

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

Minutes of the Meeting of January 20, 2000

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, January 20, 2000, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Tom Carson, Anne Costain, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Adrian Del Caro, Archie Demarest, Bill Deno, Larry Drees, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Dianna Keeler, Stephen Lester, Jeff Lipton, Uriel Nauenberg, Dale Oesterle, Dan Pabon, and William Arndt.

Members absent were: Michael Lightner, Robin Newsome-Suits, and Brook Stableford.

Guests present were: Jeff Dodge, Silver & Gold Record; Martin Eiss, RNL Design; Deborah Haynes, Fine Arts; Susan Krane, CU Art Galleries; Jim Marshall, Information Technology Services; Michael Ossian, H+L Architecture; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; Peter Spear, College of Arts and Sciences; Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services; Susan Walsh, Facilities Planning; and Kent Zimmerman, Alumni Association.

1. **MINUTES** -- Jones requested a clarification in the minutes of December 9, 1999: in his comments about the MCD Biology Teaching Labs project, he wanted it noted that the Chancellor had identified funds *toward* the project, not to *complete* the project. With this change, the minutes were unanimously approved on a motion by Carson, seconded by Jones.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE PROGRAM PLAN FOR THE CENTER FOR THE VISUAL ARTS** -- Deno distributed copies of a report from the Facilities Planning Office. He introduced Deborah Haynes, Fine Arts Chair, who spoke of the vision of the department for this new facility. The Fine Arts program would continue teaching the traditional disciplines, but also needs to respond to new technologies. The number of majors in the department has doubled since 1993. She noted the need for the academic units to be near the galleries. Susan Krane, Director of the Galleries, concurred, noting that the galleries currently exist in substandard space without proper climate and security controls.

Peter Spear, Dean of Arts and Sciences, spoke of the College's support for the project. He noted that all major scientific research universities have strong programs in the arts and humanities. On a more basic level, the current facilities have serious health and safety hazards.

Carson asked if the relocation of the Chemistry 140 auditorium was part of this project. Deno said it was not. Oesterle asked about funding. Spear said that preliminary fundraising is underway, with \$1.1 in gifts and pledges already secured. A completed, approved program plan will aid fundraising efforts by the CU Foundation. Nauenberg asked about computer technology in the new facility. Haynes said that

Fine Arts just established a cooperative computer lab. They will work with the ATLAS program, especially with media arts and computer imaging.

Cummings asked about impacts on the Telecommunications Building. Deno said that one of the proposed conditions of approval was that all Telecom and ITS needs be met. Lipton said there were still some issues concerning the Telecom switch room, but that the Telecom building had been constructed with the anticipation of an addition. Kaempfer asked if there were any formal obligation to the use of the Sibell Wolle name. Spear said no, it was an honorary name, but there was much sentiment to continue to honor Muriel Sibell Wolle in some fashion.

Lester asked about loading docks. Martin Eiss of RNL Design said that new stairs near the UMC would separate pedestrian traffic from the Chemistry loading dock, improving the existing situation. There will also be a loading dock off 18th Street, but it will serve the galleries and would not be used for trash, recycling, or other routine activities. Bartlett noted the need to outline options for future expansion. Jones suggested that at some point in the future, the galleries could be moved to a new stand-alone museum building, and the gallery space could be incorporated into the academic spaces.

Herbstreit and Baily said they had some concerns about the efficiency factor of 72%, which is high. Deno noted that this ratio includes large spaces. Cummings expressed concern about construction access if ATLAS is constructed first. Crittenden asked if the project met CCHE classroom standards. Baily noted that the CCHE guidelines are "nearly unachievable," but classrooms in this plan are in line with Campus Master Plan guidelines.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Jones, to approve the program plan with the following conditions listed in the Planning Report.

- (1) Placing new construction around and over the existing Telecommunications building, accommodating ITS staff currently occupying the second floor of the building, and dealing effectively with Telecommunication's underground switch and its conduit runs to 18th Street will be a challenge that must be met satisfactorily. A feasibility study should be undertaken to examine the impact of construction on the telephone switch and other equipment in the building.
- (2) Careful methodical construction-related plans must be in place to take down the existing Hunter building, construct the ATLAS building, construct a new building around and over the Telecommunications building, raze one half the existing Sibell Wolle building, construct a second phase of the Center there, raze the north half of the Sibell Wolle building, and construct another building there. All this will take place over several years with the disruption of those programs on site and of neighboring programs as well.
- (3) Each phase will need to work as a stand-alone building for an interim period, but also work well with the final integration as a complex of buildings.
- (4) Existing ITS and other service vehicle parking spaces must be replaced in comparable locations. Existing loading and unloading functions of ITS and Fine Arts must be accommodated during construction.
- (5) The costs of relocation must include the possibility of leasing space during construction at current market rents. Phasing of this project will require half the Fine Arts department to move twice, and the ITS occupants of the second floor of the Telecommunications

building to move out during construction for a period of up to 18 months, and then to move back in.

