

Physical Development Committee (PDC) – 3/19/2021 Minutes

Location: Virtual on Microsoft Teams

Participants: Dave Bradford, Fred Haberecht, Bob Kaempfe, Sadie Kinney-McGrath, Jessica Kramer, Nik Olsen, Mike Rush, Tom Satterly, Jim Sites, Aaron Buckley, Kristi Buffington, Steve Burn, Justin Dove, Mike Ellis, Aaron Fodge, David Hansen, Tonie Miyamoto, Terry Schlicting, Jim Sites, Maggie Walsh, Tracey Abel, Beth Adams, Julia Innes, Mark Paschke, Sue James

1. Facilities Management (FM) Design Standard: Indoor Bike Parking

- a. Aaron came to PDC in December 2020 to introduce this topic.
 - i. Created Facilities Design Standard that is currently in final draft, which was reviewed during the facilities design standards process.
 - ii. PDC asked for proposed distribution of indoor bike parking locations across campus.
 - iii. Returning to PDC today to approve map and proposed zoning. These would be appended to the standard, so when opportunities arise with a new building or major remodel, then indoor bike parking could be considered within each of the zones.
 - iv. CSU currently has a wheeled conveyance policy that does not allow bikes to be parked indoors – historically due to concern about conditions of facilities.
 - 1) Designed a standard for a room that is separate from the main facility entrance; designed to take the wear and tear that comes with bikes being brought indoors.
 - v. Within each proposed zone, attempt to install an indoor bike facility. Identified potential locations for placing these facilities based on:
 - 1) Ability to intercept bikes before entering dismount zone. / created zones that surround dismount zone.
 - 2) Natural Resources expressed interest in having a facility in their bldg.
 - 3) Goal of installing one in each zone.
 - vi. Map
 - 1) Blue dots = secure bike parking opportunities in future on outside of bldgs.
 - 2) Green = two secure bike parking facilities today.
- b. Discussion
 - i. Fred asks if Aaron is suggesting that there could be multiple indoor bike locations eventually in each zone (Zone 4, for example, which is a very dense part of campus from building square footage).
 - 1) Yes, there could be multiple. The proposal is to strive to install at least one per zone.
 - ii. Mark Paschke asks about the intent for Zone 1.
 - 1) Proposal is to add exterior secure bike parking in zone 1. Rationale is because this is a commuter parking lot. It is not uncommon for people to drive in, then transfer from this mobility hub, using a different mode of transportation. An exterior facility similar to MAX station secure parking locations is preferred because of the proximity of the parking lot. But could certainly add bike parking facility to a building if there is one identified that could support it.
 - iii. Jim Sites says there could be difference of opinion between bike riders and current occupants of buildings who may think there is a different need for the space. How to handle messaging of differences opinion of these groups, for if it should be included in the building?

- 1) Aaron Fodge thinks it would be discussed during the internal development review process either in the redesign of an existing bldg. or construction of a new buildings, that the conversation would occur referencing the map.
 - a) For example, the project sponsor for a new bldg. would have the opportunity to argue for or against this location being in the bldg.
 - b) Jim Sites thinks it will be more of an issue for existing buildings rather than new buildings.
- 2) Aaron Fodge adds that most buildings on campus have bikes being brought indoors, so there is a demand, but they are not the only users of the building, so it would have to be part of the development review conversation.
- iv. Mike Rush asked in Microsoft Teams chat, “Are the Green Squares more appropriately labeled as covered exterior secure bike parking?”
 - 1) Aaron Fodge agrees; it does meet that description.
 - 2) The Lake Street Garage is technically indoors in the garage, fenced in and has cameras on it, and meets requirements for covered bike parking.
 - 3) Mike Rush says this is a minor point but may want to label the green dots as being covered.
 - a) **Action Item (Aaron Fodge):** Make this suggested change (“covered”) on map.
 - 4) Aaron Fodge also says that last summer they did a full inventory of all bike racks in GIS – if there was some sort of awning or covering on it, these are the locations on campus (covered but not secure).
- v. Bob Kaempfe asks, would you consider south campus its own zone? Will there be any other areas on south campus to look at?
 - 1) Aaron thinks their group will guide that process because of all the new buildings. Absolutely could, but there is an opportunity by the tennis courts, parking lot, and horn shuttle for another mobility hub. It’s the only location identified so far.
 - 2) Bob Kaempfe adds that one of their selection committees is focused on health and wellness.
 - a) **Action Item (Aaron Fodge):** Attend one of their meetings to provide an update.
- vi. Mike Ellis writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “Aaron I’m interpreting the plan as having reasonable if not great flexibility, and as such am supportive. Thanks for your work on this.”
- vii. David Hansen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “A specific building block for consideration - I would question why we would want bikes coming in the narrow doors at Eddy Hall with all of the occupants that pass through these doors daily. There is ample existing covered bike parking under the building overhang on the west side that could become "secured" covered exterior.” He adds aloud, there is a pretty narrow constrained entry way at Eddy. Instead of proposing indoor bike storage, there is ample covered exterior storage that could become secure.
 - 1) **Action Item (Aaron Fodge):** Change this so it becomes exterior (blue symbol), rather than indoor (orange symbol).
 - 2) Fred Haberecht agrees this could be done on the ground level west side.
- c. MOTION - The zone map as indicated by Aaron Fodge is the framework direction for indoor bike parking in addition to the policy that Aaron showed at the December 2020 meeting. This

