

Physical Development Committee (PDC) – Minutes 2/19/2021

Location: Virtual on Microsoft Teams

Participation: David Hansen, Jessica Kramer, Mike Rush, Tim Kemp, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Stacey Baumgarn, Sue Doe, Tonie Miyamoto, Mark Paschke, Nik Olsen, Mark Ritschard, Jim Sites, Steve Burn, Dustin Vinzant, Ali Raza, Fred Haberecht, Dave Bradford, Justin Dove, Sadie Kinney-McGrath, Linda Krier, Paula Mills, Miles Pojar, Adam Vance, Heather Reimer and Marianne Wieghaus (agenda item 2), Lon Kendall and Barry Willier (agenda item 3)

1. Temporary Solar Materials Storage

- a. In February 2020 Carol Dollard presented to the PDC on a project to bring solar to CSU's campuses.
 - i. Namaste Solar was selected as the contractor to implement the project.
 - ii. Selection process narrowed the proposed 37 sites down, identifying 23 sites on main campus, south campus, and ARDEC where solar will be added.
 - iii. Materials are currently being acquired. In final design process with construction beginning in April. Expectation that installation for these sites will take a year.
- b. In August 2020, PDC gave approval through an email request for consideration of temporary storage for furniture that had to be moved out of classrooms due to COVID and the need to create social distancing spaces in classrooms.
 - i. Storage containers on Meridian Village site (formerly Aylesworth) (represented on plan as white rectangles) were previously approved during that request.
 - 1) The site is secured with a perimeter fence from the construction project that removed Aylesworth.
 - ii. Request to add storage containers (represented on the plan in green) for storage of solar project materials.
 - 1) This would provide centralized storage for the project to the campus. Typically, there would be a singular construction site where contractor could lay down and store materials, but because they are moving around to multiple locations on campus there is not a specific construction site to provide that.
 - iii. Proposed to be used through summer 2022.
 - 1) If Meridian Village needed to start site work and break ground, would find alternative location for this storage.
 - 2) It is not intended for contractor parking, just intended for mobilizing out of one location on campus.
- c. Discussion/Questions
 - i. Tim Kemp asks, if this is accepted, what would the hours of operation be and is it secured every night?
 - 1) David Hansen responds, Usually the university follows the City's standards for construction hours, so the contractors would be held to that. There will be construction on rooftops so there will be other construction impacts as well – and the hours are required no matter where on campus they are working.
 - ii. Stacey Baumgarn asks in Microsoft Teams chat, "Will all of the white containers also be in place through summer 2022?"

- 1) David Hansen responds that we don't yet know if we will be moving furniture out of the storage containers into classrooms, but if the need to store the materials continues, it would follow the same guidelines as the Namaste Solar request – until such time when the Meridian Village site is needed for site work and construction.
- iii. Tonie Miyamoto writes in Microsoft Teams chat that she, “checked with Housing and Mari is supportive of using the Meridian Village site.”
- d. Motion request to approve temporary use of the Meridian Village development site for storage of campus solar materials.
 - i. Majority in agreement. No objections expressed.

2. The Spoke – Outdoor Branding

a. Introductions

- i. The Spoke offers bike repair for students and staff at the university.
- ii. This branding proposal was reviewed by the FM Design-Review committee in collaboration with Heather Reimer and Marianne Wieghaus. It is coming to PDC for final comment and request for approval.
- iii. Heather Reimer is the Associate Director for the Departments of Central Receiving – provides oversight for the educational bike shop, The Spoke.
- iv. Marianne Wieghaus is the Interim Director of Communications & Sustainability for HDS.
- v. HDS and Central Receiving were original partners when The Spoke opened 6 years ago.
- vi. HDS and Central Receiving also partner on the Alternative Transportation Fee Advisory Board (ATFAB).
 - 1) For the past 4 years, ATFAB subsidized 80% of The Spoke operational costs through a student fee.

