

**TOPIC: UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS  
FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE**

**PREPARED BY: RYAN STUBBS**

**I. SUMMARY**

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) has submitted a Facilities Strategic Plan Update as an amendment to the currently approved master plan for the University. The Facilities Strategic Plan Update document, henceforth referred to as the amendment, updates the development strategy for UCCS based on an updated academic strategic plan for the university, the *Seven Year Growth Plan, Fiscal Year 2006 to Fiscal Year 2012* by Chancellor Shockley-Zalabak and changing data affecting development on the campus site and surrounding area. The amendment also places a greater emphasis on sustainable development practices and the preservation of the natural environment encompassing the campus.

In the Spring of 2000, UCCS submitted a facilities master plan which offered in depth analysis of the existing conditions of the campus in terms of land use and space use. The plan outlined development based on those conditions, the academic strategic plan at the time and various opportunities and constraints of the campus. Upon submittal to the Department of Higher Education (DHE) the plan totaled four volumes in length and was approved by the Commission on November 2, 2000. The current plan outlines a different development strategy than the one submitted with the 2000 plan, but it utilizes the same growth, land and space assessments and does not to require a complete re-write of the 2000 Facilities Master Plan.

Overall, the amendment offers a significantly different development strategy for UCCS and is based on the following guiding principles:

- *Prioritize the reduction of energy consumption*
- *Site buildings compactly to conserve open space and encourage socialization*
- *Create a walkable campus to help reduce car trips*
- *Preserve the natural landscape and make use of natural stormwater drainage to reduce infrastructure impact*
- *Build quality buildings for the long-term in a consistent architectural style*

The plan is also altered based on revised growth assumptions in FTEs, headcount and academic programs based on The Seven Year Growth Plan set forth by Chancellor Shockley-Zalabak in May 2005.

The first phase of growth is inline with *The Seven Year Growth Plan* and assumes that student headcount will increase from the current level of 7,620 by 2% in each year in the first five years of the plan and by 4% in the final two years, resulting with a total headcount of 9,100 students by 2012. The amendment corresponds with this assumption, showing that space needs will need to increase

from the current 1.4 Million Gross Square Feet (MGSF) to 2.2 MGSF to achieve the goals of the seven year plan by 2012. The amendment also plans for beyond the seven year plan for growth of student headcount to 15,000 by 2021 and 30,000 at the full campus buildout, which the campus estimates to occur in 2040. To reach these growth estimates, the amendment shows total space needs of 3.3 MGSF by 2021 and 6.3 MGSF for full buildout.

<b>Total GSF by Phase</b>	<b>New GSF</b>	<b>Cumulative Total</b>
2006 Existing	1,382,583	N/A
Six-Year Plan (2012)	852,385	2,234,968
Fifteen-Year Plan (2021)	1,074,296	3,309,264
Full Buildout (2040)	3,038,306	<b>6,347,570</b>
<b>Total GSF</b>	<b>6,347,570</b>	N/A

The above chart shows the necessary space needs compared with phased growth, summarized from the amendment. The planning document further allocates detailed space needs by assignable square feet and room types.

*The Seven Year Growth Plan* also identifies academic program growth which has informed the 2006 UCCS Academic Strategic Plan and the amendment. The Seven Year Plan identifies the need for two additional PhD programs, nine additional Master's programs and six additional Bachelor's programs. Potential Doctoral programs identified as possibilities in the 2006 Academic Strategic Plan include: Nursing Practice; Applied Science; Homeland Security; and, Educational Leadership. Potential Master's programs identified include: Innovation; Homeland Security; Student Affairs in Higher Education; Leadership; Nanotechnology; Sports Marketing and Management; Information Technology; and, Games Media Integration. Potential Undergraduate programs identified include: Game Design and Development; Innovation; Biomedical Engineering; Ethnic/Women's Studies; Criminal Justice; Biology; and, Honor's Programs.

Additionally, the amendment identifies a number of specific capital projects that allow for the campus to achieve the goals as identified in *The Seven Year Growth Plan*. The total amount of funds needed to accomplish all projects listed within the amendment as seeking funding from fiscal year 2005-2006 to fiscal year 2011-2012 is \$252,515,577. In order to fund the plan, the University's strategy will be to obtain \$84.2 Million in state capital funding, \$42 Million in tuition bonding/gifts, \$65 Million in campus funds/gifts/partnerships, \$55.6 Million in fee based bonding, \$1.3 Million in utility saving and \$4.4 Million in gift only funds.

