

Master Plan Committee Minutes

Wednesday, August 9, 1:30–2:30 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 324

Members: Fred Haberecht, Nancy Hurt, Dave Bradford, Tom Satterly, Jan Nerger, Lynn Johnson, Blanche Hughes, Mark Wdowik, Kathleen Henry, Rick Miranda

Other participants: David Hansen, Aaron Fodge, Seth Lorson, Terry Schlicting, Kristi Buffington, Hanna Johnson, Josh Silva, Shelly Carroll, Mike Ellis, Julia Innes

1. Foothills Master Plan Update

- a. Please feel free to provide feedback to the proposed process narrative.

2. Engineering/LSC Connector Bridge & Canopies

- a. Today is not about making a decision, but just to record comments and make an informed recommendation. The discussion will be about aesthetics, use, functionality, condition, long-term and short term value of the bridge and canopy to the campus community. What is the highest best use? To leave it and repair it or to remove it?
- b. The canopy is original to the building, cast in place to keep people out of rain and sun. The bridge came later connecting LSC to Engineering.
 - i. This is a cosmetic issue—both the canopy and bridge are structurally sound; however, they need investment in water-proofing, paint, patch; and some areas where the structure has been exposed recently, where there will be a soffit covering up the exposed areas.
- c. There are alternatives to the bridge accessibility, options to traverse between the two buildings with stairs and elevators. If the bridge were to be removed there are accessible routes from all levels of both buildings to the ground floor, but they may or may not be as convenient as with the bridge or highest best use.
 - i. There is only one elevator in the engineering wing for someone to go from upper floor to ground floor.
 - ii. Several elevators and options within LSC that can get you from upper level to lower levels.
 - iii. There is a stair case right at the bridge for those who do not have ADA-access needs.
- d. Observation from Terry Schlicting that the bridge serves as an emergency exit for people in wheelchairs. The elevators shut down in an emergency and with the bridge you can cross over to the other buildings. He does agree that there are other ways to access/cross over in non-emergency situations.
 - i. Mike Ellis says that from an accessibility perspective, the bridge is an area of refuge.
- e. Tom Satterly explains that the sense of urgency comes about because the state has identified \$360,000 for a control maintenance program to occur next year for the bridge. There are code compliant issues with the bridge, so it needs to be brought to code, repaired, replaced or removed. We have about a year to make a decision on this.
- f. Master Plan talks about a parking structure in the Engineering parking lot. This is a parking structure in our floodway that would have special considerations for that; it is possible to have one there if the university continues to grow and there is a funding model as well as a need for parking in the future. From a planning standpoint this

structure could be there. Also, in the future (10–15-year time frame) there is a possibility for redeveloping Glover and Allison nearby.

- i. Because of the grade, there is potential for a direct connection to the level of the parking structure to LSC for programming needs.
 - g. Code: From door to door, the bridge is too steep for its length and wouldn't meet ADA standards.
 - i. The hand rail is not per code.
 - ii. The incline is not per code
 - 1. It exceeds 1 and 12 ramp, no more than 30 inches. Would have to have an intermediate landing. To accomplish that could be difficult and could mean tearing it apart.
 - iii. There is adequate landing at both sides—about 7 ft.
 - h. Terry says that going that way is not ideal for people with manual wheel chairs who push their own chairs.
 - i. If the grade is too steep, would the whole bridge have to be redone?
 - 1. Fred says he believes they would have to redo the deck for the bridge at the very least to fix that problem, possibly the bridge.
 - i. Keep in mind, in developing campus, there is a major gateway from the transit center, as well as investment in the LSC plaza.
 - i. Aesthetically, are the bridge and canopy a visual distraction?
 - 1. There is a lot of canopy in a constrained space.
 - 2. Positive comments when the canopy was taken down between Library and Clark.
 - 3. Facilities thinks the aesthetics does not match with the aesthetics of the buildings and it does not reflect a positive image of the university.
 - ii. Functionally:
 - 1. There are three times as many students going through that space now than at the time when the canopy was built. People stream through the space and don't specifically walk under the canopy.
 - 2. The canopy is very close to both building, and is too much.
 - 3. Mike Ellis points out that the canopy was not built to support the existing entry. The entry has nothing over it.
 - j. Comments
 - i. Mike Ellis thinks we should get rid of the canopy, but advocates for the bridge. He believes the bridge is important to the function and accessibility of the building.
 - 1. He thinks it is important for older people and people with accessibility needs, especially in an emergency.
 - 2. 600 people use the bridge a day according to a traffic analysis done by a student civil engineering senior project a year ago. From the students' perspective, it would be important to keep and rebuild the bridge.
 - 3. That area was designed to be restrictive because the intent was for students to come through the building rather than exterior to building as part of previous master planning process.
 - ii. Mike and Fred point out that the Bridge doesn't constrict flow, but does take a load off the pinch point because there are less people using the stairs due to the availability of cross over flow. Having the elevated alternate route in the bridge

