

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

Minutes of the Meeting of May 20, 1999

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, May 20, 1999, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

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

Members absent were: Jake Hertz, Carl Jardine, Michael Lightner, and Paul Saporito.

Guests present were: Jon Burianek, Athletics; Tom Carson, Housing; Erin Coker, UCSU; Don Dethlefs, Sink Combs Dethlefs Architects; Martin Eiss, RNL Architects; Deborah Haynes, Fine Arts; Steve Hecht, Facilities Planning; John Krueger, Athletics; Michael Martens, Facilities Management; Chris May, Athletics; Dan Pabon, UCSU; Joe Roy, Parking and Transit Service; Dennis Rubba, Civitas, Inc.; Bobby Schnabel, Academic and Campus Technology; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; Paul Tabolt, Administration; Richard Tharp, Athletics; Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services; and Jim Williams, Libraries.

1. **MINUTES** -- In the minutes of the meeting of April 8, 1999, Carson noted that the discussion of Potts Field referred to an unsigned memorandum of understanding (MOU) between Housing and the Research Park. Carson said that the MOU had in fact been signed. With this clarification the minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Jones noted that a June meeting would be necessary. he asked members if June 17 would work, and most members said it would. At that meeting, a nominating committee needs to be selected to present nominations for BCPC officers in October.

Jones announced that member Larry Drees has become Co-Chair of Staff Council. Lipton announced that Bill Deno's role in Facilities Management will change: he will retain the title Campus Architect and a new Director of Planning will be selected. How and when these changes will be implemented depend on the results of a program review of the Facilities Planning Office, which is underway.

Jones reported that the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) approved the Business School project to proceed into program planning. They also considered the Capital Construction priority list. The Chancellor has asked that the BCPC reconsider their recommendations.

3. **FY 2000-2001 CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST LIST UPDATE** -- Jones introduced Vice Chancellor Tabolt, who spoke to the BCPC about the role of the BCPC and

the CEC in general, and about the prioritization of the Capital Construction Request in particular. He noted that this is a "time of change" for both bodies. The planning process involves more than land use, and should be integrated into the total learning environment. He said that the MCD Biology Teaching Labs was a small project, and its space on the request list might be better used for another project. In other words, the larger picture has to be considered.

Bartlett commented that the BCPC may not be competent to make priority decisions based on financial or political considerations. He said that the Chancellor does not always follow the BCPC recommendations, and the commission members understood this. Oesterle asked about the membership of the CEC. He noted that those members have the same constituencies as the BCPC, so did not understand what different perspective they would add to the process. Kaempfer asked if it would be more useful to the CEC and the Chancellor to submit a qualitative listing of funding requests. Crittenden disagreed, saying that a full discussion at BCPC was important. Newsome-Suitts said that when considering funding requests, the legislature wants to know how much money is in hand for projects with private funding components. Herbstreit said that the BCPC is not always privy to that information, and said that he felt the CU Foundation should be represented on the BCPC. Demarest said that to expand the role of BCPC would require more meetings and more commitment from the members. Oesterle noted that there are two issues: the process and the immediate task. Martinez asked if the rankings could be qualified, with more explanation of why the BCPC feels a project is important. Newsome-Suitts said that the Chancellor is looking for broad comprehensive recommendations from the BCPC. Cummings said that the CEC needs more information from the BCPC to add their approval to the BCPC list. Jones agreed, saying that he did not have a full opportunity to discuss this with the CEC. Baily noted that the By-Laws contain specific criteria for making decisions on ranking, but that the By-Laws were waived at the last meeting.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Martinez, to approve the revised capital construction list priority as follows: (1) Porter, (2) ATLAS, (3) New Law School, (4) Business Addition, with the recommendation that the MCDB Teaching Labs project be forwarded with a recommendation that it be considered as an additional project if possible. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. **FOLSOM FIELD STADIUM COMPLEX EXPANSION: REVISED FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Hecht explained that most of the material in this revised study is not new to the BCPC. The August 1998 study had three phases: 1A (fieldhouse), 1B (skyboxes), and 1C (stadium expansion). This new study combines the phases to address debt capacity issues. The immediate proposal, however, is only for the fieldhouse/parking structure. Dick Tharp, Athletics Director, noted that this plan is consistent with the long-range plans and goals of the department. No state money will be requested. The relocation of facilities northeast of the stadium and a parking facility in that location were in the 1990 master plan, and improvements to the stadium are long overdue.