includes David Hansen's recommendation for the change at Eddy and Mike Rush's change to the language of the green icons.

- i. Motion to proceed with this direction by Mark Paschke with the two amendments.
- ii. Sue James seconds the motion.
- iii. Clarification to motion added: the zone map is a framework for indoor bike parking as opportunities arise per zone.
- iv. All in favor; none opposed.

2. Covered Transit Stops

- a. Aaron Fodge is seeking feedback on the criteria we use to prioritize the purchase and installation of future transit stops that meet the standard approved a couple of years ago.
 - i. We adopted City of Fort Collins design standard for transit stops with some modifications specific to the university.
 - ii. We are installing the first three this spring. Funding came from PASFC - a fee board advisory committee that reports through the provost.
 - iii. Aaron Fodge shares map of transit stops across CSU campus.
 - 1) There are limited resources, so it will take time through budget cycles to install transit shelters.
 - 2) The Transit Center has its own coverings today. The MAX has its own stations. The rest of the transit stops would meet the standard in the facilities design guidelines.
 - iv. Aaron Fodge shares that FM and Parking & Transportation Services drafted criteria for how to prioritize where investments get made.
 - 1) Would like PDC to provide guidance on how to allocate resources as they become available to us to purchase additional stops.
- b. Transit Stop Prioritization Matrix
 - i. Current ridership per stop
 - 1) Buses except for the Horn collect data every time people board the bus.
 - ii. How many routes serve the stop
 - iii. Weather exposure
 - 1) For example: stops in middle of campus by Great Green have high exposure to wind.
 - iv. Potential for inclusion in future construction project
 - 1) Currently in planning for West Elizabeth corridor – the Bus Rapid Transit will probably go down Plum. This location may get lower priority in the matrix because that project may be able to cover the cost in the future.
 - v. Fred Haberecht adds that we should also consider this through the overlay of the campus experience.
 - 1) PDC has indicated special consideration to areas such as the Oval – similar to cell towers, trash cans, news racks, and other campus fixtures. Recommends including the campus experience zones as part of the matrix consideration.
 - a) Example: Having 3 transit stops in the Oval would trigger the need to come back to PDC because it is an overlay zone of special experience on campus.
 - b) **Action Item (Aaron Fodge):** Flag the campus experience zones within the prioritization matrix.
- c. Information about how transit stops are funded (David Hansen)

