

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

Minutes of the Meeting of November 13, 2008

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission (BCPC) met on Thursday, November 13, 2008, in the Provost's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Maren Additon, Deb Coffin, Jacob Golding, Anthony Hannagan, Larry Hill, Bill Kaempfer, Paul Leef, Michael Lightner, Karen Lorimer, Gregg Lundgren, Steve McNally, Daniel Oxenhandler, Phil Simpson, Cindy White,

Members absent were: Steve Bruns, Noel Cummings, Steve Jones, Keith Maskus, Russ Moore, Joseph Rosse, Alexis Smith and Richard Wobbekind.

Guests present were: Carolyn Becket, Mortenson Construction, George Bellinger, Parent Relations, Keith Conrad, Leo A Daly; Ellen Falender, Student, Carlos Garcia, University Memorial Center; Tom Goodhew, Facilities Planning; Curt Huetson, Housing and Dining Services; Casey Jones, Parking & Transportation Services; Carl Koelbel, Student/Leeds Real Estate, Tom McGann, Intercollegiate Athletics; Craig Monzio, Leeds School of Business; Jason Pickel, Whiting-Turner Contracting; Nathan Pillatzke, PEH Architects; Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planning; Ron Stump, Alumni Association; Robin Suits, Facilities Planning, and Melissa Yates, Parking & Transportation Services.

1. **MINUTES** – Coffin asked for a motion to approve the minutes of October 9, 2008. McNally moved to approve them, Leef seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** – Coffin announced that she has accepted the position of Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs so she would be stepping down from chairing the BCPC. Kambiz Khalili will assume her position of Director of Housing Administration, and will become a voting member of BCPC by virtue of his position. A nominating committee comprised of Steve McNally, Paul Leef and Anthony Hannagan will solicit a new chair. Coffin has agreed to chair until someone is elected.
3. **UNIVERSITY CLUB (UCLUB) FEASIBILITY STUDY** – Goodhew introduced the plan to renovate the UCLUB, move the Alumni Center there, and create a Welcome Center. The UCLUB, a common point of reference in the center of campus was the last building designed by Klauder in 1939. This gem of a building is an icon; it is important how we preserve it. Built as a hotel for guests, it served as a women's dormitory during World War II. It had been a part of Housing and Dining Services until the spring of 2006 when it was transferred to the campus general maintenance fund. The existing conditions of the building require \$650,000 maintenance as soon as possible, \$3 to \$5M maintenance in the next two to five years and \$251,400 in the next five to ten years, for a total of \$3,716,415, making it a good candidate for renovation.

Current users are Arts & Sciences, Parent Relations, Orientation, Undergraduate Admissions, and the Performing Arts Ticket Office (*currently being developed*). Spaces planned for the UCLUB are a Welcome Center, Alumni Center, Parent Relations Office, and some academic space. The UCLUB would not make a good academic building; because the small size and configuration does not lend itself to full academic use, and building additions could overwhelm the original architecture.

The cost of renovation is projected at \$10,445,000; there is a fair amount of abatement of asbestos and lead paint necessary which drives the price up. The Alumni Association will share the cost with the University. The University will pay for the core and shell renovation and the Alumni Association will pay for “tenant upgrade” improvements.

Goodhew introduced Ron Stump from the Alumni Association, George Ballinger from Parent Relations, and Nathan Pillatzke from PEH Architects, and then opened the discussion for questions.

Lightner asked how Koenig Alumni Center would be used when the Alumni Association vacates. Kaempfer added that the program plan needs to be specific about the plans for Koenig Alumni Center. Lightner also questioned whether or not the Heritage Center will stay where it is. Goodhew said it would but would have some displays at the UCLUB. Lightner asked if the interior space would be usable while the exterior is being renovated. Goodhew said the inside space would be usable but there would be some obstacles due to the chilled water installation. Lightner asked if the Klauder architectural style would be maintained; Goodhew said it would with the addition of ADA improvements, minor doors and windows replacements. Leef reiterated that we will maintain the Klauder architectural style. Lightner asked if parking would be swapped with Koenig. Goodhew said it would. White said Arts & Sciences would like to encourage the term “Welcome Center” be used to identify the renovated UCLUB and that the plan needs to show the use of space for faculty. Oxenhandler concurred that student advising needs to have designated space. Goodhew said they are evaluating the best use of space. Kaempfer commented that the basement is a poor use of space for academics; it is too fragmented. He suggested that they look at Room 45 in the program plan – the L shape is not effective for classrooms; it would be a nice suite for assignable classrooms. Golding went to the Association for Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (ASSHE) conference where they talked about efficient use of space being sustainable; using the space during the day and night could slow building growth on campus, saving the splendor of open space. Goodhew said this is definitely being considered and is part of the reason for the academic space. Kaempfer added that it is an ideal building to make intensive use of during hours with the secured presence, and close proximity to the UMC, making it superlative for overflow use.

