**Physical Development Committee (PDC) Minutes** – September 17, 2021

**Location:** Virtual on Microsoft Teams

**Participants:** Tom Satterly, Tim Kemp, Tracey Abel, Sadie Kinney-McGrath, Kristi Buffington, Nik Olsen, Monica Latham, Justin Dove, Bob Kaempfe, Paula Mills, Jim Sites, Mark Ritschard, Dave Bradford, Mike Ellis, Christie Mathews, Tonie Miyamoto, Jamie Gaskill, Maggie Walsh, Beth Adams, Sue James, Linda Krier, Ali Raza, Fred Haberecht, Jessica Kramer, David Hansen, Julia Innes, Adam Vance

**Guests:** Kathryn Stoner, Aaron Fodge, Jared Cumpsten

1. **PDC introductions**
   a. Christie Mathews is replacing Aaron Buckley, representing Administrative Professional Council.
   b. Jamie Gaskill is not serving on PDC, but listening in as a new employee of Parking & Transportation Services.
   c. PDC acts as advisory body to Vice President for University Operations. Concerned about physical environment of total environment; campus experience, aesthetic quality, physical characteristics. PDC works in tandem with the Master Plan Committee (MPC). However, PDC is more tactical while MPC is more strategic.
      i. Architectural control
      ii. Water resource management
      iii. Capital construction priorities and master plan (in conjunction with MPC)
      iv. Land resources
      v. Facilities standards
      vi. Protection of historic properties
      vii. University Public Art Committee is a subcommittee of PDC
   d. As a committee, PDC commits to asking questions through lens of inclusivity, diversity, equity.

2. **Field Research and Education Facility – proposed naming of new building on Foothills Campus**
   a. This project goes back to 2018 when working with various subarea groups on Foothills Campus on Foothills Campus master plan updates.
      i. The Fisheries facilities is located off Rampart Rd. The subarea for Fisheries is generally located within the yellow dotted line shown on the PowerPoint presentation.
      ii. There is a storage facility/maintenance bldg. currently in poor condition, subject to be removed. In 2018 the group approached Facilities Management (FM) through the master plan process about future support bldg. that could help with the Fisheries facility and ultimately replace the current building that is in poor condition.
      iii. Working through an update to this with the master plan committee, including a funded new facility to take to Larimer County.
      iv. This new bldg. is relocated upslope, out of the floodplain – represented in dashed red oval on PowerPoint indicated as “future support bldg.”
   b. Site plan for project
      i. Phase 1: storage area that stores boats, research items, and other items used in field experiment visits
      ii. Phase 2: adds restroom and shop to the facility
   c. Bldg. details – rendering of building is shared via PowerPoint presentation, includes Phase 1 & 2
      i. Project has gone through internal FM Design-Review Committee.
      ii. Will proceed to Larimer County for approval to advance project in Oct. or Nov. 2021.
d. Proposed name: Field Research and Education Facility
   i. Kathryn Stoner says it is important to them to represent Research and education. The structure will be used to stage and prepare both research and education activities that are conducted at Foothills Campus and other areas.
   ii. Have not secured the full amount needed to build entire structure (Phase 1&2).
      1) The College development team likes the general nature of the name because it leaves it open for securing a wider range of donors.

e. Discussion
   i. Comments of support for name
      1) Mark Ritschard in Engineering is supportive.
      2) Maggie Walsh likes it
      3) Tim Kemp likes it.
      4) Nik Olsen is in support.
   ii. Fred asks if this is a unique name. Kristi Buffington agrees that it is. Her only concern is that it is a little long.
      1) Kathryn Stoner says their original proposal for a name was longer. She is unsure what else to take out to shorten it to meet the requirements of the development folks.
      2) Jessica agrees that she wouldn’t want the name to be any longer and that it is unique, but opens up for discussion the question if it is specific enough as to whose field research and education facility it is. At the same time, she wants to acknowledge the need to balance the specifics of ownership which could change vs the generality of naming.
      3) Kathryn wanted “FWCB Field Research and Education,” but it was suggested that was too long. If another unit wants to name a different building “Field Research and Education Facility,” Kathryn suggests at that time could consider adding acronym FWCB (or whatever the acronym might be).

f. Jim Sites motions to endorse the name as proposed “Field Research and Education Facility.”
   i. Sue James seconds the motion.
   ii. Motion approved with no opposition.