- i. The 3 stops that will be installed this spring originally went as a proposal to the Alternative Transportation Fee Advisory Board (ATFAB). Then it was advanced to PASFC.
 - ii. For their current funding cycle, David Hansen asked ATFAB for 3 more stops.
 - iii. Several represented as exterior routes to campus that may be covered through TransFort’s efforts. There is coordination between university and Transfort.
 - iv. There is no funding mechanism beyond making an ask to ATFAB or through a construction project.
 - d. Research shows that people are more apt to use transit if there is a covered stop. (Aaron Fodge)
 - i. Place of safety.
 - ii. Provides visual cue.
 - iii. Helps with sense of reliability.
 - 1) In the standard there is next bus technology that tells you with a visual display when the next bus is coming.
 - e. Inclusivity
 - i. Jessica Kramer adds in Microsoft Teams chat, “We brought the transit stop design to the PDC a while ago and discussed that having these covered stops provided a level of inclusivity for those in wheelchairs, etc. where it is not easy to travel quickly from a building when the bus arrives.”
 - ii. Mike Ellis asks in Microsoft Teams chat, “Can we advance Jessica's reminder as an additional criteria item for consideration in the matrix?”
 - iii. Jessica Kramer reminds the group that the PDC agreed in the past that these provide a level of shelter for people who have difficulty traveling quickly by foot or who are in wheelchairs. It is not feasible for people in wheelchairs to move quickly from inside a building to a transit stop as a bus arrives. Believes this is an overarching idea of why we need covered transit spots.
 - iv. Fred Haberecht adds they area of refuge if appropriately distributed.
 - v. Terry Schlichting writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “rain is not good for power wheelchairs.”
 - vi. **Action Item (Aaron Fodge):** Add to matrix an inclusivity measurement (to the closest building from the transit stop).
 - vii. David Hansen writes in chat, “One of the current proposed locations is on the North side of TILT. This was directly associated with inclusivity in mind to help users at the Student Disability Center
 - f. Advertising on transit shelters within campus
 - i. There is the capability for advertising, but currently it will only be for informational maps about the transit system.
 - ii. In the history of bus shelters on campus, Fred Haberecht says that this has been a critical component in the discussion. The city has historically paid for a portion of the transit stops through advertising revenue by the vendor who installs them. He is not suggesting we have that revenue model.
 - iii. David Hansen was part of selection committee in conjunction with city’s procurement process. It was written into contract that CSU has the ability to opt out of the advertising at CSU. Proposed that the shelters will just have an area for a transit map at this point.

3. E-Bikes & E-Scooters Update

- a. The university and the city went to RFP to bring bikeshare back to the city.
 - i. During COVID bike share vendor went out of business.
 - ii. Distributed their previous bike share stations to a local nonprofit for their use.
- b. Issued RFP in fall 2020.
 - i. RFP had the flexibility for applicants who bid with E-scooters.
 - ii. Received five bids.
 - iii. Three companies interviewed.
- c. New vendor, Spin, selected – owned by Ford motor company.
 - i. Will bring 500 E-bikes to City of Fort Collins, half will be dedicated to campus.
 - ii. 600 E-scooters – 300 rebalanced to campus.
 - 1) Similar to previously E-scooter vendor, Bird.
 - iii. Ready to deploy prior to students returning in fall 2021.
 - iv. Working with Downtown Development Authority and the Student Disability Center.
 - 1) Vendor is required via contract to provide adaptive bikes.
 - 2) Possibly will have a way that bikes can be delivered to students and residents and visitors through a nonprofit in Fort Collins, supported by this contract.
- d. Next step is to finish contract with them, including requirements with CSU.
 - i. They want to have stations like the other vendor for bike share.
 - ii. **Action Item (Aaron Fodge):** Will bring share stations to PDC to review when contracted.
 - iii. Don't need the stations for system to operate because CSU has 18,000 bike parking spaces on campus, but from balancing and predictability of use standpoint, having stations is a better way to guide users for where to find them and to encourage them to park where we want them to park.
- e. Discussion
 - i. Beth Adams asks, "Will there be a requirement for the e scooters to be returned to the stations after use?"
 - 1) Yes, on campus the requirement will continue to be returned to a bike rack or bike station. The newly selected vendor has better technology for not allowing trips to end and the user continues to get billed until the bike is parked in an appropriate location.
 - 2) Through GIS will work to restrict where they can go, speeds they can travel, and the certain locations on campus where they must be parked.
 - 3) Batteries on the bikes and scooters are swappable. Instead of balancing the whole unit, the vendor can just swap batteries on site, so it should be less intrusive for how to interact with the campus.
 - ii. Justin Dove writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "One of the first comments/feedback I received was the worry of this coming back...and people blocking pathways by not returning their scooters/bikes appropriately"
 - 1) Vendor is responsible for moving the units. They are contracted with a requirement to get them off sidewalks if poorly parked.
 - 2) In the app, people can self-report behavior they see.
 - 3) A user can be fined by the company.
 - 4) Working to refine GPS in the unit so the scooter can't end trip on a sidewalk.

