

Physical Development Committee (PDC) 12/18/2020

Location: Virtual on Microsoft Teams

Participants: Martina Wilkinson, Joe Olson, Aaron Buckley, Stacey Baumgarn, Nik Olsen, Tim Kemp, Stacey Baumgarn, Sophia Shepp, Kristi Buffington, Mike Ellis, Bob Kaempfe, Sadie Kinney-McGrath, Monica Latham, Jenifer Marley, Tonie Miyamoto, Mark Paschke, Aaron Fodge, Ali Raza, Mark Ritschard, Mike Rush, Kathy Sisneros, Jim Sites, Dustin Vinzant, Shelly Carroll, David Bradford, Steve Burn, Fred Haberecht, Julia Innes, Jessica Kramer, Justin Dove, Tracey Abel, Sue Doe, Sue James, Jason Meisner, Paula Mills, Wendy Rich-Goldschmidt

- 1) **Transportation Safety Policy & Protocols** (presented by Next Phase Engineering, Martina Wilkinson & Joe Olson)
 - a. This is an outcome of the Transportation & Mobility Safety Task Force final report, a multi-disciplinary group that comprehensively reviewed safety across campus.
 - i. Hired consultants to do a quick review of all the traffic control devices on campus; to look at infrastructure design and changes to intersections; crash data review and analysis.
 - ii. The Task Force identified 4 areas of opportunity: Enforcement, Infrastructure, Policy and Standards, and Education. All four are critically important.
 - b. Next Phase Engineering – the consultants hired to establish and develop policies and protocols.
 - i. Began by wanting to develop a set of technical guidelines, identifying what signage goes where, how to be consistent with traffic control devices on campus, etc., but realized there were more topics to this informed by their outreach discussions.
 - ii. The outreach provided a holistic review of people’s perspectives on campus, heard about challenges and what was working well, wish lists and other ideas.
 - iii. Organized into 4 categories
 1. Technical Guidelines
 2. Processes to support guidelines
 3. Programmatic concepts
 4. Implementation prioritization – risk & ADA compliance to help prioritize, then consistency of location and non-standard items
 - c. Technical Guidelines
 - i. Primary tenet of applying traffic control devices (like traffic signs and traffic pavement markings) is the need for consistency in application to make them effective and to get the most proper responses. When locations are treated differently, it can be difficult for people to know how to react.
 - ii. There is a national standard on traffic control devices called Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices by the Federal Highway Administration. It is very detailed with many things that don’t apply on campus and limited on some situations that occur on campus, such as the trail and path system for bikes and pedestrians.
 - iii. Produced technical guidelines to focus on what is common to campus and on the trail/path system – put together 14 typical drawings to help with those in the field to do it consistently and approx. 20 pages of text summarizing guidelines to apply traffic control devices consistently.
 - d. Key Recommendations

- i. *Authority and process for traffic control changes and traffic control maintenance* - formalize review and approval
 - 1. Currently these processes are spread out across different depts. on campus, and it isn't always clear who is making decisions and on what, so we need to formalize the process, so everyone knows who is doing what, regarding traffic control devices.
- ii. *Annual Crash Reporting and analysis* - annualize analysis and review
 - 1. On-going, annual look at this data to monitor trends and patterns and make sure we are addressing them.
- iii. *Work Zones* - clarify process, review, and maintenance
 - 1. Process of reviewing and maintaining is not always clear, so this needs focus.
- iv. *Priority Zones* – review potential for priority zones to address vehicle bike/ped conflicts
 - 1. Intended to address safety and locations where bicyclists and pedestrians cross heavily. Crosswalks – saw inconsistent application of devices.
- v. *Speed Management* – develop guidelines around increased use of vertical elements
 - 1. Some roads on campus easier to go faster than speed limit 20 miles/hour, so introduce speed control device such as raised speed cables or raised intersections.
- e. Additional recommendation of the Vision Zero Action Plan
 - i. The philosophy behind Vision Zero is that traffic deaths and serious injuries are not acceptable. Nationwide there are 38,000 fatal crashes every year – the idea is that this is not acceptable, not even one is acceptable. It's a proactive approach to traffic safety rather than reactive approach. Similar to what safety task force is already doing. It is a broader, more comprehensive review of the education, outreach, infrastructure, policy and standard efforts brought under one program.
 - ii. Vision Zero is meant to drive culture change. Vision Zero approach is to make people think about it all the time and that doing behaviors that are unsafe are not acceptable.
- f. Vision Zero Action Plan – Next Steps
 - i. Commitment from leadership
 - ii. Visible champion for the program
 - iii. Multi-discipline core group, broader than transportation topics, including inclusivity and social justice to think about the perspectives of everyone using the transportation system.
 - iv. Identify strategies and develop keystone actions
 - 1. Enforcement
 - 2. Engineering
 - v. Engage everyone and promote culture of safety
 - 1. Education/communication/engagement – allows the culture to shift so that the expectation is that everyone is focused on safety.
- g. Martina Wilkinson adds, when task forces are created there is an urgency; they were created because of a particular incident or tragedy that may have occurred. It is important to continue to think about what might come next, even after the final report is compiled.
- h. PDC Discussion - Asking PDC to adopt the technical standards in the report, and affirm the 5 recommendations plus the recommendation of developing a Vision Zero action plan.
 - i. Jim Sites asks, if people have specific suggestions or feedback going forward, who would they talk to?

