

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER CAMPUS PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of March 11, 1999

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, March 11, 1999, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present (based on current *and* proposed By-Laws) were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Adrian Del Caro, Bill Deno, Bill Herbstreit, Steve Jones, Bill Kaempfer, Stephen Lester, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Scott Martinez, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Dale Oesterle, Craig Wilson, and Secretary William Arndt.

Members absent were: Anne Costain, Larry Drees, Jake Hertz, and Paul Saporito.

Guests present were: Andy Barnard, Sink Combs Dethlefs Architects; Bobbi Barrow, Institutional Relations; John Bruning, Facilities Management; Jon Burianek, Intercollegiate Athletics; Jack DeBell, CU Recycling; Jeff Dodge, *Silver & Gold Record*; Steve Hecht, Facilities Planning; Jeannine Malmsbury, Institutional Relations; Joe Roy, Parking and Transit; and Richard Tharp, Intercollegiate Athletics.

Jones noted that this would be a transitional meeting pending revisions to the By-Laws. As no voting items are anticipated, it will not be necessary to suspend the By-Laws.

1. **MINUTES** -- It was moved by Lightner, seconded by Deno, to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 11, 1999. Cummings noted that those minutes indicated he was absent but he was at the meeting. With this change, the minutes were approved.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Jones noted that Information Technology Services will hold public meetings to seek input regarding renovations to Chemistry 140. The meetings will be on Friday, April 9, at 3:00; Tuesday, April 13, at noon; and Monday, April 19, at 2:00. The meetings will be held in Chemistry 140.

A By-Laws revision subcommittee has been appointed but has not yet met. The members will be Jones, Deno, and Bartlett. The current By-Laws call for two readings before changes can be adopted. In April a vote will be taken to suspend the By-Laws so that a single vote for FY 2000-01 Capital Construction prioritization can take place as called for in the new By-Laws. A Nominating Committee to select a new Vice Chair has not yet met, but is expected to do so before the April meeting.

3. **ATHLETICS MASTER PLAN PROGRESS UPDATE** -- Richard Tharp, Director of Athletics, handed out copies of the mission statement of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. He noted that a capital campaign is underway and the focus in the next ten years will be on facilities development. Changes are necessary to be more competitive with other Big Twelve schools.

Tharp introduced Andy Barnard of Sink Combs Dethlefs, the consultant firm which is preparing the Athletics Master Plan. Barnard displayed a map indicating potential Athletics' projects. He said the projects speak mostly to improved support facilities and gender equity. Barnard noted that community interaction and support of the sports programs leads to generation of revenue. He also pointed out that the Folsom Stadium area will continue to be the nucleus of Athletics activities. Seating may be increased, probably to the west. Another focus is the Coors Events /Conference Center, which needs to become more multi-functional, and the Potts Field / East Campus facilities. Possible development at CU-Boulder South is not being considered in this planning period.

Oesterle asked if the high cost of these proposed projects indicated a spending race with other programs. Tharp said each new program is considered individually. There is a risk consideration for each one, and nothing will be expended without assurance that there will be tangible benefits. Oesterle asked if there was a matrix for comparison with other programs in capitalizing earnings. Tharp said the department's goal is to be in the top 75 programs in the country.

Bartlett asked for details on the additions to the west side of the stadium. Tharp said there are no details yet because that would come at a much later phase. The highest priority is the new field house. When that is accomplished the Balch / Pressbox complex can be considered. As a Klauder building, the architectural integrity of Balch -- at least from the exterior -- must be taken into account. Bartlett also asked about plans for Carlson. Tharp said that space in Carlson is rented from the Department of Kinesiology and the Student Recreation Center. Any future plans would be in cooperation with those units. Cummings asked if any facilities other than those in Carlson were being rented. Burianek said only space in MCD Biology for the Marketing staff.

Lightner asked what the top priority items were. Tharp said (1) Potts Field Phase I, (2) the Fieldhouse / Parking Structure (noting that the parking portion is revenue-producing and would be of benefit to the entire campus), and (3) luxury boxes at Folsom Field (which would be a revenue source that could help pay for other projects).

