

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

**Minutes of the Meeting of October 11, 2001**

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 11, 2001, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Tom Carson, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Terry Kleeman, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Lisa Lucio, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Joyce Nielsen, Steve Thweatt, and Tara Turner,

Members absent were: Edo Cohen, John Crittenden, Jessica Lorentz, Mary Ann Myer, and William Arndt.

Guests present were: David Cook, Parking and Transit; Michael Doyle, CommArts; Alan Fasick, Facilities Management; Jim Marshall, ITS; Mike Martens, Facilities Design and Construction; Robert Schnabel, ATLAS; Jessica Schroetlin, Facilities Design and Construction; Len Segel, Downing Thorpe & James; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; and Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services.

Schroetlin took minutes in Arndt's absence.

1. **MINUTES** -- On a motion by Bartlett, seconded by Jones, the minutes of the meeting of August 9, 2001, were approved as distributed. There was no meeting in September.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Lightner noted the University of Colorado at Boulder's recent Nobel Prize recipients, Carl Wieman and Eric Cornell. Lightner reported that Cragmor Hall on the CU-Colorado Springs campus would be the only CU project to continue because of the State of Colorado shortage of funds. He reported that CU Boulder buildings such as Law, ATLAS, and Business would be put on hold at this time. Lightner noted that Thweatt would have a further update on state capital construction funding later in the meeting.
3. **NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS** -- Carson reported that the Nominating Committee did not have candidates for the open Chair and Vice Chair positions. Carson felt the committee was at a disadvantage because BCPC faculty membership positions are not filled and there are less candidates to choose from.

Carson moved that the election of officers be postponed until the November meeting, at which time the Nominating Committee hopes to have candidates to recommend. Lightner noted that as a committee report the motion did not need a second; the motion was unanimously approved.

Lipton asked if the Chair must be a faculty member. Lightner said no, according to the By-Laws; the Chair must be from the voting membership. There was a discussion about the impact on the effectiveness of a faculty Chair verses an administrator holding the position. Lightner felt that it was important to either have the Chair or Vice Chair filled by a faculty member.

4. **ATLAS CENTER SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW: UPDATE AND APPROVAL** -- Deno introduced consultants from Downing Thorpe James and CommArts who made the

presentation. Schnabel said that the ATLAS design phase has gone smoothly without major alterations to the concept of the building.

Lightner asked if the ATLAS lounge/vending area would conflict with the University Memorial Center offering the same services. Segel said that the lounge area would not conflict with the UMC services and that vendors such as Starbucks could be contracted for the ATLAS vending.

Cummings asked what the history of the tower was, noting that he felt the tower was quite dominating from the appearance on the rendered drawing. Doyle explained that they were trying to convey the sense of a technological building and follow the mission of the campus and the ATLAS program. Segel said the tower would be approximately 80 feet high and 24 feet above the roof line.

Lipton said he was unclear on the materials being used for the construction of the tower and wanted to know what level of funding would be needed to maintain the tower. Segel discussed the similarities of the material being considered to the material used at the Boulder Public Library. Lipton noted his concern for Facilities Management maintenance of the tower and the light source located inside the tower.

The digital elements of the building were presented. Doyle explained that the excitement of the building would not be limited to the light source at the top of the tower. Media such as vertical electronic boards showing colors and shapes are still under discussion. Nielson said she felt the digital element was too commercial for a university building. Lucio said there was a conflict between being on the cutting edge of the technology and having the technology become outdated in 20 years.

Carson asked whether the main entrance was accessible by wheel chair; Segel confirmed that it was. Kleeman asked if there was only one elevator in the building; Segel noted there was one passenger and one freight elevator. Lucio asked what other accommodations were being made for the sight and hearing impaired. Simpson stated that all ADA guidelines would be met. Lucio asked how many classrooms would be available. Discussion took place about the different types of learning areas that ATLAS would provide. It was estimated that 6,000 students would be able to take a course during a semester at the ATLAS Building.