1. They could reach out to Fred Haberecht as the Chair of the Transportation & Mobility Safety Task Force, which is a subcommittee of the Public Safety Team. Task Force includes membership from PD, HDS, PTS, FM, and more.
 2. Jim thinks communicating through the colleges and depts would be most effective way to share the information. FM could do it during biennial mtgs with the depts.
- i. Tracey Abel comments on the third recommendation of the “work zone – clarifying the process” – we have both on-campus work that happens with team members, but a lot is tied contractually to capital projects in work zone areas. Important to create a standard for this so that we can tie to it contractually.
 - j. Sue James likes the Vision Zero Action Plan, and thinks this should come to Faculty Council.
 - i. Sue Doe adds in Teams chat, “I agree with Sue J. Both approaches would be great--through the Colleges and via Faculty Council as well! Just want to say that we would welcome you at EC, Fred. This is Sue Doe, Chair of Faculty Council.”
 - ii. This team went to faculty executive council team to present the Safety Task Force recommendations, so that would make sense to bring this back and get on agenda.
 1. **Action item (Julia Innes):** Schedule with Sue Doe.
 - k. Nik Olsen writes in Teams chat, “Would this be something that would best be codified through University policy? That would initiate a formal administrative review.”
 - i. Tom Satterly shares that the chief of staff had discussed including Vision Zero in the President’s courageous strategic transformation (CST) planning.
 - ii. Fred Haberecht adds that when they presented this to the Public Safety Team, Ann Claycomb thought it would be natural to discuss including this into the strategic transformation of the university.
 - iii. Codifying through policy vs through the CST planning is an active discussion among Safety Task Force members.
 1. Fred says Vision Zero is a broad look at safety and has aspects of inclusivity and sustainability in it, so it can be hard to fit in an absolute policy in the typical way.
 - iv. Tom Satterly appreciates the concern that Vision Zero would be captured somewhere. He thinks the CST plan provides a good framework that would provide validity, coming from the top down, and could avoid the need for creating and maintaining a policy in the future. He recommends STC because early on President McConnell shared her idea of strategic planning at the Master Plan Committee. She believes it is transformative and it is a living document. If the strategic plan is updated every few years that would ensure that Vision Zero does not become stale or forgotten.
 - l. Stacey Baumgarn writes in Teams chat, “If we adopt these standards - how do they enhance / replace / interact with existing standards? I am very impressed with the proposed standards - I just want to understand how they interact with what we may have already had (good or bad).”
 - i. Martina Wilkinson answers that the intent is for these standards to dovetail into the existing standards and state and national standards, and to set the framework for the updated engineering and design standards, occurring next spring.
 - ii. Fred Haberecht says that part of the current dilemma is that sometimes the standards are ambiguous and who interprets the standards is not currently centralized.
 - iii. Tim Kemp adds that there is some funding available to change out signs and add striping, and a trail-to-trail intersection by the library to redo the intersection.