Bartlett proposed an additional condition, which was accepted by Lipton as a friendly amendment:

- (6) The name "Muriel Sibell Wolle" -- former head of the Fine Arts Department, prominent author, artist, and historian -- should be clearly and prominently associated with some identifiable part of the building.

Herbstreit proposed an additional condition, which was accepted by Lipton as a friendly amendment:

- (7) In recognition of the possibility that the anticipated contributions of \$14.1 million will not be available when needed to meet construction expenses, plans should be made to fund the financing costs associated with any short-term cash flow obligations. These additional costs could be substantial (as much as \$1.5 million using the Master Plan Financial Analysis assumptions) and may require increasing the goals of the capital campaign or planing for additional departmental or other campus support.

With these amendments, the full motion was unanimously approved.

- 3. APPROVAL OF THE PROGRAM PLAN FOR THE SCIENCE LIBRARY AND INTERACTIVE KNOWLEDGE CENTER --** Deno distributed a planning report for this project. Jim Williams, Dean of Libraries said that he had noted the need for this project with the BCPC several times. There is a continuing decrease in the use of space for bookstacks and an increase in the need for "network seating." Williams noted that this new library will connect directly to the adjacent Engineering and Earth Sciences Libraries and will include a 24-hour cyber café.

Michael Ossian of H+L Architecture explained that the program plan included conceptual drawings of the site planning and diagrams of the elevations. He stressed that these are not architectural designs, but rather help clarify issues of siting, circulation, and massing.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Jones, to approve the program plan with the following conditions listed in the Planning Report.

- (1) Americans with Disabilities Act requirements concerning both site and building access must be met -- and exceeded where necessary to comply with unique conditions of this project. For example, a ramp access should be provided from Colorado Avenue sidewalks to the north entry and along the west side of the building.
- (2) Building codes will constrain the appearance of walls and openings of the new building facing the Mathematics and Benson Buildings. Discussions with campus building code officials will be necessary.
- (3) Equipment budgets that exceed \$50,000 will need to be listed and described in detail as an attachment to the program plan. The virtual reality simulation hardware/software is an example.
- (4) A staging and construction plan should be indicated, and a budget included for restoration to original condition.

- (5) Bicycle parking and service vehicle parking spaces must be provided to the extent necessary to serve the occupant needs of this building.

Bartlett proposed additional conditions, seconded by Lester:

- (6) Alternatives 2 and 3 (page 34 of the program plan) for the massing of the building be rejected.
- (7) The building should be developed along the lines of Alternative 1, with the north edge of the building being located as shown in the site plan.
- (8) The plans for the building should indicate the outlines of the footprint and form of possible major future additions to the building, up to doubling its gross square feet.
- (9) On completion, this first phase of the building shall appear to be whole and complete.
- (10) The plans for the building should include structural and utility provisions that will be needed in future horizontal expansion of the building, as outlined in (8).
- (11) The outside of the main entrances of the building shall have overhead protection from the weather.
- (12) The name "Oliver C. Lester" should be clearly and prominently associated with some identifiable part of the building, preferably a part relating to Mathematics and Physics.

Lipton said that Bartlett's conditions would have cost impacts on the project. Changes would require a full revision of the budget. Crittenden asked if the facility as outlined in the program plan was within the provisions of the Campus Master Plan. Baily said it was. Lester and Nauenberg expressed concern about the future need to expand the facility. Deno said that if the time came for expansion, it would be possible to put in under Fischer Field.

A vote was called on Bartlett's amendment, which was approved on a vote of 6 in favor, 5 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Herbstreit proposed an additional condition, which was accepted by Lipton as a friendly amendment:

- (13) In recognition of the possibility that the planned contributions of \$6 million will not be available when needed to meet construction expenses, plans should be made to fund any financing costs associated with any short-term cash flow obligations. These additional costs may require increasing the goals of the capital campaign or planning for additional departmental or other campus support.

Jim Marshall, Director of Information Technology Services, expressed concern about the initial and ongoing networking costs. Williams said that 80% of the costs were being requested from the State, and 30% would be raised privately. The extra 10% was for an endowment to support operations. Lipton said that the relationship between the Science Library and ATLAS was an Academic Affairs issue. Lester commended the plan for its inclusion of environmental factors.