means someone in a wheel chair doesn't have to fight through the flow of the crowd to get to their destination, so it is a plus to have the bridge.

- iii. Shelly Carroll comments that they have not been maintained. If we take down the canopy and keep the bridge, then we need to make a conscious effort to fund the upkeep of the bridge.
- iv. As Kristi Buffington said, people don't use the canopies because they drip in the rain.
- v. Dave Hansen notes that the ground level is also slanted, and there is an opportunity for the concrete to be redone, to have a safer more logical connection to the plaza.
 - 1. Fred agrees that there is a lot of incremental design over fifty years that doesn't add up to a functional space.
- vi. Operationally, during the winter, it is hard to clear the space due to the columns and tight confines; if the space was opened up, it would make it safer and easier.
- vii. Blanche Hughes, Jan Nerger, and Hanna Johnson from ASCSU agree that in bad weather and late at night, functionally it's good to have the bridge to stay inside and move across safely. Terry concurs that it is useful to use the bridge during cold weather. Hanna agrees there are problems with the canopy.
- viii. Josh Silva agrees with the consensus on the bridge. He points out that the canopy ties into the honeycomb structure. Aesthetically, there is a pattern/design that is integrated into the building and around the campus. If we open up that space, there would be more traffic; the redesign spills over into different parts of the building, may bring more people in.
- ix. Agreement that this needs to become two different discussions: canopy and bridge.
- x. Lynn Johnson asks about the redesign of the LSC and timeframe of how it plays into canopy/bridge.
 - 1. Mike Ellis is aiming for 2020 redesign.
 - 2. It turns into big project with the canopy system tied into it. Removing the canopy now helps later on down the road.
- xi. Lynn asks how far will the resources take us for what needs to happen.
 - 1. Depends on the scope. When the civil-engineering study (referred to above) was done two years ago, it would cost a little less than 200k to repair the bridge.
- xii. Discussion of the view shed related to the bridge: There isn't a lot to see when you look up from the stairs, so the view shed doesn't seem hampered by the bridge.
- k. Consensus is to repair the bridge and keep it, but to remove the canopy.
 - i. **Action Item (Facilities):** Revise scope and return to MPC with an update on how far funding will go. Bring back options and prioritize them for MPC.
 - 1. Give an estimate to remove canopy and repair the bridge, addressing the code issues.
 - 2. Include how much it would cost to renovate part of the plaza—if the funding can reach that far. Possibly an opportunity to partner with the LSC?

3. Parking and Transportation on Campus (Dave Bradford/Aaron Fodge)

- a. The university does a mode split survey data every year with a statistically valid sample.

