

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

Minutes of the Meeting of May 14, 2009

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, May 14, 2009, in the Provost's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Maren Additon, Thomas Higginbotham, Larry Hill, Bill Kaempfer, Curt Huetson (for Kambiz Khalili), Paul Leef, JoAnn Zelasko (for Michael Lightner), Karen Lorimer, Keith Maskus, Phil Simpson, Cindy White, and Rich Wobbekind.

Members absent were: Steve Bruns, Noel Cummings, Jacob Golding, Steve Jones, Kambiz Khalili, Michael Lightner, Gregg Lundgren, Steve McNally, Russ Moore, and Joseph Rosse.

Guests present were: Morey Bean, Facilities Planning; David Bodner, ITS; James Faber, Design & Construction; Elizabeth Goetz, PD&C; Carlos Garcia, UMC; Tom Goodhew, Facilities Planning; Louise Brauer, City of Boulder Long Range Planning; Jeff Lipton, Real Estate; Dennis Maloney, ITS; Thomas McGann, Athletics; Jason Pickel, Whiting-Turner Construction; Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planning; Mark Schultz, Whiting-Turner and Marin Stanek, ITS Administration Office.

1. **MINUTES** – Maskus asked for a motion to approve the minutes of April. Leef moved to approve the March 12, 2009 minutes, Hill seconded the motion; the motion was unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** – Maskus did not have a chair's report. He mentioned that the By-Laws had been sent to Frank Bruno's office and were not sent back, indicating by agreement that his office has no objections. He said an Item 9 amendment was proposed to the By-Laws, which must be approved by a process of two formal readings and two votes by a quorum of nine BCPC members. The By-Laws revisions drafting committee, which is Keith Maskus, Phil Simpson, Kambiz Khalili and Larry Hill, developed the proposed revisions.

Maskus introduced Tom Higginbotham, the new Tri-Executive member who is to come to BCPC, and Jerry Rudy, who was recently appointed as chair of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Budget Committee and ex-officio member of the BCPC. He also introduced Curt Huetson, who was appointed to attend and vote for Kambiz Khalili, and Bill Kaempfer, who was appointed to vote in Steve Jones place.

3. **BY-LAWS REVISIONS** – Maskus introduced the first reading of the By-Laws revisions. There is an addition to 1.d. to clarify what BCPC is empowered to do. The amendment specifically defines the words "review" and "approve". Review is defined as "to make comments on, but not make a decision", and approve is defined as "to vote on and make recommendations". The next and most important change to the By-Laws is to 2.b., which proposes replacing feasibility studies with a notice of intent. The goal of this amendment is to accelerate the approval process and allow BCPC the opportunity to make recommendations to a project before it gains public momentum. This change would

also have the effect of lowering the chances of a project being terminated after resources have been expended on an expensive and time consuming feasibility plan. The Chancellor's Executive Committee has identified the lengthy planning process as an issue, and this amendment to 2b is intended to address these issues by streamlining the planning process. This amendment is also intended to promote understanding of program and financial planning. It is meant to discourage the approval of projects by BCPC before they are supported by appropriate administrative officials and have found significant financial support. A prime example is the University Club; the Alumni Association expressed a desire to renovate it to move there before they realized how much it would cost and before they had the finances to begin.

Zelasko asked if a feasibility study would still be necessary; Maskus answered that it would not. Zelasko asked when the preliminary financial review would be required. Leef answered that after the Notice of Intent and review, a financial feasibility study would be necessary in the context of developing a program plan. Often projects are driven by individuals or individual departments, rather than by the institution as a whole. The vice chancellor should approve the project for a program plan, which should be conducted and returned to the vice chancellor, and then should be reviewed and approved. Maskus indicated that it is a great advantage for BCPC to be able to discuss and influence projects with their input. Kaempfer asked if the Notice of Intent and program plan could be introduced at the same meeting – not wanting to see a corruption of the process, he asked if something was needed in the By-Laws to address this issue. Leef noted that the program planning process could not be initiated and completed between meetings, but there could be a “minimum time between the Notice of Intent and program plan” added to the by laws. Additon asked if there is there a deadline for program plans to be completed. Hill replied that after 36 months the Notice of Intent has to be revised. Kaempfer suggested that By-Laws say: “Notice of Intent must be presented before the program plan commences”. Zelasko asked if the Notice of Intent could be placed on the Planning website as public documents. Leef replied that Notice of Intent allows for a feasibility study. The Notice of Intent will be published on the website after it is presented to BCPC. Zelasko then asked if the By-Laws and all format and content would also be published on the website. Leef replied that the updated By-Laws would be on the website. Rudy asked what happens to the program plan after BCPC approves it. Maskus informed that the program plan goes to the chancellor for approval after BCPC. When executing the program plan, the planner must take the comments and suggestions from BCPC into account.