b. Current Challenges

- i. Location is in primary transit pattern for variety of residence halls, yet it is difficult to articulate exact location due to inset nature within the Pavilion.
- ii. Primary customers (students) are not familiar with the the Pavilion and Laurel Village. Currently use other identifiers such as “across from Durrell Dining Center” or “off of Plum, just north of Moby” to identify the location for them.
 - 1) Even with identifiers, sandwich boards are needed to draw students to the actual entrance.
 - 2) There is signage on the door, but a person must be in covered breeze way in front of door to see it; only viewed approaching from Towers or north side of Durrell.
 - 3) Sandwich boards have challenges too - they blow over in inclement weather, are not put out for safety reasons, or taken and found in other places on campus on Laurel Ave.
 - 4) Plan to discontinue sandwich boards if this proposal is approved.
- iii. Because of lack of branding, The Spoke is often confused for Recycled Cycles, located at Lory Student Center, which does have an exterior sign on bldg. (6 ft by 2 ft) that identifies name, intent, and hours of shop.
 - 1) Recycled Cycles also has similar challenge with location because they are inset into the bldg.

c. Solution

- i. Install outdoor sculpture “Big Bike” to serve as foundation for The Spoke wayfinding and branding efforts.
 - ii. Big Bike is crafted from repurposed metal, upcycled by artist Bryan Petersen.
 - 1) Previously existed on Laurel Street at Lee’s Cyclery.
 - 2) Donated to The Spoke by the City of Fort Collins.
 - 3) Dimensions: 5 ft high, 9 ft long, 3 ft wide.
 - 4) Weight: approx. 1000 lbs.
 - iii. The fact that it is crafted from repurposed metal and placed near LEED certified bldg. aligns it with creating a campus image that is appropriate and memorable, drawing attention to CSU and city goals of sustainability and alternative transportation. The bike branding efforts of The Spoke will develop strong transportation connections. Representatives of Ft Collins believe “Big Bike” reflects the cycling culture of CSU and city.
- d. Location of “Big Bike”
 - i. Northwest corner of the Pavilion
 - ii. In front of The Spoke exterior entrance
 - iii. Located at 4-way pedestrian intersection
 - iv. Viewable from multiple directions
- e. Mock-up Proposals
 - i. Inset bike into landscaping that adds more protection.
 - ii. Add metal sign to enhance wayfinding
 - 1) Option 1: subtle signage
 - 2) Option 2: Deters riders
- f. Outcome
 - i. Integrated solution that works with location and design, enhancing The Spoke and campus and articulating clear branding and wayfinding for student-funded resource.
 - ii. Identifiable landmark for students.
 - iii. Integrated with alternative transportation and sustainability model through STARS and bike friendly university designation.
- g. Discussion
 - i. Mark Paschke asks about the vegetation shown in the photo, and choosing something shorter so the vegetation doesn’t obscure the sign.
 - 1) University Landscape Architect David Hansen agrees. Will need to remove a few smaller shrubs and grasses to be conscious of that; once installed, make sure irrigation system is not impacted.
 - ii. Jessica Kramer comments in Microsoft Teams chat, “FYI, the PDC approved the signage policy that discourages the ongoing use of sandwich boards on campus. The policy allows for temporary signs such as sandwich boards to be allowed for events and not as permanent signage/branding.”
 - iii. Tonie Miyamoto writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “The bike sculpture with integrated Spoke sign is a much better solution than the sandwich board.”
 - iv. Miles Pojar comments in Microsoft Teams chat, “On Behalf of Sophia Shepp and the rest of ASCSU, I would like to say that we fully support the spoke project.”

