

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER CAMPUS PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of April 13, 2006

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, April 13, 2006, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

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

Guests present were: Natalie Ahn, Chemistry and Biochemistry; William Arndt, Facilities Planning; Andy Barnard, Sink Combs Dethlefs Architects; Phil Goedert, Tangents Design Management; Joe Bilotta, JBA, Inc., Dave Bodnar, ITS; Mike Bohn, Intercollegiate Athletics; Robert Davis, College of Engineering and Applied Sciences; Jeff Dodge, *Silver & Gold Record*; George Galida, Facilities Planning; Jeff Lipton, Intercollegiate Athletics; Ann Mullins, Facilities Planning; Scott Seaman, Libraries; Jim Williams, Dean of Libraries; and JoAnn Zelasko, College Engineering and Applied Sciences.

William Kaempfer presided the meeting. He recognized both Jeff Lipton and Rich Wobbekind as recipients of this year's prestigious Stearns award. Kaempfer also noted that there were no student members present thus there was not a quorum.

1. **MINUTES** – Coffin noted that on page 2 of the minutes, the fourth paragraph down, to change 5,000 to 1,000 and in the sixth paragraph to change the Board to Association. The minutes of March 9, 2006, were not approved because there were only 5 voting members present.
2. **BY-LAW REVISION** – Since there was not a quorum at this meeting, the second reading and final approval will take place at the May meeting.
3. **ATHLETICS-AIR SUPPORTED PRACTICE STRUCTURE (BUBBLE)** – Kaempfer asked Lipton to introduce this program plan. Lipton gave a short introduction and then Galida presented the program plan. The project is a temporary and seasonal indoor athletics and recreational sports inflated practice bubble to be located at the existing football practice fields located adjacent to and north of Boulder Creek. The Practice Bubble was initially proposed in 1997. Galida stated that there is a lot of potential for multi-use for intramural and club sports. There are over 15,000 students participating in intramural organized sports activities, 432 engaged in intercollegiate athletics with over 36 club sports involving over 1,400 students, currently at CU Boulder. Many of these programs require year-round conditioning programs. The facilities now existing for inclement weather practices are overcrowded and limited hence hampering year-round preparation. CU Boulder has developed a history of successful competition with other schools in the Big 12 Conference and other top-level universities across the country. This history of success allows the University to attract and retain the very best student athletes. Continued success is directly related to the various teams' access to practice facilities, regardless of climatic conditions. A

new Fieldhouse was proposed to alleviate this congestion and lack of practice space but due to lack of funding the Fieldhouse will not be completed for many years.

Galida talked about the infrastructure of the proposed bubble. It will be approximately 190 feet wide, 370 feet long, and 55 feet high. It would be erected on the west existing synthetic turf practice field from October to April, when flooding is less likely. It will be stored in a location to be determined when not in use. The costs for anticipated infrastructure impacts have been included in the cost estimates for this project.

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics will fund the estimated \$2.6 million dollar project through donations. They have already received \$1.5 million from a private donor. The ongoing operational funds will be obtained from general revenues of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and through rental income from club sports and non-CU community sports groups.

Galida reported that an Open House meeting with the “neighbors” of the proposed site was held on April 4, 2006. About 15 people attended. Questions were answered regarding several aspects of the project including the mechanical fan noise. The fans are not overly noisy and hardly audible beyond 25 feet. The next question was regarding glare from the bubble on existing apartments. Lights are proposed to be contained inside the bubble and will only emit a soft glow. Concerns about wind and damages due to high wind were voiced. The structure is made to withstand at least 90 mph winds and is held down with steel cables anchored in concrete. It can also be deflated if necessary. Neighbors asked about the noise generated from use. Late night use will be monitored and limited to 10:00 pm and it should contain noise therefore potentially reducing it compared to open field noise. Parking issues were questioned. Parking will not change and drivers will have to park in the existing lot south of the practice fields. It is anticipated that many students will walk to the practice fields from campus. The last question neighbors inquired about was whether housing residents would be allowed to use the Bubble. When the Bubble is not being used for scheduled Campus programs, time will be made available to neighbors to enjoy playing in the Bubble.

Galida thought the neighbors felt positive about the results of the meeting to address their concerns.

The meeting was then opened up for questions. Kaempfer asked if it will replace the future Fieldhouse. Lipton answered that that it will be replaced by the Fieldhouse when the it is built; the life expectancy of the Bubble is approximately 15 years and it could take that long for the Fieldhouse to be completed. The Bubble could be used in the interim and while the Fieldhouse is being built. Kaempfer asked about the schedule for when it would be erected. Lipton said it would be scheduled the way the Balch Fieldhouse is now, by Athletics. Accordingly, it could go up at the end of October and be dismantled between April 15th and April 30th. Kaempfer also asked about how it will perform in the event of heavy snow. Galida said that they could turn up the heat inside if there is a large storm so the snow will melt and slide off. Thweatt asked about the ice the melting snow could create around the structure. Barnard answered that there would be a drainage system around the bottom of the Bubble to alleviate the ice build up. Coffin asked how many days it would take for set up and tear down and about the noise implications. Galida said that the pros who build them do it in a couple of days so hopefully with practice we will be able to accomplish it in the same time frame. She also asked if it will be within the fence line. Galida said it would.