In addition to the recent *Seven Year Growth Plan* and *2006 Academic Strategic Plan*, UCCS is has recently developed the *2006 Information Technology Strategic Planning Report* and is in the process of developing design guidelines for the campus.

The 2006 IT Strategic Planning report puts a greater emphasis on academic and administrative IT service and defines the following focal points:

- *Developing and enhancing programs and support for educational technology,*

*including hardware, software and staff support, technology-enhanced facilities, and information and information technology literacy programs for students*

- *Improving and greatly expanding web-based student services*
- *Maintaining and further developing the middleware layer of the campus's infrastructure, including security, and access and authorization*
- *Improving coordination, communication and governance of campus IT resources.*

New campus design guidelines are still being developed by the University and are being informed, in part, by the amendment.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

The Commission is required by C.R.S. 23-1-106(3) to review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education. Additionally, C.R.S. 23-1-106(4) requires that the Commission ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.

Given this statutory authority, ensuring conformance with facility master plans is a major component of the Department of Higher Education program plan review process. If conformance is not apparent, institutions are required to submit amendments to their current master plans to accommodate alternate development strategies.

According to Department of Higher Education Policies Section III Part D, Commission approved facilities master plans should be re-examined every ten years. Given the changing nature of development needs and fiscal constraints, institutions can submit amendments to their master plans in the interim to incorporate new development strategies and changing needs without undertaking the task of creating a new master plan. Section III Part D of DHE policy states:

*A long-range plan must be developed as a flexible framework for campus growth that recognizes the dynamic nature of higher education. As enrollments grow or decline and/or as academic programs change or become more comprehensive to serve new student needs, campus facility needs inevitably will change. A facility master plan must be capable of meeting these changing circumstances. To ensure that a Long-Range plan remains valid, an institution must do one of the following before the ten-year life of the plan expires:*

- *Create a new Long-Range Plan;*
- *Send a letter to DHE stating that all assumptions contained in the master plan are still valid and that all facilities' needs outlined in it are still needed but have not yet been completed; or*
- *Amend the master plan to bring it up to date.*

*Thus, at least every ten years the long-range plan for each campus must be re-examined or updated in order to keep it current.*

The recent strategic updates and shifting development opportunities at UCCS have led to the need for the amendment. Since the UCCS Facilities Master Plan approved by DHE in 2001 is still valid, the amendment is the appropriate course of action for the institution.

Also, the amendment fits with the vision mission and core values of the institution.

Vision: *The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs will provide unsurpassed, student-centered teaching and learning, and outstanding research and creative work that serve our community, state and nation, and result in our recognition as the premier comprehensive, regional research university in the United States.*

Mission: *The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs shall be a comprehensive baccalaureate university with selective admissions standards. The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs shall offer liberal arts and sciences, business, engineering, health sciences and teacher preparation undergraduate degrees and a selected number of masters and doctoral degrees.*

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

#### *Planning Process*

The amendment was primarily prepared by the architecture and planning firm SLATERPAULL Architects, in association with the firms Loebel Schlossman & Hackl and EDAAW. The process involved an assessment of square footage and site plan information for all campus buildings as well as assessments of campus infrastructure, program data, landscaping, paved areas, utilities and pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns.

The SLATERPAULL team also gathered data on regional systems, campus facilities and grounds needs through meeting with UCCS administrators, faculty, staff, students, neighborhood representatives, the North Nevada Corridor Planning Group, representatives of the United States Olympic Committee and, the Planning and Transportation Departments of the City of Colorado Springs.

The result is a plan based on sound technical planning data that creates a vision for the campus based on sustainability and preserving the natural beauty of the area as well as strategic academic goals that fit with national, state and community goals and opportunities.

The plan recommends three-phases of development for future campus growth: the first will meet the needs and goals set forth by the Seven Year Growth Plan; the next will fulfill longer term initiatives and improve campus facilities and infrastructure over the next fifteen years; the third shows a possible vision of the ultimate development phase for UCCS at full buildout.