C. Jones noted that Koenig is out of the parking system and further discussion is necessary – visitors parking at Euclid could be problematic due to safety issues. Huetson added that the planning group is pushing for multifunction space use.

Stump said they will have to look at operating expenses and how users and occupiers will pay for expenses in the program plan because of limited funds. Goodhew said they will address expenses/finances in the program plan. Lightner moved to approve the feasibility study with the comments mentioned. Additon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

4. **WILLIAMS VILLAGE PHASE II PROGRAM PLAN** – Goodhew said the further development of Williams Village is necessary to provide adequate housing to meet the demands of students, and provide flexible housing to meet the changing needs of a diverse set of users. Development should complement the existing towers, provide adequate service support to sustain the “Village” concept and be compatible with the surrounding community. The *Master Site Development Plan* completed in 2001 includes the

development of Williams Village in Phases. This program plan phase IIa adds Pod C, a 500 beds residential style unit similar to Kittredge at lot 605 east of Sterns. Phase IIb will add Pod D, another 500 bed residential style unit, and Pods A & B, a parking garage and apartment style units. Phase III will be in the future to add family housing with townhome & apartment style units on the east side of Bear Creek Apartments.

Goals and objectives here are to increase bed capacity, to accommodate growing student enrollment, and create living-learning environments, helping students gain skills of problem solving and critical thinking. Additions will allow the further development of residential academic programs and allow a greater number of students to live in close proximity to the campus.

Flagship 2030 projects an enrollment increase of 6,500 students. Residential Colleges will offer a multi-year residential academic experience for every entering student and University Villages will develop a new concept for the build-out of university properties, emphasizing an education-related, mixed-use approach.

The total estimated project cost is \$51,535,000 with funding coming from cash and bonds. Construction is projected to start in May 2010.

Lightner asked if it is reasonable to think that we can get started by 2010 – can we predict that it will be postponed? McNally noted that debt will be paid for this and that the legislative process is unpredictable. Lightner suggested that the program plan should indicate what the debt capacity will be. Simpson commented that it is included in the five year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and has a revenue stream. Lightner suggested that we need to decide how debt capacity is used as a campus issue. Goodhew said the issue with the private sector is that they are pulling back and not able to step in. Simpson said the target of this building design is to accommodate freshmen.

Lighter said he is curious about how well a RAP program will work there with its distance from campus. Oxenhandler clarified that classes are scheduled first thing in the morning and late in the day and that there is a lot of attrition from first semester to second semester. White said more space is needed for classrooms and faculty offices if you want “face to face contact time” with students. Hill added that classroom space is suboptimum there and that maybe they could consider space in other buildings. Huetson noted that Darley Commons can be used but the next phase triggers a lot more work. Hecht added that currently there is underutilized space at Sterns Central. He questioned whether Darley Commons is an efficient use of space and wondered if it will have a role in Residence Academic Program (RAP). Coffin said there will be additional studies in the *Campus 2020 plan* to look at what can be done to promote RAP effectiveness; they are a group that can work effectively for faculty and students.