3. Vision Zero Priorities
   a. President’s Vision Zero Task Force is an interdisciplinary group (University and City of Fort Collins representatives) with 5 subcommittees that have completed initial action plans and budget requests to accomplish the tasks outlines in the work plans.
   b. Conducted many stakeholder presentations and discussion prior to submitting the request for adoption of Vision Zero to the Executive Leadership Team (ELT).
   c. From the PDC perspective, as a part of Vision Zero, there will be an annual process with recommendations and approval of projects: infrastructure, programmatic, enforcement, data collection. Vision Zero will seek guidance/feedback from the PDC in terms of physical and aesthetic nature of a potential project.
      i. There will be a dedicated line item budget for this effort.
   d. Anticipate Vision Zero will go to ELT in last quarter of 2021 for adoption.
   e. Then will create a public facing website where we will share transportation related data that Vision Zero Taskforce is collecting along with prioritized subprojects.
4. Vision Zero Implementation Update
   a. These are projects brought to PDC in last year that were implemented mostly this summer. Made these improvements through the lens of safety. Lots of review occurred. Most of these projects addressed making crossing movements safer through clear delineation of modes and where users need to be, as well as consistent signage.
   b. **Pitkin & Ellis Intersection** - Student death occurred at this location, leading to initiation of Vision Zero.
      i. Speed control through raised crossing and lane narrowing
      ii. Clearly defined single crosswalk
      iii. Consistent signage and striping
      iv. Protected bike buffer (forthcoming)
      v. Focused education and outreach
   c. **Library Knuckle at LSC Theatre /Morgan Library** – Design study funded by ATFAB
      i. Clear delineation for all modes
      ii. Speed control through barriers and delineators
      iii. Clearly defined crosswalks
      iv. Consistent signage and striping
      v. Focused education and outreach
      vi. Installation of fence panels – creates clear fence delineation
      vii. Intent to keep pedestrians out of the space and delineate clearly where bikes and pedestrians need to be to reduce conflicts.
      viii. Roundabout slows down speeds of modes.
   d. **Library Loading Dock**
      i. Clear delineation for all modes
      ii. Speed control through barriers and delineators
      iii. Clearly defined crosswalks
      iv. Consistent signage and striping
      v. Focused education and outreach
   e. **Monfort Quad Crossing** – part of Nutrien Building project, funded by ATFAB
      i. Clear delineation for all modes
      ii. Separated infrastructure channels speed of mode in appropriate lanes
      iii. Clearly defined crosswalks
      iv. Consistent signage and striping
      v. Buildout of Prairie side loop per Bicycle Master Plan
   f. **University Avenue Intersection**
      i. Clear delineation for all modes
      ii. Separated infrastructure channels speed of mode in appropriate lanes
      iii. Clearly defined crosswalks
      iv. Consistent signage and striping
      v. Additional striping and adjustment of planters to deter unwanted vehicle movements
      vi. Focused education and outreach
   g. **Music Drive Crossing** – resourceful in implementation by leveraging Oval storm water project, making improvements to storm drainage at this area
      i. Single crossing point to sidewalk ramps
ii. Pedestrian refuge island narrows crossing point in front of vehicles
iii. Sets up future accessible route to Ammons Hall (State Funding Received)

h. **Hughes Way Crossing**
i. Improved visibility of bikes and pedestrians at crosswalk by adjusting curbs and ramps
ii. Adjusted curb narrows crossing point in front of vehicles
iii. Accessible ramp improvement
iv. Consistent signage and striping

i. **Lory Trail & Wayfinding** – grant through CDOT to help widen this trail
   i. Constrained trail made safer for all users through widening
   ii. Consistent signage and striping
   iii. Directional wayfinding to aid all modes determine safe route through campus (13 installed)

j. **Rampart Road Trail** – a mile of bike trail added from Overland Trail west to Jud Harper Complex
   i. Detached trail safely removes bikes and pedestrians from roadway
   ii. New lighting at key intersections
   iii. Clearly defined crosswalks with enhanced push button crossing at 2 locations
       1) Horses to safely cross street as well as peds
   iv. Consistent signage and striping

k. **(Forthcoming) Mountain Loop Separated Trail** – funded by CDOT grant & ATFAB
   i. Trail separates modes by speed
   ii. Pedestrian/bike roundabout on Pitkin clarifies intersection movements
   iii. Updated lighting
   iv. Remove vehicle from trail
   v. Consistent signage and striping