- 5) The scooter unit squawks at the user, makes an audible sound that may be embarrassing to the user if they leave it somewhere or enter somewhere they aren't supposed to be.
- 6) Fred adds that Rams take care of Rams means to put them back where they belong. Aaron agrees that there are plenty of bike racks to do this.

4. Adding Exterior Projections to Temporary Sign, Banner, and Flyer Policy

- a. Jessica Kramer shares some proposed text to add to the Temporary Sign, Banner, and Flyer Policy. These ideas are open for discussion. This was prompted when PDC received the request for the MLK exterior projection in January 2021.
 - i. Want to formally add to the policy, describe what is allowed or not.
 - ii. Our discussion in January included different location ideas and concerns about how it affects people on campus.
- b. Considerations include:
 - i. Content
 - ii. Campus locations
 - iii. Placement on bldgs./walls
 - iv. Installation
 - v. Duration
 - vi. Process of who approves
- c. Content
 - i. Projections promoting CSU brand identity, traditions; that are celebratory of university-wide calendar events (e.g. CSU Welcome, Homecoming, Commencement, University Anniversary); that are celebratory of state or national holidays; or that honor individuals will be considered for a short duration.
 - 1) These items are supported in the policy for signs, banners, flyers, so it seems appropriate to extend this to exterior projections.
 - ii. Projections that honor individuals requires a university vetting process, including but not limited to the University Naming Committee; considered on a case-by-case basis.
 - iii. Creative Services and Facilities Management, at their discretion, can bring requests outside of these parameters to the Physical Development Committee to receive broader input and approval.
 - iv. Exterior projections that move or produce differing light levels are not allowed.
 - 1) Discussed during the MLK exterior projection email conversation, for instance, so as not to distract drivers.
- d. Content – Questions:
 - i. Should ALL exterior projections be considered on a case-by-case basis by the PDC?
 - ii. Who vets the language, names, images, people?
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1) Fred Haberecht asks PDC to consider, does this committee allow exterior projections on campus? Should we allow them? Does anyone feel we shouldn't allow them?
 - 2) Sue James asks if there are any safety concerns with exterior projections distracting drivers? Fred agrees that this is a consideration for where they are placed.

- 3) Nik Olsen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "I think we need to allow these as the requests are going to become more and more common and we need some rules to guide installations (location, duration, etc.)" and "I think Bohemian Nights loaned their devices out for MLK"
- 4) Jim Sites says there is a concern of amateur installations; there needs to be a high level of control for how the projections are put together.
- 5) Nik Olsen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "I think Bohemian Nights loaned their devices out for MLK."
- 6) Mike Ellis agrees that we need policy or direction. He shares that there have been a few requests over the years in which having a process could have helped guide them. Would love to have opportunity to continue to support requests and to be flexible in review.
 - a) One request was a request to fly hundreds of drones over campus at night.
 - b) Another was an art display on back of LSC Theater with a message around saving elephants. This would have been contrary to the changing light levels guidelines, but it was in a secure place.
- 7) Jim Sites thinks that timing is a concern as well, which would apply to banners also. Asking to do it at the last minute is problematic.
 - a) Fred Haberecht agrees that we need at least two weeks.
 - b) **Action Item (Jessica):** Build in a request that it needs to be timely.
- 8) Mark Paschke shares <https://www.fcgov.com/nightsky/best-practices> in Teams chat.
- 9) Fred Haberecht thinks we need to develop a framework for acceptance so that whoever is applying can have a better understanding of standards/process. But what is the process? Is it administrative approval or should these requests come one-by-one to PDC for the time being? Fred proposes we're not mature enough in the process, so for the next request, need to take to PDC.
 - a) Nik Olsen writes in chat, "I think 1x1 so the collective wisdom of this group can review"
- 10) Jessica Kramer thinks that the group who did the exterior projections for MLK Day, may request approval for two projections for Juneteenth. Prefer to not have the discussion by email.
 - a) **Action Item (Jessica):** Ask Bridgette Johnson if they want to attend the April mtg.
- 11) Justin Dove writes in Microsoft Teams chat, "In terms of vetting, thinking out loud...especially as it relates to diversity messages and/or activism, we should consult VPD and/or SDPS to ensure messages are appropriate. Particularly if these requests are not coming from those areas."
- 12) Fred Haberecht says we say what is acceptable for content, but do we need to say what isn't acceptable, such as political advertising is prohibited or not allowed?
 - a) Jessica Kramer responds that we don't get into the process of what isn't included in the banner or flyer policy.
 - b) Nik Olsen adds in chat, "When it comes to messages, we do need to consider 1st amendment issues. OGC can assist on this aspect." When we talk about what is

the message and why are we allowing it or not. Need to apply the logic equally for why we do and don't do something.

