

Physical Development Committee (PDC) Minutes - 1/20/2023

<https://www.fm.colostate.edu/pdc/>

Participants:

Jim Sites, Bob Kaempfe, Amy Barkley (on behalf of Sue Doe), Stephanie Wagner (on behalf of Ryan Claycomb), Dave Bradford, Chris Ferris, Mark Ritschard, Ashraf Fouad, Kacie Thielman, Brendan Hanlon, Stephanie Zakis, Mark Pashke, Devan Durand, Mike Ellis, Beth Adams, Justin Dove, Meara Faw, Brian Grube, David Hansen, Sue James, Mike Rush, Tom Satterly, Jillian Zucosky, Paula Mills, Ria Vigil, Steve Burn

Introduction:

PDC is an advisory board that provides recommendations, guidance, and final direction on anything that affects our physical environment on our CSU campuses—not necessarily on where buildings will go, but on how our physical environment (the aesthetics and how it functions) work for all our campus community, including students, employees, visitors, etc.

PDC quorum is one more than half the voting members (or their designated representative) present to vote during a meeting.

Current PDC voting members (as of Jan. 13, 2023)

1. Beth Adams, College of Health and Human Sciences
2. Albert Bimper, Office of the President
3. Dave Bradford, Parking and Transportation Services (PTS)
4. Steve Burn, Central Receiving
5. Dell Rae Ciaravola, Risk & Public Safety
6. Ryan Claycomb, College of Liberal Arts
7. Sue Doe, Faculty Council
8. Justin Dove, Student Disability Center
9. Mike Ellis, Office of VP for Student Affairs
10. Chris Ferris, Athletics
11. Sue James, Office of the Provost
12. Christa Johnson, Office of VP for Research
13. Jason Johnson, Office of General Counsel
14. Bob Kaempfe, College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
15. Monica Latham, College Liaison Department of CSU Libraries
16. Christie Mathews, Administrative Professional Council
17. Jamie McCue, Academic Computing and Networking Services
18. Paula Mills, College of Agricultural Sciences
19. Tonie Miyamoto, President's Sustainability Commission
20. Mark Paschke, College of Natural Resources
21. Mark Ritschard, College of Engineering
22. Darin Sanders, MarComm
23. Tom Satterly, Associate VP for Facilities Management
24. James Sites, College of Natural Sciences

25. Dustin Vinzant (or Kacie Thielman), University Police Department
26. Ria Vigil, Office of Inclusive Excellence
27. Jon Walter, University Advancement

1. Request for Approval: Elm Outdoor Classroom (David Hansen & Mark Paschke)

- a. Introduction: Discussing this project from a larger campus use perspective.
 - i. Funding request to UFFAB for outdoor classroom. If that funding doesn't come to pass, it could be a donor-funded opportunity.
- b. Site Context
 - i. Location is southeast corner of water plaza/engineering quad, and directly north of Warner College of Natural Resources (WCNR). Immediately west of the NRRL Bldg., a facility used by WCNR. It is also located by the American Elm tree referred to as the Octopus Tree, which is on the notable tree tour (dating from 1920s) and has one of the greatest canopies of the elms that we have.
 - ii. Today the area has a parking lot/small, paved service area.
 - 1) There is a desire to peel some of the asphalt away from root zone of tree – openly help health of tree with more water reaching root zone.
 - iii. Modify entry way into building and the sidewalk that heads north to water plaza.
 - 1) West elevation of NRRL building, there is a singular entry/exit point. Proposing modification to the stoop. Currently there is a hand-built wooden ramp accessing building – can improve upon this.
 - 2) Looking west, there is an alleyway on north side of WCNR bldg. and some service parking.
 - 3) A few years ago, developed a sidewalk that leads to west through evergreen trees, installed to get people out of the alley way for those who are walking generally from Ag bldg. over to LSC. The pedestrian path accommodates that movement.
 - 4) There are two service parking areas on the asphalt. Suggesting relocation of those.
- c. Past Planning
 - i. Planning began as early as 2017.
 - ii. Outdoor spaces around Forestry and Natural Resources bldgs., thinking of outdoor education as a part of Warner College.
- d. From the plan – successful outcomes
 - i. University Ave. streetscape design – upgrade to pedestrian friendly plaza and stormwater mitigation through percolation of the permeable pavers, re-accounting of bike racks/bike parking, more accessible plaza street from east leading to LSC plaza.
 - ii. 2018 UFFAB funding received to construct, immediately east of WCNR bldg. in Sherwood Forest, and outdoor classroom
 - 1) Utilized sandstone boulders
 - 2) ADA accessible – can access from top or from gravel path.
 - 3) Mark Paschke – Very popular addition to the college teaching space. Always utilized Sherwood Forest for informal teaching and formal activities with the Forestry program. Having the classroom space has really brought a lot of classes into Sherwood Forest area. Students in WCNR like being outdoors and studies suggest

students learn better in outdoor settings. Very beneficial to the college to have these spaces. This space is utilized nearly all the time. Trying to increase ability to have these spaces around the bldg. so that classes can move outside when weather is nice.