Cook asked how the bicycle parking would be affected. Segel said that bicycle parking would be accommodated on 18th street and at the southwest entrance. Cook asked about the women's and men's restrooms noting that both restrooms looked like they were the same size. Cook asked why the women's restroom would not be bigger. Simpson said that the bathrooms were code driven and that the number of bathroom fixtures in the building exceeds what code requires. Thweatt noted that fixture counts and a bathroom usage study were used and taken into account when designing the building toilet room facilities.

Deno explained that the perception by BCPC that the ATLAS Building is "different" than other campus buildings was right. He said the building is different because it is a building representing technology and *should* look different. Deno said that the future of the campus will have more buildings being dedicated to a variety of uses and require different looks.

Herbstreit asked about new security measures for buildings due to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. He wanted to know how the attacks would affect architectural design in the future. Segel discussed some of the new security measures for buildings and the impact of the attacks on architectural design.

It was moved by Carson, seconded by Jones, to accept the updated ATLAS Center schematic design with the following conditions:

- (1) That maintenance of the tower and the entry be considered in the design.
- (2) That accessibility of entryways be reviewed.
- (3) That the possible light pollution created by the tower be discussed with operators of campus observatories (Physics, APAS).
- (4) That design of the tower be reconsidered so it doesn't become outdated technology
- (5) That the ATLAS building not become a means of commercialization.
- (6) That all bicycle parking lost due to the project be at least replaced, if not increased.

With these conditions, the motion was approved all in favor, one against (Bartlett). Bartlett said that he would have preferred a denser, taller building.

- 5. CU-BOULDER SOUTH CONCEPTUAL LAND USE ASSESSMENT: UPDATE AND APPROVAL** -- Lipton presented an update on the CU-Boulder South Conceptual Land Use Assessment. Bartlett asked if qualified faculty had been consulted on the floodplain study. Lipton said that a thorough hydrology study had been done and had been independently reviewed by Gilbert White, a faculty member from CU-Boulder. Lipton said that the hydrology study being used is very conservative. The City of Boulder is in the process of doing another hydrology study.

Kaempfer asked about parking being located on floodplain areas. Lipton said there may be flood detention areas designated for parking, but there will be some areas not adequate for parking. Kaempfer asked what would be done with the detention ponds at the site. He suggested that the pond located next to the new ecocycle facility should be looked at as a model detention pond plan. Kaempfer said he would like to see ponds with aesthetic value and wildlife.

Herbstreit asked why the final plan was being approved without the results of further hydrology studies. Lipton said the plan would be revised if needed based on the new hydrology study, but the University needs to let the community know the current status. Kleeman asked who has authority over the floodplains. Lipton said they are regulated by Federal and State authorities.

On a motion by Carson, seconded by Nauenberg, the CU-Boulder South Conceptual Land Use Assessment was approved, all in favor, with one abstention (Bartlett).

6. **UPDATE ON STATE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION** -- Thweatt reported on the State capital construction funding status. The construction of the ATLAS, Business, and Law projects will be on hold. Current funding will allow for all three buildings to be taken through the construction document phase. Simpson said that all requests will be moved back a year.
7. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** -- Bartlett offered the following motion:

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission wishes to express its sincere thanks and gratitude to Michael Lightner for his years of service as a member of the Commission and for his service as Chair of the Commission. His leadership, perception, and integrity have all contributed significantly to the efforts of the Commission to meet its responsibilities to the university community.

The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Bartlett offered an additional motion:

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission expresses the sincere thanks of the University Community to the students and in particular to alumnus Craig Wilson for their efforts that have resulted in the fine new bus shelter on Colorado Avenue near 18th Street.

Craig Wilson's enthusiastic and diligent efforts have provided a vastly improved situation for all members of the University Community who wish to use city and university buses.

The BCPC asks that a bronze plaque be mounted permanently inside the shelter bearing the message that this shelter is but one of the many contributions to the campus made by students.

The motion was seconded by Carson and unanimously approved.

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