Tharp noted that the skyboxes and club seating are the “revenue cornerstone” in that they will provide the funding for the fieldhouse/parking structure component. Oesterle asked if private donor bonds would be subject to vote by the citizens. Tharp said no.

Consultant Don Dethlefs showed a map of the stadium area showing the proposed phases. Martinez asked if the East Campus had been considered. Dethlefs said that it had, but had been rejected as impractical for the program. Wilson asked if the project would impact Franklin Field. Tharp said it would not. Bartlett expressed concerns about the possible use of Franklin Field as a staging area and its subsequent restoration. Hecht said he would forward Bartlett's concerns to the consultants to be included in the program plan.

Cummings asked if there would be renovations at Dal Ward. Tharp said there would be a few, and there would also be upgrades to restrooms and concessions areas in the Stadium Building. Demarest asked if any of the new structure would be in the floodplain. Hecht said it would not. Demarest asked if the garage could be built deeper and Hecht said it would be studied.

Lipton noted that this study had already been approved by the BCPC to proceed to CEC for permission to move into program planning; the current presentation is simply a change in the phasing. Crittenden asked about the proposed costs. Herbstreit said that the costs appear appropriate at this point, but that a market analysis is needed.

It was moved and seconded to approve the project to proceed to the CEC for their action. The motion passed all in favor with one opposed (Oesterle).

5. **FINE ARTS CONCEPT PLAN** -- Hecht introduced Martin Eiss from RNL Design, the firm which is working on the program plan. The project will replace the Sibell Wolle building and provide expanded gallery space. Eiss presented boards with a site analysis and maps. He noted that the project assumes the removal of Hunter and Sibell Wolle (in phases). Space is provided for possible future expansion of Cristol Chemistry and Biochemistry or some other appropriate program. The Telecommunications Building will stay where it is, but could be added to both vertically and horizontally. The proposed scenario also uses the north side of the Regent Avenue Autopark. Eiss showed a three-dimensional model indicating volumes and program usage. Hecht noted that the program plan will not include actual architectural designs, but space and volume studies such as this.

Crittenden asked about the diminished plaza between Fine Arts and the parking structure (Fine Arts Green). Eiss said that the space would remain but would be shifted north. Cummings asked if the building could be more than three stories. Eiss said it would be difficult because fine arts studios require higher ceiling heights. Wilson spoke in favor of retaining open space and against a proposed bridge structure along 18th Street. Lester agreed noting that new structures adjacent to the autopark

could cast shadows into the green space and create a canyon effect. Newsome-Suitts noted that fine arts programs needed ventilation and natural light. Bartlett noted that this is the last major building site in the center of the campus and that buildings should be as tall as possible. Herbstreit expressed concerns that this project would limit future options to build above the autopark.

Deborah Haynes, Fine Arts chair, said that this building will be a gateway into the campus. There is a museum component in the proposal at this point but the location of the museum may change within the site. Crittenden asked if a structure over the autopark would put Fine Arts Green into shadow. Deno said that it could be designed in such a way as to not do that. Simpson noted that this project is an opportunity to improve pedestrian flow in this busy part of campus. Lester asked if the planners could coordinate with the UMC designers and create a pedestrian bridge over the service drive.

Jones noted that this item was for information only and no approval was required. He thanked the consultants for their presentation.