- v. Nik Olsen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “Great idea and good plan on the inset. I lean towards option A as it seems more integrated into the environment.”
- vi. Mark Paschke writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “Looks great to me!”
- vii. Shelly Carroll asks if the bike seat is wide enough for people to hop on and ride.
 - 1) Yes, it is.
 - 2) Dustin Vinzant comments that PD prefers option 2 because of this concern.
 - 3) Nik Olsen defers to PD.
 - 4) David Hansen adds that it will need to be securely ground mounted. People will also want to sit on handle bars and freight rack on back. Option 2 discourages people from sitting on seat and freight rack.
- viii. Mike Rush asks about site lighting. Are there plans for uplighting the sculpture?
 - 1) Heather Reimer answers that they haven’t looked that far into it yet, wanting to make sure this was approved first.
 - 2) Tim Kemp suggests possibly put in some conduit to allow for future lighting, if it could potentially occur after the initial application.
 - 3) In Microsoft Teams chat, Mike Rush recommends considering, “solar powered uplighting” as an option.
- ix. Jessica Kramer asks if this will set a precedent for people wanting different types of signs across campus. This retail business serves a unique product and service, but will this open the door for others on campus to ask for a sculptural piece in front of their building or business?
 - 1) Nik Olsen thinks this specifically advances university wide goals, so this is a special exception to the typical signage standards.
 - 2) Tonie Miyamoto adds that this has special consideration because it is a LEED platinum bldg. The bike sculpture falls into the educational component of that.
- x. Nik Olsen motions in Microsoft Teams chat to advance with option 2.
 - 1) Tonie Miyamoto seconds the motion in Microsoft Teams chat.
 - 2) General agreement by discussion, no objections expressed.

3. Painter Center Storage Area

- a. Proposed area for addition is located at the northeast corner of the Painter Center.
 - i. For over 14 years, Painter Center has utilized a storage container on site for storage needs of facility. This was approved many years ago to serve their needs.
 - ii. A new addition was approved by MPC in June 2017, which represented a more structural addition to match the brick and other architectural contexts. However, the cost for the addition is too high for the facility to fund. Trying to consider other options that fit the need.
- b. Existing Conditions & Needs (Lon Kendall)
 - i. Painter Center houses the majority of research animals on campus – over 10,000 animals on a day and over 3,000 cages (different types).
 - ii. Caging footprint is relatively large, such as 3x6, and 6-7 ft. tall. Different animals require different types of caging.
 - 1) A need for space to swap out equipment and bedding material is critical to their operations.
 - 2) Some cages need to be changed out regularly.

- 3) Thousands of lbs. of bedding materials that need to be on site.
 - iii. There are a number of storage facilities at Foothills Campus, but it is unrealistic to move cages from Foothills Campus to Main Campus when they are used on weekly basis.
- c. Current proposal is an updated concept of storage for the facility – same location as the MPC-approved building addition.
 - i. Reviewed by the internal Facilities Management Design-Review Committee.
 - ii. Proposal for as many as 3 storage containers. Will be wrapped with an aluminum or steel fencing system to screen storage containers from public view.
 - 1) Size: 21 ft. x 30 ft long, 9 ft. tall.
 - 2) Color: dark bronze, utilized in other locations on campus such as with canopies and other building elements
 - 3) Would still allow for a vehicle to back into the dock/service area of the facility
 - 4) 18.5 ft. off existing sidewalk that separates the facility from southside of Biology.
 - iii. Design-Review Committee suggested the fence material and color, and recommended that the entrance/door systems of the containers are painted to match for consistency.
 - iv. Precedent:
 - 1) Utilized same fence material at adjacent Biology on the north and east side – screening for generator system and trash/recycling containers needed on service side of facility.
 - 2) Utilized similar material at Scott Bioengineering Bldg. on northeast side to screen off service area.
 - 3) Utilized similar material on some rooftops to screen off mechanical equipment.
 - v. Remodels and Construction Services (RCS) will oversee the project.
 - vi. Lon Kendall adds that it does not take up any of the green space; would use part of dock area and also area where current container exists (on gravel and dirt).
 - 1) David Hansen comments that a few evergreen trees are planted around this location that will also help to screen over time.
- d. Discussion
 - i. Nik Olsen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “As a research institution, I feel we have a moral obligation to properly manage the humane care of lab animals. This storage is clearly needed and the fence screening is a good solution to integrate increased storage into the landscape.”
 - ii. Mark Paschke comments in Microsoft Teams chat, “Looks like a great improvement over current conditions” and “Perhaps the motorpool facility could adopt a similar fence?”
 - iii. Tim Kemp adds that RCS looked at many different options and renderings, putting a lot of time into getting to a good product.
 - iv. Dave Bradford asks, should we consider if this is the appropriate type of screening for new projects going forward as a standard for material and design, so as not to consider that each time, but to only need to consider location?
 - 1) David Hansen says that FM has recommended this in multiple areas. It is not documented as a standard, but it is recommended for multiple projects.
 - 2) Fred Haberecht recommends we always come back to PDC so as not to open up the possibility that there will be many storage containers on campus.

