

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

**Minutes of the Meeting of October 9, 2008**

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 9, 2008, in the Provost's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Maren Additon, Deb Coffin, Noel Cummings, Jacob Golding, Larry Hill, Bill Kaempfer, Paul Leef, Karen Lorimer, Steve McNally, Daniel Oxenhandler, Phil Simpson, Cindy White, and Richard Wobbekind.

Members absent were: Steve Bruns, Anthony Hannagan, Steve Jones, Michael Lightner, Gregg Lundgren, Keith Maskus, Russ Moore, Joseph Rosse, and Alexis Smith.

Guests present were: Keith Conrad, Facilities Planning; Carlos Garcia, University Memorial Center; Kim Glasscock, *Silver & Gold Record*; Tom Goodhew, Facilities Planning; Curt Huetson, Housing and Dining Services; Kambiz Khalili; Housing and Dining Services; Tom McGann, Intercollegiate Athletics; Brian Par, Whiting-Turner Contracting Co.; Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planning; Alexis Smith, UCSU, Robin Suits, Facilities Planning.

1. **MINUTES** – Coffin postponed the approval of minutes until quorum was reached. When sufficient numbers of voting members arrived, Coffin asked for a motion to approve the minutes of September 11, 2008. Wobbekind moved to approve them, White seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** – Coffin reported that the request at the September BCPC meeting for more bike parking and bike planning information will be brought to the November BCPC meeting. Coffin introduced Paul Leef, Director of Planning Design & Construction who updated everyone on the capital construction freeze. He said two projects with construction funding were affected: Ketchum Capital Renewal and Ekeley Middle Wing Renovation, both in the design phase. Ekeley will design 100% and the decisions regarding Ketchum will be forecasted on December 20<sup>th</sup>. All other capital projects are self funded and will proceed.

Coffin then introduced Kambiz Khalili and Curt Huetson, both Directors of Housing Administration, who gave the *Housing 2020* overview.

**HOUSING 2020 OVERVIEW** – Curt Huetson, Director of Facilities Planning and Operations, Housing & Dining Services, explained the needs drivers for more campus housing. There is an on-campus residence requirement for freshmen. Current bed count is 6011 which includes the additions of College Inn, Athens North, as well as 48 additional beds in the system. Additionally, 95 over-capacity spaces were also in use during fall 2008. Flagship 2030 growth projections, the increase in freshmen above projections, and *Residential Campus 2020* model goals of 30% non-freshmen retention are driving the need for more beds. The age of facilities (1934 to 1980), identified fire life safety deficiencies, infrastructure, gutters and stone work reaching the end of life and aesthetics, mandate the need for complete facility renovations. There are also modifications scheduled in the summer annually and over 500 bathrooms renovation (being completed over a ten-year schedule) and other deficiency upgrades that go on through out the year. The facilities audit conducted in 2002 identified deficiencies that totaled over \$96M.

Housing & Dining Services (H&DS) long term plan includes an additional 1732 beds (using 20% non-freshman retention goal). Full residence halls renovation plan costs are projected to be \$1B through 2025, a plan established in 2004. A family / graduate student housing facilities plan needs to be developed soon as a campus initiative. The Quadrangle needs to be redeveloped and they need to re-densify.

Kambiz Khalili, Interim Director of Housing & Dining Services gave some background. He said H&DS has 125 acres of space and a \$78M budget with \$50M debt that they are paying at a rate of \$8.5M per year; their capability is reaching its limits and it is becoming challenging.

HDS needs to strategically partner with campus considering the following:

- Flagship 2030 objectives expedite the need for additional beds and reconfigured facilities.
- Associated parking structure, heating and cooling generation capacity increases, and flood plain and street improvements required as new residence hall facilities are constructed in Williams Village.
- Campus funding required for Residential Academic Program (RAP) program facilities.
- Funding constraints: room & board increases, total cost of attendance, debt coverage ratio.
- Family housing required capacity is not defined.
- Affordable family housing redevelopment requirements cannot be subsidized by residence hall room & board – new funding sources must be identified (applicable to existing family housing complex areas, research campus, and Williams Village).
- Affordable faculty / grad / staff housing on campus.

Khalili noted that when you bring more buildings on campus, everything is affected. They want to make sure everyone is paying for what they are using. When facilities for RAP are built, housing loses dorm space, which causes funding constraints. Affordable family housing redevelopment requirements cannot be subsidized; the current cost of maintaining Family Housing is almost more than rent – they need to come up with an equation to keep rent low and also serve students. McGann asked if there are tiered room rates. Khalili said there are and beds generate money but dining and parking do not.