Cummings asked how many student athletes there were. Tharp said just over 400. Cummings asked how the student athletics fee fit into these projects. Tharp said there was an on-going dispute over student fees. The initial purpose of the fee was to help bring the program into compliance with Title IX. It also makes it possible for 14,500 seats to be reserved for each football game for students. This is 27% of the stadium. Cummings asked about intramural use of the proposed new facilities. Tharp said that intramural use would continue. He added that a goal was to have community involvement in the use of the new fieldhouse. Jon Burianek, Assistant Athletics Director, noted that indoor tennis facilities would be jointly sponsored with the Student Recreation Center.

Lester asked about further priorities. Tharp said that improvements to Coors Events / Conference Center would be next. Covering the tennis courts at the Student Recreation Center would depend on fundraising and Rec Center support. At some future point, planning may begin for uses at CU-Boulder South.

Bartlett asked if the Potts Field project included dressing rooms. Tharp said that would come in Phase 2. Lester asked about the use of facilities for club sports; Tharp said soccer, lacrosse, and baseball would continue to use some of Athletics' facilities. Lester asked if any future revenue could be used to offset the student fees. Martinez tried to clarify some points about the student fee. He questioned the assumption that reduction in the fees would hurt Title IX compliance or student attendance at events. Lester asked if there were any projects not indicated on the master planning display board. Tharp said no, the reason for preparing a master plan was to not have any surprises.

Oesterle asked how fundraising income is allocated between Athletics and Academics. Tharp said that donors give to programs which matter to them. There do not seem to be cases where programs are thrown into conflict with each other. Donors to Athletics, in fact, often end up giving to Academic programs as well. Oesterle said that this didn't seem to be true in Ivy League schools. Tharp said the comparison did not work because those schools are privately funded, often with large endowments.

Cummings asked if expansion of the stadium would displace any programs there now. Baily said there would probably be a shift of facilities support programs to the East Campus. The stadium badly needs space for additional restrooms and concessions. He noted that CU probably makes better use of space below stadium seating than most institutions.

Bartlett suggested that the master plan should speak to the maintenance of Franklin Field.

4. **ATHLETICS FIELDHOUSE / PARKING STRUCTURE PLANNING UPDATE** -- Hecht said that a utilities feasibility study was made, and program planning is underway. There are many factors in this project, including financial feasibility, parking, traffic, and relocation of existing facilities. He noted that the size of the facilities is based on the size of an NCAA 300 meter indoor track. The consultants have made a presentation to the Design Review Board, which expressed concern about the potential height of

this structure on the north and east. They suggested that the height might be mitigated by putting parking under all or part of Franklin Field so that the field house could be lowered.

Hecht said the financial consideration is that this project should not impact the dept capacity of the University. It may be necessary to include the luxury boxes as part of this project to provide funding.

Crittenden asked about the height. Hecht said it was unknown at this time, except for a 66 ft. interior. Barnard said that his firm plans to do a massing model. Oesterle asked about the use of the facility. Hecht said it will replace Balch Fieldhouse as a practice facility and will have a full indoor track. Lightner asked the current height of the east stands at Folsom Field. Tharp said it was 77 ft.

Lipton noted that the relocation of several facilities northeast of the stadium was included in this project. Replacement and relocation costs should be factored into the master plan. Lester handed out a sheet with a UCSU Environmental Board resolution concerning the Intermediate Processing Facility (recycling). The resolution emphasized the importance of the facility and the need for it to be on the main campus. Kaempfer expressed concerns about moving the Health Physics Laboratory and the hazardous waste mitigation involved.

Cummings asked what programs would move to this new facility. Tharp said that besides the track and football practice, the speed, strength, and conditioning program would be there, along with academic support and some office space. He noted that when the Dal Ward Athletic Center was built there was anticipation of an eastern expansion. Barnard added that the northeast section of the stadium is settling and must be dealt with.

