

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

Minutes of the Meeting of May 11, 2000

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, May 11, 2000, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Tom Carson, Anne Costain, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Adrian Del Caro, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Bill Kaempfer, Steve Jones, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suits, Dale Oesterle, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Al Bartlett, Archie Demarest, Larry Drees, Dianna Keeler, Stephen Lester, Dan Pabon, and Brook Stableford.

Guests present were: David Cook, Parking and Transit Services; Christine Johnson, UCSU; Dennis Maloney, Information Technology Services; Jim Marshall, Information Technology Services; Ric Porreca, Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance; Joe Roy, Parking and Transit Services; and Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning.

1. **MINUTES** -- Minutes of the meeting of April 13, 2000, were unanimously approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Oesterle noted that this would be the last meeting for Costain, who will assume a new position in Central Administration as Associate Vice President for Human Relations and Risk Management. He thanked Costain for her service as a member of the BCPC.

Oesterle said he had attended a meeting of the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) at which the prioritized list of proposed State Capital Construction requests was considered. He said that the CEC altered the BCPC's recommendation by removing the Science Library from the list. They did, however, suggest that another technology project be added. The approval of the Law School funding for FY 2000-01 is still undecided. Newsome-Suits said that the project may be approved if a larger percentage of the funding is to come from private sources.

3. **PROPOSED BCPC BY-LAWS REVISIONS: SECOND READING** -- Oesterle asked for comments about the proposed draft changes which had been mailed to members. Del Caro suggested that feasibility studies be shared with groups such as the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) and the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee prior to presentation to the BCPC. Carson said that one of the roles of BCPC members was to report back to groups like these, which they represent. Lipton suggested that drafts and proposals be made available to a wider audience through electronic means. Herbstreit noted that a Vice Chancellor has to sign off before a Feasibility Study can be initiated; this should indicate that the affected

groups are aware of the proposal. Several members discussed the role of feasibility studies and program plans.

Jones asked about the change in term length from four to three years. Oesterle said that it had been proposed to better interface with the BFA and its committee terms. Jones said that the four year terms worked better with the two year terms of officers. Lightner noted that there is frequent turnover in members and the length of terms seems incidental. The consensus of the group was that the three year term would alleviate the BFA's concerns and would probably have no other major effect. The three year term would begin only with new members from this point on. In several places, it was suggested that the word "all" be changed to "significant." This significance would be determined by the Executive Committee.

Oesterle distributed comments from Bartlett, who could not be present. The group went through Bartlett's proposals. Some were rejected and others accepted with little discussion. There was, however, considerable discussion about his comments concerning the timing of review by the BCPC and the DRB. Carson said that it was important that the program for a project come before the design. Lightner said that the current language ["review by the DRB and the BCPC"] do not necessarily indicate order. Deno emphasized the roles of the two bodies: the DRB recommends to the President and the BCPC recommends to the Chancellor. He also noted the different role and mission of the groups. The DRB is more general (macro-view) in their reviews while the BCPC is more specific (micro-view) in their comments. Also, the DRB is more design oriented while the BCPC is more program oriented. Therefore, it makes sense that the more broad aspects of land planning and architectural fit take precedence and should go first over the more detailed aspects of program and use. It was decided not to make substantial alterations to the sections dealing with DRB and BCPC review of projects.

Oesterle asked members to report any small errors of grammar, spelling, or syntax directly to Arndt, who will compile all the changes into a final document. It was moved by Lightner, seconded by Lipton, to approve the By-Laws with these changes. The motion was approved unanimously. [A copy of the approved By-Laws is attached to these minutes.]

4. **FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE UCB INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT** -- Oesterle explained that this item was added to the agenda in response to the need to approve this project in order to add it to the current capital construction request, as noted earlier in the meeting. He introduced Vice Chancellor Ric Porreca and Dennis Maloney, Director of Information Technology Services, who handed out copies of a new Feasibility Study. Maloney explained that a Network Task Force had recommended several changes and improvements to the technology infrastructure for the campus. An Information Technology Strategic Plan also outlined future needs. The cable system installed in 1984 is obsolete. The life cycle of electronic components is much shorter. The

campus now has several independent networks. The current \$13 million proposal would provide universal access to the network.

Jones asked if this proposal would provide new wiring to each desk. Maloney said it would. Cummings asked if there would be cost savings if a higher quality wireless systems were used up front. Maloney said that the wireless technology was not yet ready for such wide-scale installation. Herbstreit asked if the proposal would require significant assignable square feet. Maloney said it would not. Carson asked if the proposal was for General Fund facilities only. Maloney said it was not, but that Housing had not been included. Porreca said some auxiliaries would be included, and appropriate fee adjustments would be made. Crittenden asked if the State had put aside a special technology fund. Porreca said the money was all from the same source, but the project would be reviewed differently as a technology proposal.

Lightner felt that this project was important; it needs to be done and it's even better if State money can be used. Lipton noted that planning for this project was to take a year, until the possibility of earlier funding came up. He thanked the BCPC for addressing this proposal on short notice. It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Carson, to approve this feasibility study to be forwarded to the CEC. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. **28TH STREET AND COLORADO AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS: UPDATE --** Baily explained that he and David Cook from Parking and Transit Services had been working with the City of Boulder on plans to rebuild 28th Street and Colorado Avenue next year. Baily showed two drawings, one of 28th from Baseline to Arapahoe, and one of Colorado Avenue from Folsom to 28th. The biggest impact on the campus would be the widening of Colorado Avenue between Regent and 28th Street. Baily said that this was simply a courtesy update about the project. For mal review will occur in the fall.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by William Arndt.