#### *Sustainability*

Stormwater drainage will be a key organizing function of street grids and preserving natural riparian habitat and vegetation. The arroyos (creeks) will be developed as riparian corridors with multiple

functions besides drainage including green space, walking and biking trails and smaller critter habitats.

The plan also calls for the arrangement of street grids and footprint placements that conform to the topographical features of the land and help facilitate campus user interaction and campus walkability.

Additionally, the campus has developed a sustainability checklist based on the preliminary LEED-ND (Neighborhood Development) rating system and plans to achieve or conditionally achieve 17 of the 19 elements listed on the checklist. The LEED-ND system identifies neighborhood sustainability goals such as location efficiency, environmental preservation and compact, complete and connected neighborhoods.

#### *Planned New Development*

The plan also divides the campus into three distinct areas with specific functions. The area designated in the plan as “North Campus” is the site with the most opportunity for new development. North Campus will include:

- Two student suite-style villages nestled between the central and south arroyos
- A Research Park/Athletic Facility District placed on the highly visible north end closest to the I-25 interchange along North Nevada Avenue
- An outdoor amphitheater nestled into a canyon on the northeast corner of the site

Central Campus is the primary location of current facilities and includes projects that are already in progress such as the new Recreation Center, Science and Engineering Building and additional housing at Summit Village and Alpine Village. Additional development at Central Campus will include:

- An internal boulevard to connect Central, North and East Campuses
- Additional academic buildings to replace surface parking lots
- A new physical plan complex.

East campus currently includes a retirement home and related condo development. Development of this site is scheduled for the long term as the campus nears full buildout.

DHE staff issued the following questions to UCCS regarding the amendment. Questions were given thorough and sufficient response and DHE staff has no further reservations in recommending that the Commission approve the amendment.

1. The Facilities Strategic Plan Update is 37 pages and the prior Master Plan (approved by CCHE in 2001) is 4 volumes in length. Is this plan an amendment to the current UCCS master plan? Does it update a certain section of the current master plan?

*Response:*

*2006 found several strategic level documents at UCCS under an updating process. Our IT Strategic Plan was updated on January 26, 2006 and a copy will be provided separately. Also the UCCS Academic Strategic Plan has been updated and will be provided separately. The new Academic Strategic Plan in particular paved the way for the Facilities plan update. The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) Facilities Strategic Plan Update 2006 utilizes the UCCS Plan approved in 2001 as its foundation. The 2006 Update document is an amendment or update, not a comprehensive re-write of the existing plan. This is possible because most of the 2001 plan sections and analyses have not changed. A Six-Year Plan and a Fifteen-Year Plan were developed in response to CCHE policies and procedures Section III, Part D, Guidelines for Long-Range Facilities/Infrastructure Master Planning, dated April 5, 2001. We recognize these guidelines were revised on November 2, 2006 just as the UCCS 2006 Update was being finalized.*

*The 2006 Facilities Strategic Plan Update updates the expected enrollment growth of the campus since 2001 and lists those facilities required to support the new projections. The 2006 Update plan is a new initiative and seeks to discover “Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)” supported by the Congress for New Urbanism and the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The plan weaves local conditions and needs into the process of designing road networks for walkable communities. The UCCS 2006 Update incorporates the concepts embodied in the new LEED™-ND (Neighborhood Development) initiative.*

2. Is UCCS assuming the same assessment of existing conditions from the 2001 Master Plan apply to the updated plan?

*Response:*

*Generally speaking, the assessments from the 2001 plan remain valid. There are however, new approaches to the development of existing land conditions that make possible the construction of facilities where previously a conservative approach ruled these facilities out. Recent soil excavation along North Nevada by SEMA Construction revealed that 10 to 12 feet below the surface of generally poor soil lies a superb R60 construction material. This enables today’s planners to conceptually terrace the northwestern campus. Doing so adds 10-15% in constructible land.*

3. What new conditions have arisen to necessitate a new facilities strategic plan? Please speak specifically to the differing land uses identified in this plan when compared with the 2001 long range development plan. For example, the 2001 plan shows proposed residential uses in the North Campus area and indoor sports and outdoor sports uses on Central Campus.

