

## Master Plan Committee (MPC) Minutes – 3/28/2022

MPC webpage: <https://www.fm.colostate.edu/mpc>

### Virtual on Microsoft Teams

**Participants:** Terry Adams, David Bradford, Kristi Buffington, Shelly Carroll, Nick Christensen, Dell Rae Ciaravola, Aaron Fodge, Cody Frye, David Hansen, Christa Johnson, Jessica Kramer, Mary Pedersen, Donna Reiser, Jacob Roberts, Alan Rudolph (for beginning of meeting), Tom Satterly, Mari Strombom, Tamara Alexander, Christian Dykson, Julia Innes

#### 1. Foothills Campus Steering Committee – Visioning (David Hansen)

- a. In 2018 Facilities Management (FM) led a series of master planning listening sessions for Foothills Campus at the request of former Provost Rick Miranda. At the same time, Parking & Transportation Services (PTS) were in early conversations about taking over responsibilities for parking at Foothills Campus and beginning to discuss need for shuttle transportation. High-level feedback heard from people working at Foothills Campus included:
  - i. Lack of cohesive voice at Foothills Campus, not knowing who all worked at Foothills
    - 1) PTS began to develop a list of Foothills Campus employees because they engaged with so many groups
  - ii. Sub-campus not physically interconnected
  - iii. Desire to develop vision for what the campus could be
  - iv. Strategic process & decisions often not aligned with physical master plan
    - 1) FM began to identify main constituents on Foothills Campus, showing interconnection and overlap as planning efforts discussed (through image developed and shared in many MPC presentations)
- b. Alan Rudolph (Office of VP for Research) was co-sponsor of the last round of Foothills Visioning with Blake Naughton (Office of Extension and Engagement). They had broad engagement, and included stakeholders already existing at Foothills Campus as well as others. The visioning committee was charged with facilitating conversations around a future vision of Foothills Campus in consultation with the physical master planning. Fred Haberecht, former Campus Planner, was involved.
- c. Foothills Campus Video was put together by Visioning Committee and help from a consultant to layout future vision for the campus.  
<https://projectcloud.newforma.com/shared/BOFvMg9YSmNfZ8V5ZLkzvxm6y56LbFuS>
  - i. Alan Rudolph adds in MS chat, “The consultant was Clark Enis, the firm that knows our culture and helped design South Campus.”
  - ii. South Campus provided a successful model/precedent.
  - iii. Shelly Carroll echoes Alan’s comment by sharing that the group of stakeholders who provided input to the vision was extensive, including Student Affairs, undergraduate, people on foothills campus as well as people who had never been on campus. Some people were very surprised to find out what happens on Foothills Campus. Part of this video developed into telling the story of Foothills Campus because the Visioning Committee realized that many people who didn’t work there didn’t know what work occurred out there. Felt that telling the story first, then moving to the vision would be best way to put the video together.

- d. There is a desire to continue the work of the visioning committee with a smaller executive committee, which would include the following people, and would meet on monthly basis to determine future efforts. Help create cohesive voice and enact strategic plan around the vision.
  - i. David Patterson
  - ii. Kerri Rollins
  - iii. Marcela Henao Tamayo
  - iv. Shelly Carroll
- e. There was not a group active at the time of the January 2022 Master Plan Committee meeting to provide a preliminary review of topics, for example of the expansion of Foothills solar project. This committee could make recommendations and bring forward topics to MPC related to Foothills Campus.
- f. Anticipated projects for discussion:
  - i. Sub-campus plan updates
  - ii. Research expansion
  - iii. Cellular technology expansion
  - iv. Connector road planning
  - v. Community “hub” facility
  - vi. Soldier Canyon Water Treatment Plant expansion
- g. Shelly Carroll adds that the Foothills Campus has struggled to come up with a collective vision because there are so many disparate entities on the campus. The committee agreed that they want to prioritize the connector road as an investment in the campus, which is critical to the campus functioning as one whole entity. There are a lot of projects that come up for individual entities on the campus, but there will be a focus by the committee going forward on how to get investment for an interdisciplinary center where undergraduates can be brought out for experiential learning.
- h. David Hansen says that the connector road and community education conference center (community hub) are two priorities for committee members. He asks, Does having a visioning committee as a preliminary resource prior to Master Planning Committee seem like a reasonable approach? There is support from Lynn Johnson and the visioning committee to advance ideas and visions in this way.
- i. Tamara Alexander asks, Is it possible for anyone from CSURF to join the committee to contribute?
  - i. David says the intent is to pull CSURF in at the appropriate moment, but he thinks they would be open to CSURF having ongoing participation. David says they had a similar conversation about the federal units on Foothills Campus. The consensus was to focus on CSU-related topics, and to pull them in if there is an interdisciplinary research or facility need. Trying to keep the committee nimble and smaller.
- j. Nick Christensen asks, is there a desire at this visioning stage to incorporate in buildings or private sector lease presence from a proactive master plan approach?
  - i. Tom Satterly responds that four years ago when CSU crafted first public-private partnership (P3) program, they included one building option with full intent to mirror incubator private sector space that could be leased out. Tom can share that info with Nick at another time. Half way through the P3 program, so have not yet executed that project.