- e. Campus Locations
 - i. Buildings with a higher level of public visibility are preferred for these exterior projections (e.g. Lory Student Center, Health & Medical Center, UCA, buildings on the perimeter of campus such as the CSU Morris Field House, etc.).
 - ii. Multiple buildings are allowed to have these exterior projections simultaneously.
 - iii. Exterior projections are not allowed on university residential buildings. Buildings near residential neighborhoods must be carefully considered.
 - iv. City of Fort Collins lighting and sign code may apply to certain facilities. If so, those exterior projections are subject to the City of Fort Collins Light and Sign Code. Facilities Management can help determine if this applies to specific facilities.
 - v. Requests for buildings with labs or research projects must be approved by the building occupants first.
- f. Campus Location – Questions:
 - i. Do we need to approve specific buildings now?
 - ii. How do we address the potential light conflict with labs / research / people working in a building late at night?
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1) Nik Olsen writes in Microsoft Teams chat, “I think identifying buildings where we would allow these projections would be optimal.”
 - 2) Jessica Kramer thinks it would be better to have preselected buildings. Not sure we have the time or bandwidth to make sure it doesn't conflict with someone's work.
 - 3) Nike Olsen adds, “Short lists of ‘yes’ are better than long lists of ‘no.’”
 - 4) Mike Rush adds in Teams chat, “agree with pre-selection - potentially leverage the DRC for recommendations to the PDC”
 - 5) Tonie Miyamoto writes in chat, “Pavilion in Laurel Village was designed for exterior projection so that could be one to consider.”
 - 6) **Action Item (Jessica):** Return to PDC with option of 6-12 preselected buildings.
- g. Placement on Bldgs./Walls
 - i. Exterior projections can only be displayed on buildings or walls. Exterior projections on the ground or within a landscape are not allowed.
 - ii. Such exterior projections should be located high enough above the ground so as not to impair a person's vision
 - iii. Consideration must be given of how the light spills over to windows and occupants within the building.
 - iv. Placement of the projectors/cords shall not cause a physical tripping hazard. Consult with Facilities Management for more information.
- h. Placement on Buildings/Walls – Questions:
 - i. Do we allow these on buildings only? Are walls acceptable? Is the ground acceptable?
- i. Installation
 - i. The organization making the request shall be responsible for providing and monitoring the projector/equipment and for ensuring it is not vandalized.
- j. Installation – Questions:

- i. Discussion
 - 1) **Action Item (Jessica):** Agrees with Jim Sites observation about needing to have a high level of control; thinks we should add the question, Who projects this?
- k. Duration
 - i. Exterior projections shall only be allowed during nighttime hours and for a maximum of 3 nights. Additional nights of display may be considered on a case by case basis.
 - ii. These exterior projections must be turned off at 11:00 p.m. each night. (Note: This follows the City's sign code for illuminated signs)
- l. Duration – Questions:
 - i. Is 3 nights an appropriate duration?
 - ii. Does it depend on the content?
 - iii. Is there a maximum number of nights allowed?
 - iv. Discussion
 - 1) Fred Haberecht believes this is a reasonable standard and they would lose impact if up for longer periods of time
 - 2) Sue James agrees.
- m. Process
 - i. Exterior projections may be requested by colleges, auxiliaries, External Relations and Facilities Management. Departments and units must go through their respective college or auxiliary to make the request.
 - ii. Requests shall be made directly to University Campus Planner in Facilities Management. Facilities Management must give final approval of the specific location and placement of the projections on the building/wall.
- n. Process – Questions:
 - i. Discussion
 - 1) Jim Sites is not keen on individual colleges putting up individual projections. Thinks requests should come from higher level.
 - a) Fred Haberecht thinks the President's Office or University Communications seem like good sources for that. Request could come through president's office for initial vetting.
 - b) Nik Olsen agrees that any VP or Provost could bring it up and work to formalize the request through the Provost or the President's Office, and this would cover all the divisions.
 - c) Jim agrees that meets his concerns.
 - d) **Action Item (Jessica):** Add this to the process section.