- m. CSU PD perspective on these recommendations and Vision Zero
 - i. Dustin Vinzant comments that with the four-pronged approach (enforcement, education, policy/standards, infrastructure) he believes PD will need some items put into policy in order to support the enforcement component. Traffic laws exist, but at the core of campus there are rules around the flow of pedestrian, bike, and vehicle traffic going well, which don't always fit into state laws. PD is pushing for some of this to be put into policy so that enforcement can help move the vision forward. To put the infrastructure in place, after the phase of education, then the enforcement will come.
 - ii. Wendy Rich-Goldschmidt adds that this is long overdue. As campus continues to become very busy with many modes of transportation, Wendy believes the time is now. From a PD perspective, they want to work in collaboration from an educational perspective, first and foremost; want to be part of the proactive educational piece and then can educate through enforcement, if needed. Agrees for the need for consistency in signage and on our approach going forward, including a variety of perspectives and subject matter experts.
 - iii. Jason Meisner would like us, as much as we can, to add appropriate barricades and barriers through intelligent environmental design, that is better because there can only be so much enforcement. One other concern Jason has is that there will be one standard on one side of street and another on the opposite side pertaining to bike trails.
 - 1. Fred Haberecht says some of CSU standards will go further because we are in a denser bike environment.
 - 2. Joe Olson says the intent is to build these so they are tied into the city standards and consistent. However, they may be more in-depth in some locations because of the volume of people crossing the road. The university has a great relationship with the city in this area.
- n. Nik Olsen comments in Teams chat, "We had a lot of success in public health messaging for the pandemic through a social norming campaign. Research has demonstrated that people are more likely to behave in a certain way if they know that is how the majority of others behave. For example, if we can share a factoid like '95% of cyclists stop at stop signs on campus' it could encourage the behavior we are wanting to see."
 - i. Social norming would fall into the education recommendation where it is culturally unacceptable to create an unsafe situation.
- o. Motion to adopt the standards in the report and affirm the six recommendations.
 - i. Mark Ritschard makes the motion.
 - ii. Tim Kemp seconds the motion.
 - iii. The PDC approves the motion without any objections expressed.

2) Indoor Bike Parking Standard (presented by Aaron Fodge, PTS)

- a. Purpose is to discuss aspirations for campus distribution of this facility/amenity type.
- b. CSU has a Wheeled Conveyance Policy
 - i. The goal of it is to keep wheeled items like bikes and skateboards out of buildings to keep facilities in good working order, not damaged from commuters bringing their conveyance indoors, and not deteriorated from the abuse of wheeled vehicles marking the walls, etc.

- ii. From Environmental Health Services perspective, don't want them parked where they could impact egress or the ability for someone to get out of a building.
- iii. An audit showed that most buildings (66 out of 70) had bikes in bldgs.
- c. We have a need for a standard because we see projects starting to site these facility types such as the CSU Spur – Vida. A bike room is a way to achieve LEED certification credit points.
- d. Crafted Standard Design Elements, vetted through Facilities Management review process.
 - i. Facility with separate entrance directly into where storing bikes indoors, avoiding main entrances.
 - ii. Durable flooring and wall - can hold up to bikes
 - iii. A way to lock bike
 - iv. Repair stand
 - v. Key card access
- e. LEED Certification – can get up to 2 points by adding this kind of facility to bldgs.
 - i. Goal is to get long term bike storage within 100 feet walking distance from entrance of bldg.
 - ii. Accessible to all users
 - iii. Recommendation to have access to shower nearby
- f. See examples of bike storage facility in presentation
- g. Building Signage – Environmental Graphics Designer Jessica Kramer has a sign standard that could be posted in doors/windows acknowledging the building has bike storage inside.
- h. How should the facilities be distributed across campus?
 - i. Align with future new construction projects?
 - ii. Is there a preferred distance from other bldgs.?
 - iii. LEED requirement of new bldgs.?
- i. PDC Discussion
 - i. Mark Ritschard – likes the idea of requiring this in new bldgs. Wants to know, how do we address this in existing bldgs.? It would be nice to provide a solution for some of the closely clustered bldgs. in the center of campus for those who like to ride their bikes there.
 - 1. Could look at bldgs. that have space available to do this. If dept or college felt they had a space identified, then could work through the process of FM estimate of designing the room to the standard.
 - ii. Mark Paschke – likes the idea and thinks we should strive to put as many into existing and new buildings, but is hesitant to require them in new bldgs. because it could become a challenge for people trying to raise funding. He wants to know – how would you manage these spaces? Would they be open to anyone on campus or only to people in the bldg.? Would they fill up with abandoned vehicles?
 - 1. Aaron responds: Not saying today that new buildings should require this. Want there to be design standards to make sure buildings can withstand the pressures of bringing bikes inside.
 - 2. In terms of access, with amenities such as lactation rooms, the expectation is that anyone could have access as an enrolled student or employee. Would key card the facility to regulate what Mark P. described. If a request is made for access to the room and there is space available, make sure the room is being used for commuting. Intent of room is not to store a bike for long-term, but to support commuting. Key card access would be shared with PTS to help manage that.