*Response:*

*The development of the western side of North Nevada Avenue was not envisioned with the 2001 plan. Today, it has become a reality as Costco and Lowes sign contractual agreements to redevelop the land into University Village, a commercial/retail center. Further, in 2001 the City of Colorado Springs’ leased use of the Four Diamonds Sports Complex was assumed to be in perpetuity. The lease of this University land expires in 2014 and with the redevelopment of North Nevada it was important for UCCS to work in concert with the City and the Urban Renewal Authority to seamlessly develop our lands to match that of the*

*developers to the benefit of the University and the City of Colorado Springs. The Facilities Strategic Plan Update 2006 differs from the 2001 plan in its fundamental assumptions. The 2001 plan approached land use and development in a most traditional way. In contrast, the new plan makes sustainability an integral part of the planning and development process. Creating a sense of place, pedestrian scaled environments, and an abundance of open space mark the 2006 Update plan for its highest and best use of the land while preserving and creating special places on campus. With the completion of the Science/Engineering Buildings in 2008 the “Central Campus” is nearly complete. Few additional facilities are possible, as objectives of the 2001 Plan will have been met. Still, there are concepts such as structured parking rather than on-grade parking that makes the new plan sustainable.*

4. How will the different sections of campus interrelate with each other? There is over a mile between the north and south campus sections. How will student activity at each part of campus (North, East and Central) interact?

*Response:*

*The 2006 Update acknowledges the linearity of the UCCS campus. Transportation such as today’s campus shuttle bus system and perhaps an on-campus train-like or cable car system of transportation in the future are keys to keeping the campus connected. An interior frontage road concept has been included to make transport easier and more direct. We will look to a people mover transportation system, which may use technologies such as monorail, automated guideway transit or maglev. Propulsion may involve conventional on-board electric motors, linear motors or cable traction. In the interim, planning from the 2006 Update includes centers of learning concepts such as the east end of campus becoming a college of nursing center the north and west areas becoming a business, engineering, and research center, while the central campus remains the core curriculum producing facility.*

5. How does proposed academic building growth overlap with proposed program growth and strategic planning?

*Response:*

*The Facilities Strategic Plan Update took off from the recently completed update of the Academic Strategic Plan. In this way both program needs and facilities capabilities are addressed in the 2006 Update plan. The numbers, types, and locations of new facilities keep steady pace with the estimated growth in headcount and strategic program planning objectives. For example, the beginning of a research park is planned within a six-year period from the completion of the 2006 Update plan. The complete and ultimate development however depends upon the success such a research capability supplies. The final research park is not envisioned until fifteen-years after the 2006 Update plan or 2021.*

6. Is there much interaction between the neighborhood that is adjacent to the central campus and the University? Do students live in or frequently traverse the adjacent neighborhoods?

*Response:*

*Yes. There is continual interaction between the Cragmor Village neighbors and UCCS. Students park their automobiles in nearby residential neighborhoods and walk to UCCS through the Cragmor Village neighborhood. Our police officers routinely patrol there and*

*will respond to emergencies – the neighbors often express their appreciation of this welcomed security presence to the University staff. In winter months, as a courtesy, our grounds crew plows the street for the neighborhood. Last summer (2006) the University and the CU Foundation worked together to acquire the Ulrich House, as the owner and resident was moving away after more than 48-years next to the campus. Mr. Frank Ulrich was one of our shuttle bus drivers for many years.*

7. What plans does the University have for Athletic and Recreational growth that will allow for such a large portion of the campus to be dedicated to these land uses?

*Response:*

*In 1965 UCCS was a primarily commuter-based University campus. With 900 resident beds today and a future that will see the campus transition to a residential four-year University we recognized with the 2006 Update that recreational facilities for students today are inadequate. Up and until this past fall, our gymnasium could seat a little over 200 spectators. We replaced the seating and increased seating capacity to over 400 and still the gymnasium cannot accommodate all spectators. We understand that as UCCS grows recreational opportunities must grow too. In the future, we see UCCS competing at the NCAA Division II level for several years, but we know that Division I awaits a growing and successful University. Our plans include that eventuality perhaps in the sport of football.*

8. On page 31 of the strategic plan update, seven-year growth plan is mentioned as a resource. Please submit a copy of this document.