l. **(Forthcoming) ADA Enhancements** – funded by State Architect’s Office
   i. Improve deficient infrastructure
   ii. Reconstruct ramps with slopes and tactile warning pads
   iii. Reconstruct sidewalks with inappropriate slopes and deficient surfaces

m. **Vision Zero is Infrastructure, Enforcement, Education, and Policy working in tandem – progress made in all of these areas.**
i. Roundabout at Library Knuckle is good example of this.
   1) Student employees and full-time employees verbally engaging on this site with users about how to navigate this area safely, answer questions. Enforcement also on site for those who don’t want to use it correctly.
   ii. Vision Zero is the constant commitment to learning, experimenting, and making improvements to safety.

n. **Outcome of adoption of Vision Zero, will continue to have projects like this. Coming projects are funded through multiple sources.**
i. Line item base funding
ii. Grants
   1) A year ago, there was preliminary engineering design for separated corridor between Visual Arts, MRB, and Gifford. Extensive stakeholder involvement. Rewarded grant out of 72 applicants for $600,000 to create separated trail.
This funding is combined with an investment from ATFAB for second bike roundabout by Braiden at the Pitkin bikeway.

2) Grant applications are strong because of the formal process and being able to tell CSU’s story.

3) Tim Kemp points out that we have great data and this ties into grant applications.

5. **Foothills Campus Compost Facility Accessory Structures**
   a. Facilities Management (FM) is requesting an accessory structure to support the composting facility at Foothills campus outside typical structures
      i. Reviewed through internal FM Design Review Committee.
   b. Compost Facility – Benefits
      i. What do we compost – food waste, animal bedding and manure, green waste
      ii. How much – 396 tons in 1 year
      iii. Dedication to Students – living, leaning laboratory; part of CSU’s sustainability mission
      iv. Waste Reduction – diverts 300,000 pounds of preconsumer food waste from landfill
      v. Compost use – used on landscaping and horticulture projects. Also donated and sold.
   c. Non-Standard Accessory Structures – examples on campus, approved recently:
      i. Storage Pods
      ii. Jack Christensen Track Storage
      iii. Painter Center Storage
      iv. Bike shelters
      v. Bus shelters
   d. Compost Facility – Site Context
      i. Red dotted line in presentation indicates compost facility
      ii. Yellow is proposed site for the structure
      iii. Located at Laporte Ave
      iv. Site utility limitations include: No sanitary sewer and limited water
         1) There is power
      v. Facility operated by FM in conjunction with HDS, ARBL, and CVMBS
         1) Request to add small break room and restroom facility
         2) Restroom for groups that tour the site and for employees who work on site
         3) Undeveloped site today
         4) Proximity to parking and access needs beneficial to site
      vi. Red rectangles in presentation are site plan indicating the two accessory structures
         1) Upper structure is storage and breakroom area
         2) Lower structure is restroom facility
         3) Grey area is the sidewalk connecting the two facilities
         4) Yellow - Access for vehicles
      vii. Currently working outside of a tuff shed and in vehicles. There is not a defined space for employees to work from.
   e. Cost effective for structure, cognizant of utility challenges
      i. Precast concrete structures similar to what would be found at forest service/park type facility
      ii. Prefabricated structure built off site.
iii. Siding may have barn wood type impression in concrete.

iv. Roof - concrete shingled material that represents cedar shake type shingle.

v. Cognizant of foothills – proposed colors of structures appropriate for surroundings. Recommendation is to pick grey or tan range for color palette to blend with surrounding landscape.

vi. Power run to it for lighting and simple outlets.

vii. There is not a sanitary sewer connection. Have this similar to trail head facility with a truck that pumps out the unit.

viii. Very durable and weather resistant material.

f. For all accessory structures, clarification that this is not an implementation of a campus standard. This is an exception or variance of campus standards for good reason.

g. Discussion

i. Stacey Baumgarn, “Regarding the restroom at the Composting site - have you explored using a composting toilet? (Instead of a vault)” 
   1) Project Manager Jared Cumpsten – they talked about composting toilet, but the current idea meets their needs. Could explore if needed.

ii. Tonie Miyamoto – Wonders if a composting toilet could be part of the composting facility, which is a living lab. She could see this becoming a part of the educational tour components and at that facility.
   1) Fred Haberecht asks, what are the cost implications of the two approaches?
   2) Jared Cumpsten – would need to explore what would be required/allowed from code perspective for the composting toilet.