- e. Proposed Concept – Elm outdoor classroom
 - i. Portion of the asphalt paving would be removed immediately west of NRRL bldg.
 - ii. Accommodate another stone/boulder seating arrangement to provide similar outdoor seating/education space.
 - iii. Additional tables can be set under tree
 - iv. Revamp west entry with new ramp and stoop
 - v. Modify sidewalk to accommodate room in the space
 - vi. Alleyway that leads to the space is critical to operational and service needs
 - 1) Integrated Solid Waste drives large truck to collect recycling and trash
 - 2) Delivering for back loading and dock space
 - 3) Fire Dept. needs to access through alleyway.
 - 4) Need to accommodate the parking and maintain some pavement to allow for larger vehicles to turnaround
 - vii. Landscape improvements anticipated – native plant material related to educational outreach and learning as part of WCNR curriculum, and promoting pollinators on campus
 - 1) Screen the pavement with some larger plant material
 - 2) Vegetated green screens to soften looking at blank brick walls
 - 3) Stone seating similar to Sherwood Forest space
 - 4) Crusher fine surface on base plane to allow water to percolate, to improve tree needs. Surface is same as Sherwood and can accommodate from ADA perspective
 - 5) Vision looks back to water plaza south of engineering
 - viii. Bike rack needs to be accommodated in plan
 - ix. Area to seat 20-25 people comfortable
 - x. Relocate impacted service parking
 - 1) There is existing parking area. Can move curb line and adjust on northside of Natural resources Bldg.
- f. Discussion
 - i. Sue James – is it a general assignment classroom that everyone can use or just for Warner?
 - 1) David Hansen & Mark P. – Informally, anyone is welcome to use the space. It is not general assignment because couldn't schedule a course due to weather. It's a space that can be used as a first come, first serve situation. That's the way the one in Sherwood Forest works. Can schedule the space through campus scheduling for special events.
 - ii. Mark Ritschard – how will the site be affected when Glover comes down (in Phase I and Phase II)? What about the protection of the site from the noise and construction and how will it affect classes for noise?
 - 1) David Hansen – Site should be outside any laydown or construction zone, an outlier to the immediate impacts of construction. There will be an immediate impact during the life of Glover construction. Engineering quad to the west will probably be

- laydown and construction zone. Need to take long view that this is a benefit beyond that construction.
- iii. Kacie Thielman – Mentioned looking at access. Does the access change on west side of NRRL? Usually accessing on asphalt road, but sometimes patrol cars squeeze from water plaza to east side of Natural Resources. Is that still accessible or will be blocked off with seating area?
 - 1) David Hansen – Sidewalk remains but ends up with a curve. Width of pavement is same but slightly different alignment could be challenging. There is a stormwater drain west of that, so it drops off into inlet into the grass, but could look at how to minimize that grading effect if need to contemplate accessing in emergency situation.
 - 2) Kacie Thielman – Patrol would potentially drive on it. Try to stay on asphalt as much as possible. Fire and med would be staged on outer portions, can't access due to width. Doesn't see any other issues.
 - iv. David Hansen – Plan proposes addition of site lighting. There is a lack of lighting and older lighting, so there would be an upgrade to lighting.
 - v. Kacie Thielman – Are you looking at cameras potentially?
 - 1) David Hansen – Cameras not part of current consideration.
 - 2) Kacie Thielman – Lighting would be good. There is transient activity on east side of campus. Could see them using the rocks. If there is room in- the budget, recommends looking at ways for rock sizes or textures to not be as comfortable to lie down on – from safety perspective of transients potentially sleeping on rocks.
 - 3) David Hansen – Is that an issue in Sherwood Forest?
 - 4) Kacie Thielman – Not that much, mostly hanging out in the trees. Consideration of how covered it is with a lot of foliage. Sherwood Forest is pretty open. Probably not that big of a concern.
 - vi. Brandan Hanlon – Can you repeat source of funding?
 - 1) David Hansen – There is a request submittal to UFFAB. Not awarded yet. Otherwise, looking at it as a donor opportunity.
 - 2) Brendan – What was the estimated budget needed?
 - 3) David Hansen – Approx. \$200,000 to realize the modified parking, development of site, electrical needs of lighting, and landscape and irrigation upgrades.
 - vii. David Hansen shares that this has gone through a review with the Design Review Committee, internally through Facilities Management.
 - 1) Also reached out to Central Receiving, Parking Services, and bldg. proctors.
 - viii. Jim Sites – Looked out the window at the tree and thinks the land looks great.
 - ix. Gargi Duttgupta – Since it impacts the physical structure of the campus, PDC has purview because it is the exterior campus character that we're discussing, even though there is no funding source yet. We're making sure this is approved by PDC before seeking funding. If funding came later, is this something we could advance?
 - g. Motion to approve the outdoor classroom space as proposed.
 - i. Sue James motions to approve the space plan.
 - ii. Dave Bradford seconds the motion.
 - iii. Unanimous approval – everyone from the PDC is in favor. No opposition expressed.