- ii. David Hansen shares that the visioning video could be shared with private partners to prompt interest.
  - iii. Christian Dykson is in support of the committee. ASCSU is willing to help activate student voices. He is curious, How do we tell this story to prospective and incoming students? He suggests it could be partnership with Admissions; could be a powerful tool for recruiting new students; could inspire and incubate future careers in a really effective way.
2. **Transportation Planning: West Elizabeth Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** (Aaron Fodge, David Hansen)
- a. The West Elizabeth BRT makes a vital connection between Main Campus, MAX, and Foothills Campus.
    - i. Project started in 2014 with the West Central Neighborhood Plan 2014. Looked at the connections that surround the university, preparing for the stadium, and produced a series of recommendations that included BRT.
    - ii. Led to West Elizabeth Enhanced Travel Corridor (ETC) adopted by City Council in 2016.
      - 1) 6 or 7 enhanced travel corridors with increased investments in transit, bike, pedestrian across the city
      - 2) Underpass at Elizabeth/Shields
      - 3) Elizabeth corridor highest transit usage in the city (4 bus routes travel the corridor)
    - iii. CSU & City successfully partnered for design grant to start design in 2021
    - iv. Replace current bus routes on Elizabeth with BRT connecting CSU main campus and foothills campus. Provide safe predictable service (8-10 minutes) & consolidate redundant services.
    - v. Moves thousands of riders daily between Foothills and Main Campus
    - vi. Advances transportation plan for the Foothills Campus with transit center on the campus
    - vii. Goal to have all electric bus fleet
      - 1) EV charging at both ends of the route
  - b. West Elizabeth route proposed to go from the Equine Center at West Elizabeth and Overland, travel east toward main campus (past I-House, Rams Village, University Village) quick turn on Shields to serve the north residence halls, Moby Arena, and CSU Transit Center. There will be a connection to the MAX at Laurel station – proposal to take BRT down Myrtle to connect to USC.
  - c. This has been part of the city planning and the campus master planning for both Main Campus and Foothills Campus. To make vital connection, we need transit center and a dedicated shuttle, which started last January. The connector road will be a transit guideway leading to more efficient and frequent connections to the bldgs. on Foothills Campus.
  - d. The transit center is federally funded on campus. Helps drive ridership.
  - e. Foothills Campus Transit Center brought to MPC several years ago. Worked with Pickett Center on this idea.
    - i. Ground set aside in the master plan.
    - ii. Intent to have a transit center that allows for 3 spots for enhanced BRT. Potentially leverage Pickett Center as park-n-ride with existing parking lot. Transfer point for the Foothills circulator shuttle. Design set up to accommodate all these foreseen needs.

- iii. Design it with roundabout. Needs for sidewalk and separated or shared bike facilities along Overland Trail. Accommodate safe crossing patterns across Overland Trail with safe crosswalks, so people can transfer safely.
- f. West Elizabeth corridor has a large percentage of student housing; this is the highest density area for student housing. City wants to accommodate these connections between campuses through bus and by making sure there are appropriate sidewalks, tree lawns, and protected bike infrastructure.
  - i. Trying to introduce protected bike infrastructure.
    - 1) Type 1 – where it is in the street with a buffer area that has some form of protection. These kinds are typically where there are a lot of driveways. Does not make a lot of sense to put at the grade of sidewalks because there are too many transitions between driveways.
    - 2) Type 2 – where the protected lane is at grade with the sidewalk. There is a physical curb keeping vehicles away from bicycles. This is CSU’s preferred style, separating cyclist from vehicles, and has less intrusive structures in street that allows CSU to have more flexibility for converting our streets during events.
  - ii. Cross section typically has turn lanes, 11 ft drive lanes, and BRT running throughout.
- g. Raised platform stations along street would be at same elevation as the floor of the bus. Trying to have consistent feel to the stations.
  - i. Integrated design for safety so the bike is pushed behind the station, to avoid the bike running through where boarding/offloading passengers would be.
- h. Shelly Carroll asks, Will CSU students and staff be able to ride for free?
  - i. Yes, that would be the intent just like any other route on the system.
- i. City Park intersection crossing – Street will feel more compressed in some places with narrower travel lanes. Critical to make safe design, since this location is a high crash intersection in city currently.
- j. Plum Street by Moby pool (C Wing) – there are plans for potential expansion of this facility, but also many tricky crossing movements currently occurring on this block of Plum St. Trying to create clear pathway for bikes and peds to navigate through this section. Would like to eliminate the angled walk to clarify the crossings along the street.
- k. Still in discussion with consultant about where Horn will locate, and if there is a separate stop.
- l. Near Parmelee’s parking lot, cyclists are moved down to the street level. To have people flow simultaneously, need to bring bikes to street level to merge safely through the roundabout. This is a low volume traffic corridor. Most parking is static, daily parking for students in residence halls. Lots of crossing movements at this intersection currently that the design is trying to alleviate.
  - i. Aaron Fodge adds that the roundabout balances keeping transit moving and making flow of bikes and peds more predictable so right of way is yielded correctly. It slows people down when movements aren’t predictable.
- m. Mari Strombom asks in Microsoft Teams, “Aaron - will that be the same on Plum? We need to make sure that delivery trucks have a place to park by the residence halls on the north side, and we also need to consider move-in and move-out traffic concerns.
  - i. Yes, this will be the design for Plum and other locations on our campuses where protected lanes are identified. CSU should be creating more load and delivery areas as