*Response:*

*One has been mailed separately. It is also found on the UCCS website at: <http://www.uccs.edu/~facsrvs/docs/StrategicPlan/Final%207%20Year%20Growth%20Plan.pdf>*

*This plan was approved by the Board of Regents of the University in the summer of 2005. Its bold and innovative format led the CU President to require all Universities in the CU System to create such a document for their campuses and to be prepared to present them to the Board of Regents early this spring. UCCS will be the first to do so in May with our update of this planning document.*

9. Page 6 indicates the guiding principal to “build quality buildings for the long-term in a consistent architectural style.” Is the University developing design guidelines outside of the facilities strategic plan update?

*Response:*

*UCCS has written Design Guidelines that were produced in 1996. A copy will be sent separately. The Facilities Strategic Planning team used these guidelines as the Facilities Strategic Plan Update proceeded. Still, we recognized that they too required an update and so the Strategic Plan Update team worked in concert with the UCCS Design Guidelines and then identified how they could be updated. Mr. Lamar Kelsey, former member of the CU Design Review Board is supporting UCCS with our update of the UCCS Design Guidelines effort, which trails the completion of the Facilities Strategic Plan Update. The new and updated Design Guidelines will also be forwarded upon their completion in March 2007.*

10. Will the University be seeking LEED certification on current and future buildings? If so, do implementation costs include the associated costs of LEED certified buildings? Also, if so, what level of LEED certification will the University seek?

*Response:*

*UCCS has registered two current projects to become LEED™ Certified. The Student Fitness Center and the University's largest project, the Science/Engineering Buildings are both currently registered with the U.S. Green Building Council to become LEED™ Certified. UCCS will not seek more than a LEED™ Certified rating of current or future buildings until our construction specifications equal or better those employed by CU Boulder. At that point it may be possible to say that a LEED™ Silver certification does not add cost. We are just not there yet.*

11. Does UCCS envision any future property transactions? If so, where have opportunities for land acquisitions been identified?

*Response:*

*Yes. As the renderings of the Six-Year and Fifteen-Year plans reveal, two residential neighborhoods are in close proximity to UCCS. Eventually, the University anticipates the acquisition of these properties, as residents become sellers. This will not happen overnight nor will it be immediate. Today, each of the properties in the Eagle Rock neighborhood, for example, would list for sale in the range of \$350K to well over \$600K.*

12. Fall 2006 headcount reported to CCHE is shown as 7,547. Is there an estimate for when might a head count of 30,000 be reached?

*Response:*

*It is anticipated that an estimated enrollment of 30,000 students (headcount) will be reached in 2040, thirty-four years from the Update Plan's completion in 2006.*

13. In what ways has the University progressed towards the vision presented in the 2001 master plan? How does the new plan change/improve on this vision?

*Response:*

*Since 2001, both Main Hall and Cragmor Hall have been renovated. Long awaited work on Dwire Hall is underway now and a Student Fitness Center has started. The campus' largest construction effort and largest facility, the Science/Engineering Buildings will open in 2008. These actions were all part of the vision contained in the 2001 plan. Taking a bold step beyond with the 2006 Update plan, UCCS embarks upon a path of sustainability. It is our hope that the 523 acres available to UCCS will become a sense of place, be a walkable campus, one with a myriad of recreational opportunities and open space. Building orientation and energy conservation take center stage in the 2006 Update plan as do carefully designed streets and roadways.*

*Both plans follow sustainable design practices to some degree, although the 2006 Update plan had the added benefit of research done by ITE (CSS) and the USGBC (LEED-ND) that was incorporated into the planning process. Other than that, the Six-Year 2006 Update plan is similar to the 2001 Plan. The most significant plan difference thereafter resulted from the emergence of the North Nevada Corridor as an economic driver, coupled with the ability to*

*relocate the Four Diamonds Sports Complex in 2014.*

*The result is the 2006 Update plan's mixed-use University Village, creating a strong functional and economic connection with the commercial/retail center development on the west side of North Nevada, combined with the creation of an indoor/outdoor recreation/athletics complex at the northwest corner of the site replacing the Four Diamonds Complex as well as adding two critical functions not in the 2001 Plan, a Multi-Purpose Arena and a Competition Natatorium. University Village (ours) would not happen until the Fifteen-Year 2006 Update plan, sometime after 2014 when the Four Diamonds lease ends.*

*Another significant difference is in the nature of parking planning. The 2001 Plan concentrated parking in the traditional campus planning way, in big lots on the edge of the campus. The 2006 Update plan, utilizing the concepts of CSS and LEED™-ND, disperses parking to where it is needed, primarily to promote pedestrian safety and walkability and reduce total car trips for the protection of the environment.*

14. Are the 6 and 15 year plans based on the space needs analysis conducted by Paulien and Associates in the 2001 Master Plan? How have space needs and utilizations changed since the 2001 analysis?