6. **BUSINESS PROGRAM PLAN: UPDATE** -- Simpson said that this update was in reaction to comments on the plan at the last BCPC meeting. It contains an analysis of some alternatives for observatory field. He introduced Dennis Rubba of Civitas, who displayed maps with three alternative scenarios. The third alternative was the preference of the consultants. Lester stressed the need for alternative transportation options. Baily commented that the plan was deficient in bicycle and pedestrian corridors. Tom Carson of Housing expressed concern about service to Reed and Crosman Halls. Joy Roy of Parking Services expressed concern for capacity of parking. Wilson emphasized the need for both passive and active recreation spaces. Deno said that this project could substantially improve the existing recreation fields, which have current inadequacies.

It was moved by Bartlett, seconded by Lipton to approve the proposed location of buildings, parking, and open space for the program plan, with the condition that service pedestrian, and bicycle access be studied further. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. **SCIENCE LIBRARY COMMONS: FEASIBILITY STUDY** -- Deno noted that the site across Colorado Avenue from Franklin Field has been designated as the location for a science library ever since the 1963 Sasaki plan and the 1988 Fischer Field plan. Because the site is adjacent to the Engineering and Earth Sciences Library, the new facility could connect to them underground. Stack space could be constructed under Fischer Field. Jim Williams, Dean of Libraries, said that this project had been presented to SCAG (now CEC) and that consultants had been hired to do a program plan and conceptual planning. For many reasons, the project is no longer considering the Hunter site.

The project now under consideration will be more than a library, but will be a crossroads of activity and will include a food court and other facilities. The “commons” refers to the concept of a building that will provide a common link between the various science and engineering libraries. Cummings asked about the existing space. Williams said that the Science Library is overcrowded in Norlin, and its removal from that building will pave the way for Norlin to be renovated as a humanities and social sciences collections repository. Bartlett asked about the cost of the new technology and its maintenance. Williams said that there would be new staff members to support the technology. He noted that the facility would be complimentary to the ATLAS and Discovery Learning Center projects.

Herbstreit said that the financial analysis is as complete as it can be at this stage. It needs a probability assessment from the CU Foundation for the privately funded portion. Costain commended Williams for his work with faculty groups in formulating concepts for this facility. She asked about student study space. Williams said that 500 networkable seats are planned. Cummings asked if the food service would be privatized. Williams said he did not know yet. Simpson noted that food service across campus is a master plan issue.

On a motion from Deno, seconded by Costain, the project was recommended to move to the CEC for approval to prepare a program plan.

8. **UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE: INFORMATIONAL ITEM** -- Lipton said that Facilities Management is re-engineering some utilities programs. He distributed a sheet showing the relationship of utilities to the General Fund budget. He said that in order to manage energy usage, better data is needed, and that data will have to come from separate metering of facilities. Herbstreit noted that it would be good to keep better track of research vs. general fund activities. Lester asked about Facilities Management’s resource conservation plan. Lipton said that the plan needs to be looked at again; the first version was too broad. Crittenden asked what would happen if there were a sudden increase in bills to departments. Lipton said that the Vice Chancellors will deal with that situation.
9. **MASTER PLAN** -- Baily discussed Master Plan maps which had been included in the member’s mailing. One map indicates potential long-term development areas -- “urban growth boundaries” in Bartlett’s language. The second map shows those additions and new buildings included in the 10 year master plan. Crittenden asked about the timing of projects in Grandview. Baily said that the earliest development might be in five years, with more development ten years and beyond.
10. **TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN** -- Baily showed color boards of maps which were black-and-white in the plans distributed to members. They showed plans for various modes of transportation: pedestrian, bicycle, mass transit, fire lanes, vehicular circulation, and parking locations (including possible structures). Lester asked about the 18th Street / Colorado Avenue corridor. Baily said that the concept of a mall on

these streets is included in the plan, with transit links. Deno said that he felt a better way was needed to finance parking.

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