Deleted: Intent,

Huetson commented that this amendment implies that projects come to BCPC sooner in the process, allowing BCPC more input earlier. Maskus agrees and said they are trying to change the dynamic and decrease the time it takes for the initial feasibility review to be completed. It also allows projects to receive critical comments before resources are invested in a feasibility study, rather than after the investment.

McGann asked how a project could be streamlined if it was introduced tomorrow, since BCPC currently does not meet every month; would the project be forced to wait for approval until the next scheduled meeting? Kaempfer replied that the executive committee usually meets every month, so all agenda items should be communicated to the executive committee so a full meeting can be scheduled.

McGann then asked what the minimum dollar amount must be for a project to be required to be reviewed by BCPC. Kaempfer said BCPC has to review projects over \$2M. Kaempfer asked if the Athletics Department was in agreement with the current process of the Vice Chancellor sign-off. McGann expressed that if an investor comes with money to back a project, it is important to streamline the process to make use of the financial support. Leef said that in the current Colorado capital construction, statute is defined as being driven by a program. Maintenance projects over \$2M should not trigger BCPC review, as they are usually repair and replacement projects. McGann gave the example of the new video boards at Folsom stadium. Leef said they will attempt to ensure that repair and replacement does not trigger this process. Huetson said Housing is doing some repairs and replacements that do not have to come to BCPC; for example, the replacement of dorm furniture totals over \$2M, depending on the building, but does not require BCPC review.

Deleted: statute,

McGann expressed that Athletics' biggest concern is to make sure they are in compliance with campus policy. Maskus said Phil Simpson should be informed about any maintenance project over \$2M and/or those projects that effect visible external components of a building.

Maskus then went on to introduce 3b2, which adds some language about sustainability and carbon neutrality. For voting members of the BCPC, 3A is unchanged. The number of voting members increases by one, but the number required for a quorum remains the same. Under staff members a voting member designated by Vice-Chancellor for Research was added. Under current By-Laws, vice-chancellors are allowed to send a non-voting member. It is logical to have a person from the institutes that can vote. 3C simply prevents chaotic proxy voting. Instead, it states that voting members who will not be present for a meeting can be replaced by elevating someone else as a temporary voting member, who will come to the meeting and vote.

Additon asked if the words "not allowed" could be eliminated, because several voting members send others in their place. Maskus agreed that this is a good suggestion but clarified that the intent is to make sure that replacements are made in an appropriate manner. Kaempfer clarified that in this context a proxy is a piece of paper that directs a person to vote a certain way.

Zelasko noted that currently there is a split of faculty membership between Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) and direct membership of faculty. She commented that since there is so much involvement in the building process, more insight from the provost to the dean would be useful. She questioned whether there should be higher involvement on the academic side in the planning process rather than the BFA having three voting members. Kaempfer suggested that clause B be used as an alternative. Clause B states that the chair of the Boulder Faculty Assembly and Budget & Finance committee remains, with the addition of six faculty members appointed by the chancellors in coordination with faculty leaders including the BFA and the A&S Council, making a total of seven faculty members. Kaempfer moved to approve this revision to the By-Laws; Zelasko seconded the motion to eliminate a, leave b, and say six members of the faculty. After a vote, the motion was unanimously approved.

Kaempfer introduced 5a and explained that this is a clarification allowing BCPC officers to be voting members. 5b clarifies the voting of the Chair, in accordance with Roberts's

rules. 8b expands the notice period for materials to be available from forty-eight to seventy-two hours. Zelasko commented that the seventy-two hours was a good balance to give people a chance to review plans.

Maskus informed everyone that voting and approving the revisions indicate a commitment to read the entirety of the By-Laws carefully and thoroughly before the next reading.

Maskus asked for a motion to approve the first reading of the By-Laws revisions. Kaempfer moved to approve them, Leef seconded the motion; by nine votes, the By-Laws revisions were unanimously approved. Wobbekind asked if the newly edited version of the By-Laws could be posted and distributed. Maskus said he would update them and see to it that they are distributed and posted.

4. **RESEARCH BUILDING SYSTEM OFFICE BUILDING FEASIBILITY STUDY** – Goodhew presented the Research Building Systems (RBS) – Multi Tenant Office Building and Campus Data Center feasibility studies. These two buildings began as one project and were separated into two projects to allow more discussion and input on each building. The location would be on Pod G in East Campus, on the northwest corner of Colorado Avenue and Discovery Drive. This location provides access to local, regional, and campus transportation systems. A gateway structure, providing an entrance to East Campus and setting the standard for future buildings, the RBS Office Building will be a build and shell project with the rest of the building to be finished with the tenant's finish allowance. The goal is to provide larger contiguous space, especially in the research branch. This goal drives the need for dry lab space, in support of the extensive wet labs being implemented in the nearby Systems Biotechnology and Chemical & Life Sciences buildings. The budget for this project is \$11,600,000, which includes land acquisition of \$1,600,000, and construction of the building core projected at \$8,750,000.