A vote was called on Lipton's main motion. The motion, including the additional 13 amendments, was approved 12 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention.

4. **SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION RELOCATION: FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Deno noted that a feasibility study is earlier in the process than a program plan. Deno introduced Stewart Hoover, Interim Dean of Journalism, who explained that this project would be for a permanent home for the school after interim facilities in the Armory Building. Proposed is a new facility in the northwest corner of the Fine Arts/ATLAS/Telecom site, which would be phased after the full demolition of the existing Fine Arts Building. Jones said that the project had some similarities to the proposed Communications Academic Program Initiative (CAPI) from 1995. This project, however, would be considerably scaled down. Nauenberg asked about ITS concerns; Deno said that those concerns would be addressed in the program plan, as well as the relationship with ATLAS. Kaempfer noted the interaction with the adjacent Chemistry program and the need to work with that department. Baily noted that this is the preferred site in the Campus Master Plan for Chemistry/Biochemistry expansion. Deno said these concerns would be in the program plan. Lester and Costain asked that consideration be give to a site in Grandview.

It was moved by Jones, seconded by Bartlett to approve the feasibility study with the following conditions, as set forth in the Facilities Planning Report:

- (1) Resolve the phasing issues for the Hunter site with respect to the other project's funding and construction schedules.
- (2) Demonstrate that the needs of the adjacent Chemistry/Biochemistry program can be accommodated.
- (3) Show how the ATLAS Center and the Center for the Visual Arts will cooperate with the SJMC to share program space and equipment.
- (4) Include cash flow projections for all phases of the project, including timing of construction expenditures and private contributions and potential financing costs.
- (5) Specifically address fundraising capability of the SJMC and the CU Foundation for this project, including an assessment of the probability of raising up to \$10 million in private contributions.
- (6) Verify that there is a firm commitment on the part of the CU Foundation to raise the funds for this project in light of the fact that it is not included in the current capital campaign goals.
- (7) Develop a back-up contingency plan for funding the project and related debt service commitments in the event that fund raising efforts fall short of the goals.

The motion, with the above conditions, was unanimously approved.

5. **KOENIG ALUMNI CENTER EXPANSION: FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Deno introduced Kent Zimmerman, Alumni Director, who said he would answer questions about the proposal. Carson noted the need for upgrades to this facility. Herbstreit said he had no issues with the funding scenario, as the project would be fully funded from private sources. Jones asked if the plan included realignment of the Koenig

driveway to line up with 13th Street. Deno said it was not part of this project, but that the realignment is an assumption in the long-range goals for this area.

Cummings asked how much of the project was rehabilitation of the old building and how much was new construction. Zimmerman said this project would concentrate on new construction, but that there would be some renovation also. He added that Colorado Historical Fund moneys (gaming money) could only be used for historic preservation on the existing building.

Baily said that the project was in compliance with the new Master Plan. Lipton asked about parking. Zimmerman noted that new parking was being proposed at Grandview. He also mentioned that Koenig is adjacent to several bus lines including the HOP and the SKIP. Cummings asked if the small building to the south would be demolished; Zimmerman said yes.

It was moved by Lipton, seconded by Carson, to approve the feasibility study with the following conditions, as set forth in the Facilities Planning Report:

- (1) Preserve and respect the existing house, as the second oldest building on campus. Its interior and exterior features should be enhanced whenever possible.
- (2) There should be an appropriate level of funding for future phases, especially the unfinished areas of the new addition, so that finishes will be consistent with the level of quality of the earlier work.
- (3) Include cash flow projections for all phases of the project, including timing of construction expenditures and private contributions and potential financing costs.
- (4) Specifically address fundraising capability of the Alumni Association and the Foundation for this project including an assessment of the probability of raising \$3.5 million in private contributions.
- (5) Develop a back-up or contingency plan for funding the project and related debt service commitments in the event that fund raising efforts fall short of the goals.

Lipton added another condition to his motion:

- (6) A full traffic and parking analysis should be included.

The motion, including these six conditions, was unanimously approved.

6. **MASTER PLAN UPDATE** -- Baily reported that the CEC accepted BCPC recommendations concerning the approval of the Campus Master Plan. They added additional recommendations concerning Williams Village. Those changes have been incorporated into the plan, which will now be presented to the Regents for their approval.
7. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** -- Bartlett expressed concern that design for projects was being done before planning, and that the Design Review Board sees things before BCPC. Deno said he would discuss these processes with Bartlett. Nauenberg

said that program plans need to be clear in differentiating between conceptual plans and architectural plans.

Jones announced that Journalism has begun to use the Mobile Production Unit that was acquired by the Athletics Department as part of the new scoreboard project.

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