2. Transportation Demand Management Master Plan Update (Devan Durand)

- a. Overview:
 - i. Updating 2014 Parking and Transportation Plan
 - ii. Hired Kimley-Horn through On-Call Engineering Contract
 - iii. \$172,000 Planning Effort
 - iv. \$60,000 Grant from CDOT to Deliver TDM Plan (shared with the State)
 - v. Target Completion – June 2023
 - vi. Recommendations for inclusion in CSU’s 2024 Master Plan Update
- b. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – Providing travelers with effective choices to improve travel reliability. For CSU, that’s students, staff, and visitors coming to campus.
- c. Transportation Planning
 - i. Improve infrastructure connectivity and circulation
 - ii. Improve permeability of walkways, bikeways, & transit
 - iii. Improve multimodal safety
 - iv. Prioritize the movement of people – system efficiency (for example, through intersections)
 - v. Support interconnectivity between modes (for example, how easily people can get from a bus to a bike pathway or to a pedestrian pathway)
- d. Data driven planning – data sources and factors considered, sharing with Kimley Horn
 - i. Sources:
 - 1) Parking Demand
 - 2) Transit Ridership
 - 3) Bicycle Counters
 - 4) Crash Data
 - 5) Household (Travel shed)
 - 6) Cordon Study (Transportation flow)
 - ii. University-Driven Estimates:
 - 1) Enrollment
 - 2) Beds (on-campus housing)
 - 3) Land-Use Trade-Offs
 - 4) Example: How are we building? How does construction impact safe movement and circulation?
 - 5) Goal by Mode of Transportation
- e. Examples of data
 - i. Pitkin Low Stress Bike Corridor – Worked with city to map households to show nearly 8,000 staff and students that lived within this 5-mile corridor, facilitating the \$600,000 spend by the city to create the low stress bike pathway.
 - ii. Understand movements at all of our intersections by bikes, peds, vehicles. Understanding the turning movements help us understand what kind of infrastructure we need to seek out for improvements and what kind of education or enforcement opportunities and recommendations we need to improve safety at our intersections
 - iii. Poudre Express – Worked with UNC, mapping households to understand how improving the movement of people could assist staff and students every day. Poudre Express moves through Greely and Windsor to Main Campus in Fort Collins.

- iv. Sustainability efforts – as we improve electricity, it will put more focus on transportation and what we can do to reduce emissions.
- v. Infrastructure – people used to drive all the way up Center Ave to the Lory Student Center in the 1960s. Now infrastructure has changed as we have grown with academic building along Center Ave. No longer can drive write up to the buildings. All our campuses have boundary restrictions. As we grow, we need to understand how that impacts the movement of people and circulation.
- f. Different movements on campus and how people get to campus
 - i. Resident halls on west side of campus
 - ii. Academic buildings on east side of campus
 - iii. Converge in middle at the pedestrian walkway
 - iv. People coming onto campus north south traffic creates conflict and potential risk, so need to understand movements to improve safety
- g. Example from West Elizabeth Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project with City
 - i. Adopt complete street standards.
 - ii. When doing designs or making changes to buildings or infrastructure, come with perspective of safety for all modes of transportation (pedestrians, bikes, vehicles), design so all moving safely through campus.
- h. Permeability – How can campus be welcoming?
 - i. Federally funded transit center at heart of campus – brings community directly on campus
 - ii. 10 routes coming to campus
 - iii. MAX (Bus rapid transit) – three MAX stations on campus, one on south campus
 - iv. City bikeways, low stress bikeway – insurance campus is welcoming to community
 - v. Engineering – design of underpass at Shields/Elizabeth – come onto campus safely
- i. Equity
 - i. Once people get to campus, provide other amenities to support employees, students, and visitors. Reduces need to make additional trips off campus to accommodate their needs
 - ii. Examples: Lactation rooms, Reflection spaces, Break rooms
- j. Education
 - i. Training to first year college students, assist with how to share road and move around campus safely
 - ii. Pop up events, engaging commuters on their commute path about our efforts on safe movement
 - iii. In 2019 a student struck and killed on campus. President enacted Vision Zero taskforce with charge to improve safety on campus. Vision Zero is effort to eliminate all fatalities and serious level crashes
- k. People focused throughput – Increase Throughput Efficiency and Reduce Vehicular Emissions
 - i. Elizabeth BRT program – understanding as we move forward with MAX 2.0, it is about moving people safely. Example shows how the design keeps bicyclists and pedestrians safe as buses and vehicles also move on street.
 - ii. Foothills shuttle – 2 dedicate on foothills campus. Connecting those shuttles with routes that come to main campus. How to improve this movement more efficiently for people on our campuses.
- l. Improving Interconnectivity