you've described. We can accommodate move-in with one-way circulation for unloading. Protected bike lanes are critical to support commuters that are uncomfortable in the roadway.

- ii. Aaron Fodge adds, "Protected lanes also prevent motorists from parking in bike lanes."
- n. Mari Strombom asks in Microsoft Teams, "Would it be possible for the raised bike lanes to only be on the south side of Plum?"
  - i. Aaron Fodge says it is possible, but he doesn't think they would recommend it for the reasons mentioned in his comment above.
  - ii. The alternative they considered was putting protective infrastructure in the street. That would mean removing infrastructure for events like move-in, for example. During move-in week, they would shut down the road. Could use the protected bike lanes as staging areas or for golf carts to move back and forth. Could align circulation in one way.
- o. Mari Strombom's concern is also during the course of the academic year. There are delivery trucks frequently parked on the northside of the street: delivering packages and refilling vending machines, students' vehicles stopped there when loading and unloading for weekends. Wants to make sure we're considering that full context. Would like to explore retaining ability to get closer to residence halls on northside.
  - i. Aaron Fodge says, yes, we could, but he would not personally recommend it. Parking in the bike lanes is not legal. The area is signed as no parking.
    - 1) Mari agrees, yet that is how it is being used.
    - 2) Aaron says that CSU needs to make sure we identify design that adds places for deliveries, not just a topic for Plum, but a topic to be considered for the whole campus. Deliveries are going to go up on our campuses, and we need to allow for these movements to occur safely. This is an issue that goes beyond Plum.
  - ii. David Hansen adds that another benefit to the raised bike lane is that having everything at the same level helps us with clearing efforts during snow removal. This was also a key conversation with city staff regarding the Elizabeth corridor.
- p. Christian Dykson, is there enough margin on the north side walk for the raised bike lane to merge or take 50% for designated offloading or delivery zone?
  - i. Potentially everything is on the table, but David Hansen thinks that they'd prefer to figure out a different location for deliveries, and to not have them park on Plum Street. While it still happens and is an enforcement challenge, it is not legal and CSU PD could ticket them today. Need to have a holistic conversation for all corridors on campus.
  - ii. Mari Strombom writes in MS Teams chat, "I agree Aaron - and I don't see delivery and load areas built into this plan for Plum street." And "And it's also not legal on Laurel, so where are they supposed to go?"
    - 1) Agree that we need to work on this. More evaluation on this is needed.
    - 2) David Hansen proposes using monthly meeting with PTS, FM, HDS to discuss.
- q. Electrification of the bus not represented in the conceptual design. Potential for small triangular parking lot for buses to pull off and electrically charge. Also, there is the idea to electrify and charge out at Foothills Station. There will be other locations throughout City of Fort Collins.
- r. Timeline:
  - i. 2020 – Corridor tour with Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
  - ii. 2021 – Recognized by FTA as an eligible project

- iii. Spring 2021 – Begin Conceptual Engineering Design
- iv. April 2022 - Finalizing conceptual level engineering design and pricing
  - 1) Awaiting budgeting and current estimates for project – preliminary numbers occurring in coming weeks. Critical next step for the project.
- v. Spring/Summer 2022 – North Front Range MPO Project Adoption
- vi. Fall 2022 – FTA approval of project
- vii. Q4 2022 – Identify Local Match toward “Small Starts” Grant
- viii. Spring 2023 – Begin Final Engineering Design
- ix. Q4 2024 – Construction Start

**3. Campus Planner Search Update** (Jessica Kramer)

- a. The position is posted and the full consideration date closes at the end of April 4.
- b. Received about 17 applications.
- c. Initial interviews will be in April.
- d. Plans to have on campus forums the last week of April/early May. This position will have a lot of collaboration across campus, and we would like campus input.
  - i. This position will look at interior space planning and space utilization as well as exterior, an expanded role from the previous campus planner role.