*Response:*

*Space needs were based on student headcount targets that were similar for both plans through the year 2010. In the 2001 Plan, the Space Needs Analysis by Paulien and Associates calculated space to serve a 10,000 student headcount in Year 10 (2011). The 2006 Plan was based on a 9,100 Student Headcount for the Six-Year Phase (2012) and a 15,000 Student Headcount for the Fifteen-Year Phase (2021).*

*As far as total space calculated, both the 2001 and 2006 Update plans programmed space needs based on CCHE Guidelines. The 2001 Plan called for an additional 700,000 GSF by the Year 2011. The 2006 Update Six-Year plan calls for an additional 852,385 by the Year 2012.*

*One significant difference: the 2006 Update plan responds to changing trends in student housing needs since the 2001 Plan was developed. The 2001 Plan projected a need for 600 beds. When the 2006 Update plan was initiated the total bed count had already risen to 901. The 2006 Update plan forecasts a need for an additional 750 beds by 2011, and another 989 beds by 2021. Additionally, there is a growing market for student apartments vs. traditional residence halls, and a higher GSF/Bed accommodating some of this housing type was factored into the calculation as well.*

*Other significant differences: there was no plan for a Research Park, a Multi-Purpose Arena/Athletic Complex with an Indoor Track/Field house or a Competition Natatorium in the 2001 Plan.*

15. The prior long range plan identifies 4 campus zones (Trembly, Heller, Meadows and Cragmor). Why is the segmentation of campus by these zones no longer being used for planning purposes?

*Response:*

*These are still used. With the Heller property a special space is maintained separate for the most part from campus. This separation continues the rural feel one has when on the Heller Center property, a feel we want to preserve. The Trembly zone is our largest target for growth. Cragmor remains the central or main campus while additional development is planned for the Meadows zone as properties become available and as the University acquires them.*

16. How does regional and local public transportation currently interact with campus and how is it planned to interact in the future?

*Response:*

*A great deal of interaction and coordination occurs with all elements of Public Transportation as UCCS recognizes the need to facilitate the movement of students on and off campus. The City's Transportation office is in close coordination with all the current construction happening in and around the UCCS campus today. On February 13, 2007, as an example, we held a Transportation Demand Management Workshop on the UCCS campus with key transportation leadership in attendance from around the community. This Transportation Demand Management Workshop was designed to look at transportation issues at UCCS and make recommendations for creating a more pedestrian and bicycle friendly campus, increasing the connectivity with Colorado Springs through public transit, and lessening the effect of private vehicles to the campus. Currently, over 87 percent of our community drives to the campus in single-occupancy vehicles, representing over 19 million miles annually and many tons of climate changing carbon dioxide emissions. As an institute of higher education, we felt we needed to be concerned with our impacts and to provide a model for our community in taking care of our environment. We know there is more to do and plans are underway to continue this dialogue in the future.*

17. Proposed academic buildings shown on the 15-year plan, south of the proposed Academic Village on Central Campus, appear to have footprints overlapping land that is not developable due to soil conditions identified in the 2001 Master Plan (Constraint Map #5). Will it be possible to safely construct these academic facilities?

*Response:*

*Yes. As indicated in the response to question #2 above this area is planned to be terraced. Soils below the surface will support safe construction in this location.*

#### **IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**Staff recommends the Commission approves the Facilities Strategic Plan Update for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs as an amendment to the Commission approved 2000 Facilities Master Plan for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.**



**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

C.R.S. 23-1-106 Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning

(3) The commission shall review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education on state-owned or state-controlled land, regardless of source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with and approved master plan, program plan, and physical plan.

(4) The commission shall ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.