Crittenden asked about recreational access to the new track. Tharp said it was a question of scheduling as it is in Balch. Crittenden also asked if the stadium might be opened for people to "run the steps." Burianek said this was unlikely, because of the concern for the new grass field.

5. **POTTS FIELD IMPROVEMENTS: FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Hecht said that this project is proceeding under the new process, wherein the BCPC will see a feasibility study and make comments. These comments will be forwarded to the Chancellor's Executive Committee, which will then authorize the project to move into program planning.

Hecht said that the Potts Field turf needs to be replaced, but it also needs to be re-configured to accommodate a soccer field. Lipton noted that pods in the Research Park are reserved for development. Potts Field itself is probably safe from development in the foreseeable future, but pods B and I might be needed in 5-10 years. If the decision is made to develop CU-Boulder South, the uses at Potts Field might be moved there. Baily noted that there is not utilities infrastructure at CU-Boulder South, but Lipton suggested that low impact uses could be accommodated there in a relatively short period of time.

Bruning said that the fiscal feasibility study indicated there would be no cost in the conversion of irrigation from potable to non-potable. Burianek said that cost was included in the project, but that once accomplished there would be no on-going operational cost. Oesterle asked about funding sources for the improvements. Burianek said it would be privately funded, and that there are already interested donors.

6. **FOLSOM FIELD LIGHTING DRAFT PROGRAM PLAN** -- Hecht said that under the new process BCPC would see early drafts of program plans and provide input early in the process. The BCPC already saw conceptual and design studies. He noted that new field lighting would require upgrades to the electrical distribution system, which would have some space impacts in the Stadium Building. Cummings asked if the increased distribution capacity was needed for the entire stadium or just the field lights. Hecht said it was for all the electricity at the Stadium. Oesterle asked about funding. Burianek said that there is already a commitment from a donor and that money normally paid by TV networks to rent lights would go instead to the Athletics Department.

Lester asked if the stadium would be used at night for events other than football. Burianek said yes -- events like the Bolder Boulder and the July 4th show. Baily noted that the restriction on concerts in the stadium was for the time of day, not because of objections by Athletics. Lester asked if the TV revenue could be used to lower student fees, once the lighting is paid for. Burianek said that the issue of student fees was between the Athletic Director and the Chancellor.

Cummings asked if there had been community input on the design of the lighting. Burianek said no, not in detail, but that his department always works with the city on evening events at the stadium. There are other issues being worked on, such as sound and concessions. Hecht noted that there was no real change from the existing situation except that the lighting would be permanent rather than rented for each event.

Bruning asked about lighting outside the stadium, for parking, concessions, etc. He suggested that Clanton Associates, who is preparing the campus lighting master plan, be involved.

7. **MASTER PLAN UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF BUILDING SITES** -- Baily said that the master plan schedule has been extended a bit, to include public input. Final approval is anticipated in November. A rough draft will be ready late Spring.

Baily presented a large map of long-term potential development. He noted that areas are indicated as sites within which development could occur. They are not building footprints. He also showed a map with more specific indication of projects currently known which are likely to occur within the next ten years.

Kaempfer asked about ultimate build-out. Baily said that while there are finite limits to what could be built, this Master Plan would not go that far into the future. Lester suggested that the map be more explicit in marking open spaces which are permanently reserved. He also noted that the period for public comment should be at a time when students are on campus. Cummings asked about expansion of the Power House. Baily said there was room for a small addition, but that beyond that satellite facilities will be considered.

Crittenden asked who would make the final decision as to whether Potts Field would remain in the Research Park. Lipton noted that the current Research Park Master Plan did not indicate Potts Field as a building site because there was not an alternative site for track and field events when it was written. That master plan is still in effect. Bartlett asked about the progress of planning for the Grandview area. Baily said the consultants are still working on the plan, and some outside mediators may be asked to help. In response to a question about parking, Baily said that in the long-term, there would be more parking structures. Joe Roy of Parking Services said that the demand for parking involves proximity as much as total inventory of spaces. He noted that the surface parking now subsidizes the expense of structure parking.

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