- iii. Tracey Abel asks in Teams chat, “has a study been done on cost per square footage for new build out space needed to accommodate all clearance?” She adds that she likes the comment that this facility is not required in new buildings, but having a standard in place is great. Requirements sometimes compete with actual square footage for a user group if there isn’t a clear understanding of cost per sq. ft. Knowing what is required and what is optional is helpful.
 - 1. Aaron responds that they didn’t put in size requirements, but could do that. **Action Item (Aaron):** Reach out to a peer university to find out cost per sq. ft. What is preferred sq. footage to seek in new construction? Also related – finishes and how conditioned the space is mechanically. Could possibly also have LEED requirement discussion to guide this as well.
 - 2. Aaron adds that another option is exterior secure bike parking. We have two facilities on campus that meet this new standard.
 - 3. Tracey mentioned space required for bikes – horizontal vs vertical. Aaron reminds us that a challenge with vertical hanging racks is that a user may not have strength to lift the bike to hang it, but it does change sq. footage, so could provide both options.
- iv. Tom Satterly asks, where would the proposed locations be distributed on campus? In a similar manner to amenities such as lactation rooms and reflection rooms, how would they be prioritized so we know where there is a need and where we would like to see them? Suggests focusing on where the need is and to look at existing structures. Tom says Facilities Management is working on custodial breakrooms and equipment storage rooms. If we knew where the highest need was, there may be a way to trade off space and leverage the need for including a bike storage area in an existing building, then reach out to ATFAB for funding.
 - 1. Aaron responds that we could use GIS and building occupant data to see where highest occupancy is to make a recommendation for future facilities.
- v. Dustin Vinzant likes idea of dedicated spaces because it will give everyone an opportunity to comply with the rules, so bikes aren’t in emergency access areas. Adds that he would advise against putting these in mechanical rooms due to critical infrastructure protection, wouldn’t want to give people access to the workings of bldgs. Due to safety concerns for event spaces, we remove bikes around certain areas like Canvas Stadium, Moby, Lory Student Center, so should keep that in mind when designing these spaces. It needs to be standalone facility or away from structural amenity that could be perceived as risk.
- vi. Jessica Kramer reminds us that as with reflection rooms and lactation rooms these bike facilities should not be limited to building applicants. Sharing as campus wide resource is critical. Jessica would like to see these to be requirement in new construction similar to lactation rooms. She explains in Teams chat, “As a member of the Inclusive Physical and Virtual Campus committee, I'd like to see new construction be required to include such a space similar to the standards for lactation rooms and reflections rooms: as Aaron said, PDC and Master Plan Committee approved the 500 feet requirements. So that if a new building is being built, if there isn't a lactation room in another building within 500 feet of the new building, then the new building would be required to add one. The specific distance c doesn't have to also be 500 feet, can be more.” She continues, “I'd also like to see the same approach for reflection rooms and lactation rooms: anyone on campus can utilize these rooms (reflection rooms now require a key card access), not just the building occupants.

Space is of course valuable and so adjacent buildings can share one indoor bike storage room so that not every building on campus needs to bear the burden (cost/space) of having an indoor bike storage room.”

1. Stacey Baumgarn agrees, writing in Teams chat, “Can we use the same approach as Jessica has suggested? Seems Fred is saying yes??”
- vii. Tim Kemp has reviewed the draft standards and the comment log and comment responses over the last few months. Thinks that after adoption of the standards, we could look for an opportunity for a pilot project that can allow us to document the cost, to see how operations and maintenance works, and to do a user survey to get input on how it works.
- viii. Aaron returns to the question, what is our aspiration for distribution of these facilities? How are these geographically dispersed? He thinks the steps would be to adopt the standards, amend the wheeled conveyance policy to support this facility type, and create a map to see where the void is. Would be helpful to have specific GIS-based recommendation on map.
1. **Action Item (Aaron):** Deliver map at next PDC mtg for the most highly occupied buildings on campus with underlay where surface bike parking, covered bike parking, and secured bike parking with numbers to show how all parking assets come together.