- 3) Mike Rush adds this material is relatively expensive for a screening element. Not directly applicable to everything that needs to be screened. It is more cost effective than brick, stone, or stucco when adjacent to certain buildings – but for examples like trash enclosures, it would be overly costly for the university, and he doesn't think it should be a standard because it is only applicable in some situations, but not across the board.
- v. Stacey Baumgarn asks in Microsoft Teams chat, "Is the screen easily movable to allow for the containers to be changed out if needed? It looks great but tight. Do you need some bollards in the drive?"
 - 1) Lon Kendall responds in Microsoft Teams chat, "That's a good question. We haven't moved the existing one in the 10 years I've been here."
 - 2) David Hansen agrees that we should add a recommendation for a bollard to protect the fence for vehicles backing up. This is a system that can be unbolted per panel and removed if needed.
 - 3) Stacey Baumgarn writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "But, if the logistics side of this works for Lon - I have no comment. Just curious."
- e. Tim Kemp motions to approve use of proposed materials for a storage building addition at the Painter Center.
 - i. Mark Paschke seconds the motion.
 - ii. No participants express opposition to this motion, so motion is approved.

4. Update: Cellular Upgrade at Atmospheric Simulation Lab

- a. Brought to PDC previously in December 2020. Currently we have existing cellular equipment on tower itself. The proposal was to lengthen the lease agreement and replace/update the equipment on it.
- b. Outcome – after discussion with stakeholders
 - i. Allow use of tower that exists today through the remaining lease period (5 years).
 - ii. Any updated equipment needed in next five years can be installed on the tower.
 - iii. At conclusion of lease, company will remove existing equipment from tower. Company will need to install new infrastructure on a new tower.
 - iv. Need to have larger conversation about cellular/wireless needs on all campuses.
- c. Discussion
 - i. Fred Haberecht adds: He met on site with Mark Ritschard, Jim Jensen, and Jim Sites. It was apparent to him that this should not have been approved for use originally on the tower. It is potentially a research tower that is un-usable with the equipment on it. Secondly, there is a need for improved cell coverage at Foothills Campus. Will need to develop a plan that describes – do we allow a tower? How tall? What does it look like? Develop objectives for improved cellular service on campus.
 - 1) Mark Ritschard agrees.
 - 2) Jim Sites asks how binding the lease is.
 - 3) **Action Item (Fred Haberecht):** Find out how binding the lease is. Would need to offer an alternative.
 - ii. *Recommendation:* To develop a university stakeholder group for the purposed of developing a cellular masterplan for Foothills Campus, Main Campus, & south Campus for consideration of future planning efforts.

- iii. Nik Olsen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "I agree. The President's Office received an email this week from a carrier wanting to put a tower on the Rec."
- iv. Stacey Baumgarn writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "Yes to the recommendation. But, if the cell company proposes an upgrade to equipment, can we propose a new location at that time?"