iii. David Hansen adds that this is an industrial-type of site. What are the limitations we might want to consider putting on this type of request for the future, so that this isn’t precedence-setting?
   1) Tim agrees that it’s important to be cognizant of exceptions and precedence-setting. He is in support of the project.

iv. Mike Ellis asks in Teams chat, “What do the employees on site think about the proposed structures?”
   1) Fred Haberecht and David Hansen respond that the lack of having this type of facility has been a concern for employees, and they don’t feel like they have an equitable situation without a facility. There is nowhere to go without sitting in their vehicle.
   2) Jared Cumpsten – these facilities will meet their needs and the employees are on board with proposed structures and have been wanting them for quite a while.
   3) Tom Satterly says FM has been trying to figure out a solution for five years. Staff operate out of their vehicles. They run their AC and heaters to have an environment that keeps them comfortable from hot or cold weather. People tour this space. Need to provide them with a facility. They are in support of the design that Remodel & Construction Services came up with.

h. Facilities Management is supportive but do not want this to be precedent setting.

i. Stacey writes, “To the degree that it is precedent setting - perhaps a composting toilet is the appropriate solution? What is the life cycle cost implications of the choice?”
ii. Nik Olsen, “I think the pressing need near would be to meet the needs of employees on a long-term scale. We certainly do not plan to end operations out there so a permanent solution for shelter and bathrooms is going to be critical for long term.”

iii. Fred Haberecht that we should ask when working through projects ask, Are we providing an inclusive equitable environment for the CSU community?
   1) Jessica Kramer adds in Teams chat, “Yes, this would be inclusive for the employees, the students and any other visitors to the facility”
   2) Desire to explore composting toilet from educational and sustainability perspective.

iv. Tom Satterly shares that they put in a composting toilet in Georgia. Having enough utilization is critical. Include the life cycle cost analysis of composting toilet with understanding that we continue to move forward if it doesn’t work out. Need to have a better understanding of how much use there will be.

i. Nik Olsen motions for approval of this facility and to explore the possibilities, ramifications, feasibility, and life cycle cost of including a compost toilet on this site. This is approved on a one-time basis.
   i. Tonie Miyamoto seconds.
   ii. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passes.

j. **UPDATED INFORMATION:** Recommendation to not install a composting toilet based on code guidance. The State Plumbing Board does not allow composting toilets in higher education.

6. **PDC Voting Membership & Quorum**

a. The membership of this committee brings together multiple areas of expertise for making sound recommendations. Each member of this committee will represent one of the following constituencies and will be responsible for reporting the activities of this committee to their particular constituency.
   i. Representatives to be designated by respective deans, vice-president or council vote.
   ii. PDC is not just a deliberative body but also the expectation is that the discussions and decisions made here are communicated back to the respective groups that make up the membership.
   iii. PDC makes a recommendation to VPUO.
   iv. PDC has been going on for over 25 years, and then over 40 years in previous incarnations.
   v. PDC is receptive to including representation from other areas of the university.

b. **PDC Quorum = 1 more than half the voting members present to vote**

c. **Voting Members**
   i. Chair, AVP of Facilities Management
   ii. Office of the President representative
   iii. Office of the Provost representative
   iv. Office of the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence representative
   v. Office of the Vice President for Research & Information Technology representative
   vi. Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs representative
   vii. Office of the Vice President for University Advancement representative
   viii. Office of the Vice President for MarComm
   ix. Office of General Counsel
x. College representatives (1 each)
xi. Administrative Professional Council representative
xii. Classified Personnel Council representative
xiii. Faculty Council representative
xiv. ASCSU representative
xv. Academic Computing and Networking Services representative
xvi. Athletics representative
xvii. University Library representative
xviii. Risk & Public Safety representative
xix. President’s Sustainability Commission
xx. Central Receiving representative
xxi. Parking & Transportation representative
xxii. University Police representative
xxiii. Student Disabilities Center representative
d. Ex Officio (staff supports, prepares materials, and facilitates discussion or is an additional participant under an office that is already represented in voting membership)
i. Architect on staff at the University
ii. Landscape Architect on staff at the University
iii. Additional Facilities Managements staff
iv. City of Fort Collins representative
v. Marketing & Brand Management representative (Under MarComm)
vi. Student Leadership, Involvement, & Community Engagement (SLICE) (Under the Division of Student Affairs)
e. Discussion
i. Tonie Miyamoto asks if President’s Sustainability Commission (PSC) is a voting member or ex officio.
   1) Fred thinks PSC should be a voting member.
   2) Sue James agrees.
   3) Stacey writes, “PSC and many other members are listed on the website (more than were indicated on the slide). Perhaps the website should clarify who is voting and who is ex-officio.”
   4) **ACTION ITEM (Julia) — clarify on webpage.**
ii. Stacey Baumgarn – agrees that these are good clarifications. Appreciates university committees formalizing their processes and operating guidelines and it is helpful when talking about shared governance to have this defined. Stacey’s experience on PDC is positive. “The PDC provides proper notice to representatives for meetings both inside and outside of meetings when action is needed.” Suggests adding a sentence like this that indicates members are given proper notice when action is needed/taken.
   1) **ACTION ITEM (Julia) - add to webpage.**
iii. Christie Mathews – asks about taking info back to APC to get a read on constituents. Will there be an opportunity to gain feedback before voting on initiatives?
   1) Fred Haberecht is unsure how it would work if each group would have to go back to their group to get consensus before making a recommendation; it
could get unwieldy. Historically PDC is receptive to holding an item if there
needs to be greater input of stakeholders.

