure. Alarms can be integrated into the system to warn of leaks or mechanical failure, should they happen.

The bubble would utilize existing lighting and would be used primarily when the weather or temperature prevents outdoor practice sessions. It will require a concrete foundation at or below grade; mechanical units, portable and above grade, with integrated alarms and backup systems; electrical service; and natural gas service (for heating). Doors and/or airlocks will provide entry and exiting to the structure (number to be determined by life safety codes).

A modification to location size might be considered by shifting the existing turf to the West a sufficient distance to avoid any possible encroachment into the center of the practice field.

This modification may also allow the bubble size/configuration to be increased to allow additional vertical clearance along the sidelines and increasing the size will come closer to accommodating the NCAA minimum soccer field width of 210', or a track, or to help accommodate portable lighting. This modification may require relocating the perimeter site fence and existing field light poles, all resulting in increased costs.

It won't impede the function of the Floodway because it will be dismantled during flood times. The bubble will be easy and quick to collapse if necessary. It should be aesthetically pleasing with a pleasant environment inside. It will be 150 feet from existing Housing units to take on a natural shape of a curve. It can be translucent or they can introduce colors and logos. The bubble will be heated to 58 to 65 degrees and the heat will be turned down when not in use. It will provide a safe environment for healthy recreation and lifestyle alternatives for students, supporting a good image.

Galida opened the discussion up for questions. Additon asked what the wind impact would be. Galida said it could withstand up to 150 mph winds. Lipton added that the concrete foundation will support it. Thweatt asked if drainage patterns would be changed. Galida answered that drainage would be looked at in design. Cummings asked what it would look like when down. Galida replied that helical piers are going to be used and not seen. Myer asked if there could be a guarantee that it could be taken down quickly. Galida said they will try to ascertain this but it depends on what type of dome is chosen. Lipton added that consultants will make recommendations regarding how long it takes to collapse. Hurd asked where it will be stored. Galida said they would rent off campus space to store it. Coffin announced that Housing has concerns about the noise. Galida said they will be able to detect decibel levels of noise and there will be 150 to 160 feet separating the bubble from Housing. Coffin asked if they would anchor the bubble to existing parking lot. Galida said no; cables would connect directly to the dome. Coffin also said that Housing tenants have a concern about the fields being lighted at night. Galida said they will take this into consideration and will try to create a balance. Nielson was concerned about the interior noise that would be generated comparing it to the tennis courts bubble at the Harvest House. Thweatt said noise shouldn't be a serious problem because the turf will absorb the noise, unlike the tennis courts that reflect the sound. Arndt asked if it might impact Naropa and suggested they be notified and asked for input.

It was moved by Jones and seconded by Myers to approve the Feasibility Study for the Air Supported Practice Bubble; it was unanimously approved.

4. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BCPC BY-LAWS** – Coffin noted that changes in the By-Laws require nine voting members to be present, so a vote cannot be taken on the proposed changes at this meeting. Also, the By-Laws do not allow proxy votes. Therefore, the first reading will be presented at this meeting. Thweatt said it might be possible to poll members by e-mail, possible to approve the second reading.

There was, however, a brief discussion of the proposal. The changes are required due to the elimination of the position of “Executive Director of Facilities Management”, and to make the current Campus Architect a voting member instead. Also, wording will be adjusted to clarify the status of representatives for the Vice Chancellors.

5. **SOLAR POWERED CANOPY** – Thweatt introduced Ghita Carroll from the Environmental Center who did a presentation about the Canopy. The Environmental Center has allocated \$100,000 for the construction of a Solar Powered Canopy or awning somewhere on the CU Boulder campus. Funding will also come from two student-fee referenda – Sustainable CU and the Energy Efficiency Fund as well as \$45,000 from Amendment 37 rebates from XCEL Energy.

The awning is a shade structure that would generate electricity which would go back to the CU grid. With this project proposal, the Environmental Center is promoting the use and understanding of renewable energy. The design process would include a student design competition judged by decision-makers for new construction on campus.

The awning could have an environmental impact of recycling 1,000 kWh hours per month, which would save CU money and reduce CU’s consumption of fossil fuels as well as lead the way for additional solar power systems to be installed at CU. CU’s leadership in solar power would be demonstrated and combined with their existing effort to reduce power consumption by making buildings more efficient, and would act to further CU’s goals to meet Campus energy and climate goals to ultimately become climate neutral. Currently most of CU’s electricity comes from natural gas, however with rising gas prices; it is possible that CU electricity would be drawn from Xcel Energy, which is predominately powered by coal. In this scenario, the Solar Power Canopy would displace an average of 1,870 lbs/month CO2 and 673,200 lbs CO2 over the 30 year lifetime of the system; 9,048 lbs coal/year, plus associated SOX, NOX and mercury pollution.

A maintenance contract with lifetime warranties will be purchased as a part of the installation of the system that will enable CU staff to simply call to have the system repaired when a problem occurs. Since solar power systems like the ones proposed have no moving parts, maintenance expenses are very low. With a properly designed system, no more than about a half day of inspection per year is required. They are expected to last at least 20 years and experts believe they will last 30 years or more. The panels are very durable and are built to withstand severe weather. They will be specifically designed with wind in mind as well as designed to prevent people from walking on them. They will be insured along with the building they are attached to.

The locations investigated are Euclid AutoPark, the Student Recreation Center south patio, and the UMC south patio. Thweatt suggested that the new basketball court by the Coors Event/Conference Center might be a viable option. Arndt suggested that the hallway

entrance to the Recreation Center tennis courts might be a good location. The Environmental Center will research other locations.

Newsome-Suitts said that Paul Tabolt reviewed the proposal and was strongly in favor of it. Cummings asked how it would tie to the CU grid. Thweatt answered that it would be tied to the building that it is attached to, which will affect the grid. Wobbekind suggested that we check availability and get in line for maintenance because he knows from personal experience that companies making the awnings are backlogged since there have been incentives offered for energy efficiency. Jones noted that he had concerns about the Euclid AutoPark location because it was originally designed to have floors added above. Simpson added that the basketball courts would be a big advantage because they are funded by students which could save costs. Arndt asked if the awnings were meant to be visible. Carroll answered that they will be visible but won't stick out.

Although formal approval was not required, BCPC members expressed general support. The project will return for BCPC review when location and other details are determined.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by Karen Lorimer.