Coffin commented that there is no mention of the work that has been done with Family Housing to mitigate their concerns in the Program Plan and suggested that a bullet be added to the CEC recommendation noting the public input from Family Housing and from the City. Lipton mentioned that he had met with the City of Boulder Flood Commission and that they informally approved it. Cundiff asked if funding would totally come from Athletics. Lipton answered that they would also acquire funds from groups who use it.

Cundiff moved to pass the Program Plan for the Air Supported Practice Bubble. Wobbekind seconded the motion. Those present voted unanimously in favor.

4. **CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE UPDATE** – Simpson updated everyone on Capital Development. He said the CEC Board approved the Arnett Hall Program Plan on March 22nd. The Long Bill was written and three projects were included for design: Visual Arts Complex, Ekeley Middle Wing, and Ketchum Capital Renewal. There was all state Capital Renewal for Ketchum to re-do all infrastructure. Three controlled maintenance projects also were funded retroactively and five additional projects are also in the Long Bill. Wobbekind asked if VAC will have to come up with private funding. Simpson answered that it would have to come up with \$10 million dedicated to the CU Art Museum.
5. **SYSTEMS BIOTECHNOLOGY BUILDING PROGRAM PLAN** – Simpson introduced Rob Davis, the Dean of Engineering, who gave a brief introduction. He said this will be the first academic presence in the Research Park. Faculty is working hard on programs and \$20 million has already been funded. The vision is to build new buildings to bring researchers and students together from Biochemistry, Chemical and Biological Engineering, and Colorado Initiative in Systems Biotechnology to promote collaboration between UCB, UCDHSC, local biotechnology industry, and beyond. It will place CU at the forefront of Systems Biotechnology.

Simpson did a Power Point presentation to introduce the Program Plan. Systems Biotechnology is new research, teaching, and technology development at the interfaces between medicine, life sciences, physical sciences, applied mathematics, computational sciences, and engineering, requiring a systems approach by multiple disciplines. The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering and Applied Science are jointly proposing the construction of a major new facility at the Research Park. It is proposed as a research and teaching facility to bring students and researchers together collaboratively. It will accommodate 60 science and engineering faculty with shared labs for 600 researchers. The facility will feature highly efficient and flexible lab design with the latest in technology, with an educational component, including an auditorium, seminar rooms, classrooms, computer rooms, and teaching labs. Other amenities include a gallery, café, and conference rooms organized around an interior “main street” concept resulting in a place where people will want to linger. The total programmed size of the building is about 150,340 assignable square feet, with a total gross square footage of 262,662 at a cost of \$113 million. The source of funding is indirect cost recovery - \$25 million, UCB cash reserve - \$10 million, Engineering College - \$5 million, and Arts & Sciences - \$5 million.

The site, adjacent to Smiley Court Family Housing and across Colorado Avenue from off-campus residences, is located in Pod I of the Research Park, which is served by buses, is a main pedestrian and bike route, and is along a main auto entrance to campus. A campus shuttle drop off is also planned. The site has tremendous views with good solar exposure.

Three hundred eighty to four hundred new parking spaces will be added. Research lab space for sixty research professionals is planned. The labs will be designed in modules to be able to be shut down without affecting the other labs for future renovations.

Simpson opened the discussion up for questions. Additon asked who would fund the campus shuttle. Coffin answered that they will encourage partnering with the CU Buff Bus to establish a shuttle stop. Simpson added that there is a concern that the busses aren't frequent enough – they will study this. Thweatt agreed that transportation needs to be studied. Wobekind asked if the City of Boulder had been approached regarding a bike path. Simpson answered that the City has a bike path in their plan. A sidewalk along Colorado Avenue from 30th to 28th Street has also been planned for several years and Facilities Planning will work with the city to bring this to fruition.

Myer asked how much space will be freed up on the main campus for backfill opportunities. Simpson said there will be a redistribution of the backfill of the Engineering Center, - 1/3 Chemical Engineering, 1/3 Bio Chemistry and 1/3 new Researchers. Kaempfer asked if indirect cost is shared by campus. Davis said that up to 30% is coming out of cost and the state will contribute 20%. Cummings asked what the forecast for state funds was. Simpson answered that the state could be requesting more for program plans due to the impact of Referendum C. Coffin asked who determined the Smiley Court plans and asked what the implications toward the end of the useful life would be. Simpson said they considered Smiley Court because the building is over 40 years old and it was only built to last 40 years and that the statement “towards the end of it's useful life” comes from this. He also said that they need to look at the area in light of densification of campus. Thweatt commented that as time goes on we will have to invest more and more in Smiley Court and that increased reinvestment is in order. Coffin said that there are other Housing buildings – like Athens and Newton Court – that need to be upgraded before they upgrade Smiley Court. She made a point that she doesn't want an inappropriate assumption made that Housing will agree to the demise of Smiley Court. Coffin also noted that she appreciates that the bubble proposed layout has green space consideration. She inquired about the landscape piece on the edge of the project. Simpson said they plan to develop a similar cohesive edge to match the Research Park.