Kaempfer expressed his concern for a 20% increase in students affecting the Buff bus load. Golding said buses are currently packed at peak times and bus use by students and others increases in the winter. Oxenhandler asked where storage parking would be and if ADA issues are being addressed – students with disabilities have access trouble. Goodhew said Planning is addressing ADA access issues. C. Jones said growth will force a look at the whole system. East campus build out will affect ridership other than students. New larger buses are replacing old buses and more are being added. Other strategies are to restrict freshmen from bringing cars to campus, look at car share programs, and plan east

campus efficiently so people can easily use public transportation. Huetson expressed concern about over flow parking in the neighborhoods. Lightner wondered how transportation is going to be paid for – the cost of providing transportation needs to be captured. C. Jones said this is part of a broader transportation issue that needs to be addressed. Coffin said she is confident it will be addressed – they will not expect current capacity to serve 500 more students. Golding asked what the process for future transportation planning was. C. Jones said the *Transportation Micro Master* and *Campus Master Plan* addresses this. Leef said the planning base will be covered – Planning, Design & Construction (PD&C) is developing stronger relationships with Parking and Transportation Services and the Environmental Center. McNally asked if these issues need to be addressed in the program plan. Lightner said he would rather not burden the program plan but would like BCPC to check the progress in six months. Lightner moved to approve the program plan with modifications mentioned, Hill seconded the motion; it was unanimously approved.

5. **BIKE RACKS ON CAMPUS** – Reilly said there is a partnership with the Environmental Center, Parking & Transportation Services, Planning Design & Construction, and Housing & Dining Services to tackle the broad issues around bike racks on campus. They are examining the retrofitting of existing areas, planning for new building construction, and evaluating the current census.

As Landscape Architect and Planner, Reilly is charged with making sure the architectural heritage is honored while ensuring that bike racks are functional, convenient and blend with the landscaping.

The 1999 *Master Plan* indicates that there were 7,327 bike parking spaces throughout campus. The Environmental Center recent statistics showed 8,282 spaces (7,590 total useable) with 297 sites identified on the entire campus; 156 of these sites were identified with illegally parked bikes. Bike registration is encouraged but only 32% of the bikes on campus are registered. There are seven different styles of racks throughout campus of which 692 are rams head style racks which are considered non functional. Bike rack use has increased 20% since 2007. Illegal bike parking has increased 20% in general fund areas on campus and 27% at residence halls since 2007.

McNally asked if rams head style racks are being replaced. He also asked if they have looked at other campuses to see if there are other racks that are more efficient. Reilly answered that they have looked at other campuses and products and have found Cora racks to be the best value and they will increase density. Cook added that design has not changed in years – the other options they have looked at take up more space and are more expensive. Kaempfer commented that there are many “junk bikes” in visible areas throughout campus and illegal bike parking is not enforced like illegal car parking. Removing junk and abandoned bikes will open up space for more bikes. C. Jones said they have to follow policy according to the law which is the same for bikes and cars. Parking Enforcement is in charge of all bikes and vehicles on campus; they only have a staff of four so they have to prioritize. Cars tend to take precedence over bikes and there is not enough space to hold confiscated bikes for long periods. Safety and ADA has top priority. Kaempfer suggested that there might need to be more public education regarding bike policy and registration of bikes. C. Jones said there is currently an awareness program; students are notified of violations. McNally commented that there is no motivation to register and it costs \$10. Kaempfer questioned why the residence halls

students are double counted. Reilly answered that they must have parking available point to point. Lundgren asked why bicycle parking is not enforced. C.Jones said they enforce bike regulations primarily on a complaint reporting basis and are proactive on life safety and ADA issues; they check all of the racks twice per year for abandoned and junk bikes. Golding said that no money is generated for enforcing bike parking so it appears that there is less motivation to enforce bike infractions. C.Jones said they have to look at the full system – do we want to focus the limited staff on car parking regulation or bike parking regulation. Cook added that there are outreach programs but lack of supply makes it difficult to justify enforcement. Leef said alternative transportation is important and bikes are a key component of alternative transportation. Oxenhandler suggested that it be scrutinized carefully in order to support and promote alternative transportation. McNally added that we need to do whatever we can to encourage alternative transportation. Lundgren suggested that new construction projects need to look at bike parking and alternative parking. Golding inquired where the revenue for bike spaces would come from. Leef said it will be considered and decided in the planning stage. Building renovations also need to assess what is available for bike parking. Cook added that there has been a 20% increase in bike use in the past year which is significant. The amount of bike parking needs to be considered as well as steps towards maximum utilization and aesthetics.

6. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** – McNally thanked Deb Coffin for her service to the BCPC and wished her well with her new appointment.

McNally moved to adjourn the meeting, Hill seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by Karen Lorimer, BCPC Secretary.