Oxenhandler asked where Williams Village will be built. Simpson said it would be in the parking lots just east of the existing towers. McNally stated that renovation costs a lot and they will have less beds after renovation – he asked what the percent of residence halls have non-freshmen. Khalili said they have about 2% currently and need 25 – 30%; we are behind schedule, we have 53 freshmen living in over capacity spaces through the end of the semester. Huetson added that Kittredge has pre-sold to upper classmen but we have too many freshmen – what is priority? Khalili said we can't have upper classmen in the RAP program for 2 – 3 years. Freshman retention and academic success is determined if they live on campus their first year. He said when students come to the university, we teach critical thinking and meeting deadlines – not having housing for students for their first year will affect this and whether they remain. Adding to Williams Village will help remedy this.

Oxenhandler asked how program fees are distributed. Coffin answered that the program fees are paid to colleges, for faculty time, programmatic activities and for office and classroom space. Certain facilities do not have enough space so beds are taken away as they renovate. Kaempfer asked how RAP was paid for. Khalili said that housing used to pay \$300 - \$400 per year for programming but this was discontinued. White added that RAP does not pay for the amount that the program costs. Programs work when there are offices that are manned on site. Huetson said that Andrews will have faculty there and a faculty residence which will take out 8 – 9 beds for a 1,100 sq ft apartment; faculty living there transforms it to a living environment for the program. Khalili said there needs to be discussion about how to combine more collaborative work - Residence Assistants (RA's) should be able to take classes in RAP but how will that be funded? Look at the concept from a financial point of view – are we filling buildings and what are the impacts. Golding asked what the plans for Williams Village II are; Khalili said it will be freshman housing with a dining center. Golding asked why bed count has decreased so much. Khalili answered that it has not; bed count is the same – 6011 beds. There is one building out of commission for renovation; they have maintained bed capacity – there were 5600 students planned for this year, we ended up having 5833, which was a big jump. At the last minute they had to find options for 233 students. Next year enrollment might go down because they are going to screen students more diligently. Golding commented that it was uncomfortable for students to be in hotels. Khalili said only 15 students were in hotels for 4 days.

4. **CENTER FOR COMMUNITY AMENDMENT (C4C)** – Simpson gave some background information about C4C. The Center for Community project proposes to construct a new dining center with Student Affairs office space and a central parking garage on a site south of Hallett Hall and east of Regent Administrative Center. The original estimated cost of this project was \$65.5M, of which approximately \$52M was construction cost. Preliminary cost estimates based on the schematic design as modeled by the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC), Saunders Construction, and the architect's cost estimator indicate that the building construction cost is \$13M over budget.

Parallel to this discovery, the Department of Housing and Dining Services (HDS) has been seeking ways to increase the number of beds for residence hall students on campus to meet the expected enrollment surge predicted by the *Flagship 2030 Strategic Plan*. Flagship 2030 calls for increasing the student population at historic growth rates resulting in a growth of 6500 students on campus (29,500 to 36,000 students). It also calls for creating a residential college experience on campus where students have access to smaller, more personal classes in the residence halls and more upper division students remain in the halls, which has the added benefit of improving discipline through mentorship of freshmen. This has the dual effect of placing more upper division students in freshmen beds and reducing the overall number of beds in halls as rooms are converted to suites and special rooms.

The solution proposed in this amendment option offers the opportunity to address both issues and provides a way to maintain the wholeness of the programmatic components by expanding the Center for Community to include the HDS offices located in Hallett Hall, then converting the vacated space back to residence hall rooms to create an additional revenue stream that will pay for the expanded scope. Additional revenue would come from increasing the number of parking spaces proposed from 365 to 428 and raising the

fundraising component of Student Services by \$772,000. They are trying to find a way to bring down the parking rate increase.

Simpson said the Chancellor has approved this amendment option which proposes to add 19,000 GSF by expanding the third and fourth floors of the building, making them more efficient floorplates. Study by the design architects have determined that ratio of exterior wall surface to square footage enclosed is far worse than on other campus buildings. Furthermore, the CM/GC and architect determined that 10,000 GSF could be added to the project for less than \$1 million while reducing the exterior enclosure and that the total 19,000 GSF could be added for approximately \$2.5 million. This is because mechanical and circulation systems do not have to be extended to incorporate the added space. Thus, the building team determined that the site is under-programmed.

Expanding the building is relatively simple from a design standpoint. The parking garage sets up a strong structural grid system that can be extended up into the building to create the space. Programs may shift around to meet the functional needs but the overall volume will remain consistent.

The university considered two other alternatives to this amendment. The first option was to reduce the project scope to meet the budget. To do so, the project size would have been reduced by more than 19,000 GSF of program space and the parking garage would have to be reduced to 254 cars in surface and structured parking. This would have forced several programs to be cut from the project, the dining center to be reduced by 100 seats, the bakery would have to remain in its current location at an operation cost of \$330,000 per year and all student services functions would have been reduced, eliminating any future growth potential. This option also had the highest room and board increase because the HDS share of the project would increase without the additional revenue from new beds in Hallett Hall.