Jeff Lipton is in charge of RBS and manages over 6,000 GSF currently, with a very low vacancy rate (5% in 2007, 2.5% currently). The facilities combine over 420,272 usable square feet. Currently the project is planning a 100,000 sq. ft. building.

Goodhew also mentioned alternatives for this project, which are to build two small buildings, to look at purchasing an existing office building, or to wait for private developers; the last two options are not feasible based on the current state of the economy.

Lipton added that the University has owned the land since 1955. The office building will follow the system set up for RBS buildings whereby RBS completes construction on the building and then rents it to University or private tenants. Tenants pay rent and the funds are used for upkeep and to mitigate the cost of construction and future maintenance. RBS has been building buildings since 1961. There has not been a new building since CINC was built eight years ago. Currently, CU may have to reject research organizations due to the lack of space. Eventually, the RBS buildings are donated back to the University. RBS is not interested in providing space to current residents. They are hoping to be able to house new research grant projects and collaborative institutes.

Maskus asked if the model would move the institutes from where they are; Goodhew replied that the plan is to get new tenants. He said they would like to move ahead and

initiate a program plan so by the end of the year the design phase can begin. Tenants are expected to be able to occupy the building by summer, 2013.

Goodhew demonstrated that this project supports campus planning and Flagship 2030 by allowing space for interdisciplinary discovery, and the 2000 Master Plan by developing opportunities for research. Maskus commented that he is concerned that INSTAAR would demand new space. Lipton said that it is not likely because INSTAAR would have to be able to pay the rent before they would be eligible for space in the new building. Wobbekind recommended that the sources of funds should say “rent charged for space”. He asked if the university would have any responsibility should the project fail. Lipton replied that yes, the university is responsible, because it uses revenue funds. Wobbekind commented that he did not want to see the University go in debt anymore. Zelasko questioned who would be interested in this RBS space. As Systems Biotech is already overfilled, she recommended including infrastructure in the new office building to allow tenants to create some level of wet lab. She also suggested including fume hoods to support wet labs. Lipton said that if tenants want wet lab space, they will be responsible for installing wet lab equipment. Goodhew added that budget-wise, it is a simple office and dry lab building. Lipton said that this is the first phase of a multi building complex. If wet lab space is in demand, the build and shell process allows the tenant the flexibility to meet these needs. Maskus said there is a vision for east campus, and an interest in expanding research capabilities – we do not want to create a research ghetto; this space must be planned. Lipton commented that the freedoms are tremendous. The Research Park has 158 undeveloped acres – 58 of these acres are open and 40 are unencumbered. A six acre pod has been designated for this project, and this office building will have two spaces within the pod. Maskus said that there is a plan for many people to fill these offices. It must be designed so it has long term flexibility as a campus facility.

Kaempfer made a motion to approve this project. Leef seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the feasibility study was approved.

5. **RESEARCH BUILDING SYSTEM DATA CENTER FEASIBILITY STUDY** – Goodhew presented the Campus Data Center feasibility study, collaborated between RBS (represented by Jeff Lipton), Information Technology Service (ITS), and UCB Facilities Management. This facility will be on the same six acre lot on East Campus as the RBS office building, which it is closely related to.

This stand alone facility will house only the Data Center and will allow advanced research through high end computing and communications. The building will encompass 20,000 gsf with 12,000 asf reserved for data center floor space. The building systems will be set up to provide Tier 2 levels of redundancy and reliability. The goal is also to provide some Tier 3 or Tier 4 redundancy and reliable computing areas. Office spaces will be located in the adjacent RBS office building along with on-site parking.

This new facility will replace the computing center on Marine Street, which might reach a low Tier 1. The Marine Street building is in the flood plain and would likely be heavily damaged in a flood, compromising several campus communication systems. The financial model projects the cost of the Data Center facility at \$41,400,000 with \$1M going toward acquiring land, \$35M for design and construction, \$2,400,000 for racks and cabling, and \$3M for Xcel electrical feed improvements.

The Data Center will reduce computing energy use and free up existing space by consolidating computing space into one facility. Currently, UCB is operating on an antiquated system. Computing centers by nature are high intensive energy users. They are currently scattered throughout campus; with this new facility, computers will be in one location and can be easily managed and shared. The number of computing centers on campus is still being researched; there is no comprehensive record of their numbers. The Data Center will solve the problem of huge energy waste by inefficient computer use. The goal is to build a data center to provide efficient sharing of research resources, increasing the likelihood that any particular field will have available a range of expertise that can address problems in creative and potentially unique ways. Opening a data center on east campus will free up existing building space for academic and research support, and reduce energy consumption related to computing equipment.