Newsome-Suitts pointed out that the Governor's Office of Innovation and Technology is reporting on their website that there are now over 300 biotechnology firms in Colorado. Fifty-seven of those businesses are located in and around Boulder. The CU Technology Transfer Office reports that 111 licenses have been commercialized from current research going on at the campus and that \$23 million has been received from royalties related to biotechnology. She expects that this building proposal will be received well by the legislature. Wobbekind said that it is possible that Fitzsimons is where the legislature will focus their attention. Kaempfer added that this is critical and Newsome-Suitts added that she believes the legislature will spread the benefits of their support geographically. Thweatt commented that the whole north section of Fitzsimons is dedicated to future Biotechnology initiatives. Davis made an academic argument that Biotechnology is desperately needed. Wobbekind stated that he thinks that Fitzsimons has a fledgling Biotech area and that they need more hence they will be our main competitors.

Simpson said it is planned to be revamped in 10 years to keep up with the rapidly changing technology and that room for growth is built in. Ahn expressed a need to create an interdisciplinary collaboration and said there were no plans to make an institute. The hiring

concept would be a permanent affiliation. Lucio asked what the long term return on the investment would be. Ahn answered that this is not a new concept and that it will help us be competitive. Bringing together Engineering and Mathematics will have immediate benefits because it fits into Federal funding. Wobekind said there would be 500 to 600 students involved. He moved to pass and Lucio seconded the motion. Those present voted unanimously in favor.

6. **NORLIN LIBRARY RENAISSANCE PLAN – PHASE 1** – Simpson introduced Jim Williams, the Dean of Libraries, who briefly talked about the proposed plan. He said it is an exciting new space for campus collaboration between the Library and Information Technology Services. Students strongly support it and have committed 25% of the student fee budget towards it. He feels it will increase student productivity and it will be a place where students want to come to work. It will be a “candle in the night,” complementary to everyone to function independently with assistance. It is overdue since students have been asking for improvements since 2001.

Simpson did a Power Point presentation introducing the Norlin Renaissance Plan which is a culmination of a four year study to update the library to be a new learning environment where students and faculty can develop a collective learning experience, a new model for libraries in the 21st Century. Ultimately, the space will be transformed into a highly functional, logically organized modern library, incorporating the need for student interaction with each other and with information. The larger aspect of the Norlin Renaissance Plan will be a five step approach costing \$25 million. There will be five to seven steps with 30 phases. The total plan and moves will take 10 years at which time they will address building system issues. The goal for the first step is to create a twenty four hours, seven days a week, open space for students. It will be 15,050 square feet of commons, including computer stations, work centers, team learning stations, a coffee and snack shop, a hot topics reading area, a new computer lab for teaching, a writing center, a lap-top support center, team technology rooms and a twenty four hour central help and service desk; a comfortable space where students will want to be. A portion of the second and third floors will also be addressed. The reference and periodicals areas with additional study space will be consolidated on the second floor. The third floor former computer lab area will be converted into graduate study space. No changes to parking are anticipated since there should be no impact to transportation. The infrastructure will be updated as needed, involving new telecommunications and electrical plans for power, data and voice systems. The first phase of the project budget is \$5,099,418 to include professional fees, construction, equipment, furniture and contingencies. Funding is provided by a combination of student approved technology fees and gifts and donations.

Simpson opened the discussion up for questions. Kaempfer gave a break down of funding; \$1 million will come from UCSU technology fees, and class gifts, and \$4 million from fundraising and cash reserves. The IT Infrastructure project is an ongoing project not included in the \$5 million that will fund some improvements complementary to this scope of work.

Kaempfer asked about the staging and timing. Wobekind said that two IT labs will be vacated. Additon asked what the campus capability to raise funds is. She is worried that so much fund raising is going on that it will “tap” the students’ parents. Wobekind said the Chancellors office is involved and that parents of previous students are willing to donate.

The Parent's Association values this plan and resonates with it. Myer asked if the Information Center and Help Desk could be used by the library. Williams said no, the Information Center would just be for the new commons area. Simpson answered that we are voting on the project. Kaempfer asked if this was an appropriate use of this space. Wobekind said this is a priority for campus and that IT is an issue for campus. Lucio would like to see the Campus invest more money in the Library. Kaempfer was concerned about the security. He asked if the access would be restricted with card access and if there would be some physical presence in the space or just a monitor. He maintained that Boulder Creek homeless people and transients should not have access. Wilson answered that access will be by card reader system. Lucio asked how it will be renovated. Simpson said that there are no walls, just structural columns which will save a lot in renovation costs. Coffin was concerned that the Night Ride could not accommodate the numbers of students who could potentially use the new facility.

Wobekind moved to pass the Program Plan for the Norlin Library Renaissance with the addition that the campus finds additional funds. Lucio seconded the motion. Kaempfer amended the motion to add strong encouragement for additional funding from Campus. Lucio seconded his amendment. Those present voted in favor of the motion.

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