The other option considered would be to build the larger office building but a smaller parking garage. This option has all the same advantages of the one proposed in this amendment, and offers lower parking rates but would increase the proportional share of the project for Student Services. It also was not chosen because a review of parking needs in this area of campus indicated that parking could be in short supply if a major parking structure was built on the parking lot immediately south of the site. This led to the proposal given in this amendment being favored.

The legislature will approve the amendment by February 2009 with a projected completion date of July 1010.

Kaempfer thought option one would reduce congestion and asked if option two would increase congestion. Simpson answered that they are working on a traffic study to mitigate congestion; Regent Drive will not be developed so congestion will not likely increase. Wobbekind said they should look at the benefits of fair taxation and think about it carefully because employees should not be taxed. Hill commented that the dates for housing to move are right before semester starts and may not be convenient for students. Simpson said they have to evaluate all of this – they cannot go deep into the semester and not affect beds. They will try to work this out with Housing. Oxenhandler asked if the increase would be gradual; Simpson said yes, it will graduate over 5 years. Kaempfer asked if the lower number is 850 and what the percentage is in terms of years. Khalili said

20% is the current amount. Kaempfer suspects we will have a 20 – 25% increase over 5 years. Khalili said the increase would be 8½ – 9% over the next 5 years. Wobbekind asked if philanthropic funding is planned. Simpson said Student Affairs is looking for donors. White asked if they would allow the same model of funding for an academic building; McNally answered that academics does not have the same funding model.

5. **ANDREWS SMITH BUCKINGHAM (ASB) AMENDMENT** – Goodhew gave some background on ASB, which was built in 1960. The program plan was approved in August 2007. The Department of Housing and Dining Services is in the process of renovating the residence hall facilities within the Kittredge Complex. The primary rationale for renovating the residence halls is threefold: to support the *Residential Campus 2020 Plan* by creating academic program spaces for classes, seminars, faculty offices and tutoring; to upgrade aged infrastructure, by improving fire, life-safety, accessibility, and the heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system; and, to create room configurations with amenities that will be attractive to non-freshmen students. Arnett Hall was the first building in Kittredge Complex to be renovated; renovation is complete. The second building, Andrews Hall, is currently under construction. Conceptual designs for both Smith Hall and Buckingham Hall have been drafted.

These expansions to the Kittredge Complex are less expensive per bed than development of a new residence hall complex at other locations. Existing infrastructure of the Kittredge Complex will support the added facilities and student residents with limited improvements. In addition, providing more student beds within the main campus area is ideal to integrate students into the campus activities and is a preferred location by most students.

This supplemental request is for \$16,980,600 which raises the total project cost from \$41,295,359 to \$58,275,959. The intended program elements remain as they were envisioned in the previous program plan with the addition of a new wing to Smith Hall, adding 130 student beds to the project. This new residence hall wing accounts for 82% of the increased funding request. With this amendment, the campus is proposing to take advantage of this cost-effective opportunity to increase beds on the main campus and therefore revenue to the housing system to better respond to the immediate needs of students.

Conceptual designs for both Smith Hall and Buckingham Hall have been drafted. The renovation of Andrews Hall is scheduled to be complete and open to students for the fall of 2009, with *Buckingham Hall* following in 2010, and *Smith Hall* in 2011.

These projects will be funded by revenue bonds issued by the University and paid for out of room and board revenues from Auxiliary Services. A combination of increased revenue from the addition of beds and modest annual rent increases spread across the entire housing system will pay for the renovation projects. Rent increases will recognize the effects of increases at comparable institutions and the rates within the City of Boulder rental market.

McNally commented that this was a great document but thought it should address faculty and residence apartments and be noted that it reflects a \$750,000 increase. Goodhew said the cost difference is related to the RAP program. Golding applauded the fact that raw water is being used and that we are pushing for LEED standards; energy use and LEED

standard is important to the students. Kaempfer asked what the feedback on Arnett was; Khalili said that feedback was positive and commented that judicial incidents reports have decreased. Kaempfer asked if the 5% upcharge is enough for renovated rooms. Khalili answered that the proximity and size might make it more valuable and that the increase was based on market tolerance. White said the faculty is concerned that the upcharge for RAP's may exclude certain segments of the student population.

6. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** – Coffin announced that there will be a rededication of Arnett; the original buildings were not dedicated.

Wobbekind moved to adjourn the meeting, White seconded the motion; there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by Karen Lorimer, BCPC Secretary.