It is estimated that it will take three to five years to fully equip the Data Center; computer equipment will be installed as existing campus equipment is replaced. This project is necessary for greening the campus and reducing the energy budget. It will be constructed on the same time line at the RBS office building. The Campus Data Center project supports Flagship 2030 by allowing advances in research through high level computing services.

Additon asked what the preliminary source of funds would be. Lipton said they will separate the two items so that each one can do a program plan individually and define what the sources of funding are. There are major research organizations that are interested; all options will be considered. Kaempfer wondered what the impacts to campus would be. Lipton said potential cost impacts will be flushed out in the program plan. The program plan is necessary to start planning for the facility and to move forward. Maskus asked how each department would pay for use of the center. Hill had the same question and noted that all departments will gain space and capacity; there is a lot of research to do in the program plan. Zelasko commented that most data centers are run by “cowboys”; the program plan is valuable – it needs to include how you pay for it and the infrastructure. Lipton said there are policy changes that the chancellor’s office will have to deal with. Some level of centralization is implied – how is that going to be paid for. Policy and management need to be considered.

Leef added that from his experience, there is resistance to the change of centralizing information systems initially, but once the departments begin to move they will see the value. Thought needs to be put into how to size it appropriately to accommodate growth. Huetson asked if the scope encompasses all of campus. Goodhew said all of campus, including Housing is being considered. Huetson asked how many pod G serves now; Lipton answered it serves one substation. Wobbekind asked if anyone has higher than Tier 2. Malony said there are some isolated cases of tier 3 – power is the biggest issue. Rudy tried to identify specific sites on campus that would have the “biggest bang for the buck”. Kaempfer encouraged them to contemplate this. Maskus asked how interested are you in getting this approved today. Lipton said that all of the questions can be addressed in program plan; this is a Notice of Intent before the program plan. Wobbekind thought the cost could be much higher than projected. Leef moved to approve the feasibility study, Hill seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

6. **SYSTEMS BIOTECHNOLOGY BUILDING SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW** – Faber said the Systems Biotechnology Building (SBB) received DRB approval for the buildings but they want to see the landscape schematic design again. He noted that Discovery Drive dead ends where the back of the east half of Pod I is being designed with LEED permeable paving as a temporary parking structure. The pavers will be used for future parking lots because they are portable. The main entry, on the Colorado Avenue side, will be a quad type entry on the west with a freedom bridge connecting SBB to the computer center. This building will define East Campus, using the same cues as main campus – the windows will be the same style but not as regimented. They have been directed to design all four wings with laboratories and offices, neighborhood style. They will build the first three wings and the shell of the laboratory space so who ever leases the building will be able to finish the space to meet their needs. An NIH grant will be used to finish the building and a second NIH grant will finish the labs. Each lab is designed as a modular unit and a colloquial room on the top floor to entice perspective researchers. When the sister buildings are built, they will duplicate the previous completed model. Wobbekind asked what the height of the building would be; Faber answered that it is 107 feet. Technically it is four stories tall but in reality, it will be a five story building. Leef commented that the city has requested that the building sighting and massing not be open to Colorado Avenue, therefore, it is set back from street to accommodate the city. Faber said a courtyard and an auditorium are planned to reduce the scale from the street and as public and private gathering spaces for students. Open space and light are also important considerations. Kaempfer asked what the external building would be made of; Faber answered that brick with limestone trim, reminiscent of main campus is planned for the exterior. The roof could be tile or as an alternative, asphalt and metal is being considered. Additon asked how it compares to IBS – is there any similarity? Leef said the intention is to pick up the color range of the sandstone with a similar look for all four buildings. Rudy asked what the estimated cost of maintaining a building like this would be. Leef answered that it would be about \$10.95 per sq. ft; Faber added that it could total \$3M. Leef asked Faber to talk about alternate transportation. Faber said there will be a split sidewalk/path for bikes and pedestrians which will connect to the bike path planned to go under 28th Street along the Boulder Creek path; a bus stop for the Buff Bus and RTD is planned. McGann said parking on East Campus is currently utilized for all games and athletic events; he inquired about how the parking and people will be managed on East Campus in the future for these athletic events. He also wanted to know how the lot would be managed for the next ten to fifteen years with 3,000 people using it. Faber answered that they will all need to come together to decide the most optimal way to manage traffic on East Campus. Leef said that the East Campus Master Plan will also address East Campus traffic management.

7. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** – There were no other items from members.

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