a) Example: With the Black Lives Matter pavement painting PDC
said other groups needed to give more input before they went
forth with the project.

iv. Sue James suggests that for decisions of import and scale, a PDC member could make a
motion to table an agenda item for further deliberation to ensure representatives for
the impacted groups have time to discuss it and get more input from the groups.

1) Fred Haberecht agrees the PDC has always been receptive to that.
2) Christie Mathews is understanding that this type of work often happens as
part of project development before it comes to the committee. Christie can
also share out the agenda with her group (APC) to collect any initial
thoughts before the meeting if possible.
3) Sue James says this wouldn’t be a change to the bylaws because it can
already be done.

7. IDEA Corridor Facility Planning Recommendation – given to Council of Deans, indicating suggested
process of approval for capital development projects.

a. IDEA corridor (Center Ave. Mall extended) is from Laurel Street to Lake (by Physiology,
Environmental Health, & MRB)

b. Buildings associated with the corridor have 50% of research labs and 75% of classrooms on
campus

c. Why change now?

i. There is a greater system level expectation and accountability that indicates there must
be rigorous justification for new space.

1) Validity for new space
2) Based on individual program growths and assumptions
3) Needs sustained financial viability

ii. Limited future debt capacity

d. Enrollment pressure due to demographic changes – fewer potential students coming to
universities.

e. Program Plan → Design → Construction

i. Traditionally kicked off projects with a program plan, then Board of Governor’s
approval, then proceed to design and construction.

f. Proposed process that occurs first and improves the process:

i. Program Assessment → Financial Assessment (Viability Assessment by CSU
Leadership) → Space Assessment

1) Need resources to perform these steps adequately
2) Need to be systematic and inclusive

g. Goals

i. Enhance partnership between university and colleges
ii. Provide roadmap from concept to bldg. opening
iii. Redefine colleges’ accountability and ownership in the IDEA corridor
iv. Create sustainable academic and business plans supported by all stakeholders and
market data.
h. Program Assessment, Financial Assessment, Space Assessment can yield efficiencies.
   i. Sharing this at PDC to show what is going on and what the expectations are for colleges.
   ii. Tom Satterly comments that we have done well, but this process will be more informed (what we operate and maintain), more inclusive, and this effort will require resources (FM staff and space analysis consultants = approx. $700,000 one-time cost). This effort pulls in our culture, values, and new leaders.
      1) Real estate is a premium. From a life cycle FM perspective, each time we add a new building, we add on the maintenance and reinvestment. All current facilities add up to $300,000,000 in major repairs that we continue to defer. We receive less than 5% on an annual basis. Important to limit the number of assets that we manage so we can invest in those future resources in a smarter way.
      2) He endorses this effort, but it is an investment (cost and time).
   iii. Fred Haberecht add that the CST and academic master plan efforts will be aligned with this; this is the mechanism for realizing those goals in those efforts.
   iv. Sue James thinks that for people who have been on campus for a long time this is overdue and a good move.
   v. Fred Haberecht thought it was rewarding to hear the provost comment that we need to know what we are prioritizing, how big we will become, what areas will grow, etc. Fred thinks these basic measures are critical tools in physical master planning.