

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

Minutes of the Meeting of August 8, 2002

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, August 8, 2002, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Deb Coffin, Noel Cummings, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Bill Kaempfer, Terry Kleeman, Jeff Lipton, Mary Ann Myer, Robin Newsome-Suits, Joyce Nielsen, Steve Thweatt, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Al Bartlett, Carina Bernard-Walker, Edo Cohen, John Crittenden, Steve Jones, Lisa Lucio, Jana Milford, Uriel Nauenberg, and Sarah Schupp, Suzanne Tegen, and Richard Wobbekind.

Guests present were: David Cook, Parking and Transit; Lynn Faudree, Athletics; Kelly Fox, CU System Budget Office; Pam Lingenfelter, Arts and Sciences; Jerry Peterson, Graduate School; and Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning.

Chair Kaempfer was scheduled to arrive late to the meeting, so Vice Chair Herbstreit presided in his place.

1. **MINUTES** -- There were no comments on the Minutes of the meeting of May 9, 2002. There were no meetings in June or July.
2. **BY-LAWS REVISIONS** -- Herbstreit noted that the revision process has been going on for some time. He said that the changes proposed by the committee were mostly cosmetic, and intended to provide consistency within the document. There was a discussion of the proposed changes, and a few new changes were suggested. As there was not a quorum to formally approve the changes, they will be incorporated into a final draft to be submitted for approval at the September meeting.
3. **PROGRAM PLAN FOR THE ACQUISITION OF 1777 EXPOSITION DRIVE** -- Lipton explained that an opportunity has arisen for CU-Boulder to acquire a large building in east central Boulder. A program plan has been prepared and needs to go through the usual process. The 86,000 square foot building was formerly a manufacturing facility for Exabyte Corporation. It would be purchased as part of the Research Building System and rented to campus tenants. The building is near other East Campus facilities, and is convenient to the new Stampede bus shuttle. It is in excellent condition and has offices and large bays of unfinished space. It is easily adaptable for various uses, especially research. The cost of this building equates to about \$75 per square foot, which is substantially lower than the estimated \$200-300 per square foot to construct new facilities of this type on the Boulder campus.

Baily said that this proposal complies with the *Campus Master Plan*, which recommends acquisition of properties near the campus, including the East campus and the Research Park, when opportunities such as this arise. He noted that the campus currently has a deficit of research space, as compared to comparable institutions. This acquisition would help reach stated long-term needs for research. Baily showed a map and site plan of this modern facility.

Jerry Peterson of the Graduate School said that CU has set a new record in external grant and contract funding, but without adequate facilities, may not be able to accept some large grants. Herbstreit said that the purchase would be cash funded, and would bring in enough F&A (Facilities and Administration) funds to “pay for itself.” Kleeman asked if this could free up space for classroom and office use on the Main campus. Peterson said there might be some backfill opportunities.

As a quorum of voting members was not present, Lipton asked for a straw vote of those in attendance. There was unanimous approval of the program plan.

4. **HELLEMS CAPITAL RENEWAL REQUEST** -- Lipton noted that the State Buildings Division has devised a new funding process for major renovation for existing buildings. This would consist of infrastructure and maintenance upgrades that would not involve changes in the programmatic use. The idea is to make one request per year. Ketchum was the first project proposed, last year. That project has not been funded, but it is prudent to proceed with a proposal for this year, to have things in the queue when funding is restored. Thweatt spoke about how facilities were prioritized for this program. A number of criteria were considered based on the matrix conceived last year, including the Facilities Condition Index (FCI).

Newsome-Suitts asked if programmatic changes could occur at the same time if the funding came from another source. Thweatt said he felt that it might be possible. Kleeman asked about downtime when the facility would be under renovation. Thweatt said that the project would be phased so as not to interrupt the entire building at once. Lipton noted that Fleming could possibly be considered as surge space, assuming the construction of the new Law Building.

As a quorum of voting members was not present, Herbstreit asked for a straw vote of those in attendance. There was unanimous approval of the request.

5. **CHAIR’S REPORT** -- Kaempfer commented on the recent memorandum from Provost DiStefano placing a moratorium on program planning for State-funded projects (a copy of which was included in the member’ packets). Kaempfer noted that there is the flexibility to do feasibility studies, and in some cases, prepare marketing materials to support fundraising. Newsome-Suitts said it might be two to three years before capital construction projects are funded by the state. It may be necessary to look at other funding initiatives, such as those used in California. Lipton noted, however, that it’s a good idea to keep projects in the pipeline for the eventual future return of funding. Thweatt noted that whatever the situation, it is probably a good idea to update all program plans annually. This may be a good opportunity to do that.
6. **HOUSING LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN** -- This item was once again postponed until a future meeting.

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