- i. They hire Neon Global to do the survey of students and employees.
 - ii. They ask, What is the primary and secondary modes of transportation and how many days do they do it? (See presentation for results.)
 - iii. Our results are great! In comparison, the city's goal for biking is to hit 20% for their climate action plan for primary mode; today, they are at about 6–8%. CSU is at 16%.
- b. Discussion of sample response rate / is 1,000 enough across the university to consider a valid sample?
 - i. 1,000 is a good sample size. From a research standpoint, Aaron is confident that this is representative.
 - ii. They receive a randomized sample list from ACNS every year.
 - iii. **Action Item (Aaron):** Share this info with Jan Nerger.
- c. There was a decrease in driving vehicles over that time period. 2015 started a three-year construction cycle. More transit came on board during that time as well.
 - i. For students, 1 in 3 drive to university as primary mode; 1 in 4 ride transit; 1 in 5 ride bike to campus. These are exceptional numbers for a city our size.
- d. Secondary mode indicates willingness of people to try different modes of transportation, which can suggest steps that lead toward behavioral change.
- e. Employee sets are broke out by faculty, admin pro, and state classified.
 - i. On where PTS spends resources, there will be more focus on employees in future because of the numbers for primary/secondary mode preference.
- f. The distance people travel to CSU: students live close (they can maybe shift transportation costs to cost of living close), but more distance for employees.
 - i. 70% employees live in Fort Collins; number has gone down in recent years.
- g. This data, along with the fuel efficiency of vehicle, is used to determine climate action plan budget for greenhouse gas emissions every year.
- h. With the last three years of construction, there are many variables to the data and it is hard to assess what is driving behavior and how people commute here.
 - i. Streets have been closed
 - ii. Parking lots have been closed, some permanently
 - iii. Improved bike infrastructure, including buffered bike lanes and the Pitkin low stress bikeway
 - iv. Added transit routes and mason/MAX corridor
 - v. Access to campus has gotten better, both around and on campus, such as identifying sidewalk deficiencies and making improvements, as well as two new underpasses
 - vi. Generational and community changes—people want to come to campus by bike and pedestrians and are coming in different ways that they used to.
- i. Reallocation of resources this year—won't see the impacts of this until October most likely.
 - i. A couple of locations on campus not heavily utilized: Moby and Ingersoll parking lot, as well as South College Garage (built ahead of time for Biology, Chemistry, Medical Center).
 - ii. Offering on lower cost parking options on main campus with the goal of opening up additional parking in core of campus with these shifts:
 - 1. To bring in new customers who haven't parked on campus
 - 2. Relocate some existing permit holders

- iii. Will reduce meter rates at Moby to alleviate congestion at LSC parking lot and library parking lot; keep that traffic on the perimeter of campus and provide lower cost options.
 - j. Access to campus—everything funnels to the core; people want access to it.
 - i. Bikes and pedestrians and transit accessing the campus more than ever.
 - ii. Private shuttles coming to campus: Private developments want access to the core of campus and working on finding interim solutions, but this increase is due to students shifting transportation costs to rent and use the private shuttles of the complexes where they live.
 - iii. Uber/Lyft are not reducing emissions (unless pooling), just reducing people parking on campus.
 - k. Parking Resource Change
 - i. PTS is maintaining the level of parking availability that we need as a campus, but the demand is changing due to other programs PTS is investing into to get people onto campus using other modes, so it is looking a bit different.
 - ii. Continue to lose parking and build elsewhere.
 - iii. There are losses at upcoming constructions sites, such as with the Animal Science addition, by Gifford, and with the planned losses of Aylesworth and Newsom.

4. Residential Parking Permit Program (Seth Lorson)

- a. The City's residential parking permit program upholds and facilitates the strategies CSU has in place on campus for parking; it creates a symbiotic relationship. From a sustainability perspective, the RP3 asks people to make a decision to pay to park on campus or to make the decision to ride MAX or take an alternative way to get onto campus.
- b. Over 4,000 parking spaces are included in RP3—and this number will be growing.
 - i. Soon it will be a 30-minute walk to campus if a person wants to park in a neighborhood.
 - ii. RP3 will probably extend as far east as Stover; today it currently goes as far east as Peterson.
 - iii. Hours/days of enforcement are: Monday through Friday, 8–5.
- c. The City got a CDOT grant to bolster park-n-rides along the MAX and park in the most appropriate places.
- d. For major stadium events 12K+, RP3 will be enacted:
 - i. Four hours before kickoff there will be barricades around the neighborhoods that will communicate that vehicles parking in neighborhoods will get towed and \$100 citation if you park in the neighborhoods.
- e. Concern expressed by Hanna wondering if students are aware of this and asking for more graphics about this to be sent to students, so they become aware
 - i. There is a link on the PTS website.
 - ii. Please let PTS, Facilities, or the City know if this message is not getting to the students.
- f. **Action Item (Julia/Josh):** Schedule presentation for Seth Lorson, PTS, and Facilities on this topic to give more info to ASCSU.
- g. Suggestion to turn front page of Collegian into a parking primer
- h. Suggestion to email more info out to students returning to campus.
 - i. **Action Item (Dell Rae Ciaravola):** Send campus wide email (“returning to campus?”) that shares this RP3 info.