- i. Overland Trail and West Elizabeth Corridor – bring transit center to Foothills Campus to help improve that circulation effort, joining the campuses easily and providing opportunities for people to access other transportation from bus (bikes, their vehicles, remote parking, or rental vehicles).
- m. Connecting Transportation Modes
 - i. Fleet Vehicles (rental vehicles available)
 - ii. Free Transit
 - iii. Spin E-scooter and E-bike share
 - iv. Zipcar (only have to be 18 to take a zip car, have accessibility to move on and off campus)
- n. Parking and Transportation Services working for the university with surrounding partners to improve transportation efforts
 - i. City of Fort Collins
 - ii. North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization
 - iii. CDOT
- o. Timeline
 - i. Phase 1 (currently in) – engaging and sharing information, feedback gathering
 - ii. Phase 2 – bring people in through focus groups and driving into more detail
 - iii. Phase 3 – come up with draft plan for people to review
 - iv. Phase 4 – wrap up by end of the fiscal year
- p. Questions
 - i. What employee transportation needs should be considered in the plan?
 - ii. What student transportation needs should be considered in the plan?
 - iii. Considering day-to-day activities of CSU community members, what infrastructure improvements should be considered in the plan?
 - iv. What opportunities exist (or could exist) for you and/or your dept to play a role in optimizing the transportation system at CSU?
- q. Discussion
 - i. Jessica Kramer writes in Teams chat, “To join the outreach email, receive updates, and join a focus group: [TDMPlan.colostate.edu](https://tdmplan.colostate.edu)”
 - ii. Gargi Duttgupta – Connectivity between campuses is critical. Regarding the other means highlighted (zipcar, scooters, bikes, cars) and given the location on main campus, is that the best location on main campus to encourage students and staff to use the transit or other means to do a quick back and forth between Foothills? Trying to imagine the main physicality and where primarily is the hub of student usage.
 - 1) Devan Durand – are you asking about the transit design at Foothills Campus?
 - 2) Gargi Duttgupta – The availability of alternate transportation on main campus seems to be at southeast end of campus. Is that part of the TDMP to figure out if that is the right location? People won’t want to walk one mile on the main campus to get themselves a means to transport themselves to Foothills Campus.
 - 3) Devan Durand – Yes, that is part of this study, how we improve connectivity. Kimley Horn to analyze the data with objectivity to assist with how we improve the infrastructure to support the connectivity. That may be micro transportation hubs. Excited to understand what the best way is to encourage people by having the right infrastructure in the right places to use these different modalities.

- iii. Kacie Thielman - Will have more questions/comments as the process goes further along. Thinks the idea is great of having defined lanes of travel for a bike, for a pedestrian, for vehicles, for turning. We need this on main campus, dividing lanes of travel because having them mixed is where we run into issues. Within the consulting process, keeping that format alive of defined and protected lanes for bike travel systems separate from vehicle travel. Having ease of access for first responders when looking at separate lanes and turning lanes, as well as lighting and wayfinding. All of this is given stuff.
 - 1) Devan Durand – safe movement involves all those pieces.
 - 2) David Hansen writes in Teams chat, “Kacie great comment. We are working on a separate ‘complete streets document’ through the lens of vision zero that starts to provide guidelines for consideration of all modes and how to best provide accommodation for all modes. More to come on that throughout this process.
- iv. Amy Barkley writes in Teams chat, “this may be a general question for Transfort, but I am curious if discussions about more frequency in buses have been part of this conversation. It seems that a lot of the buses are timed only every hour, which may not be convenient for those traveling to and from.”
 - 1) Devan Durand – We want Transfort as an active partner in TDM planning because it is about, what do we understand about barriers of why people don’t take transit and what are the improvements we can do with our partnership with the city?
- v. Gargi Duttgupta writes in Teams chat, “EV - is that part of this TDMP too?”
 - 1) Yes, definitely how to develop EV program.
- vi. Mark Ritschard – Engineering’s foothills campus presence is on Laporte. What are the considerations in the planning of the interactions between Foothills on Rampart Rd and Laporte? What is the status of the dirt road conversation is?
 - 1) Devan Durand – Yes, it is the goal that the master plan effort and results from Kimley Horn will lay that out for us – what are the critical elements to consider in our ten-year planning effort. We don’t have a result yet, but we want to make sure those things are captured.
 - 2) David Hansen writes in Teams chat, “Mark - we are still looking to identify funding for the Foothills Connector road that you mentioned to realize the Foothills campus transit circulator to connect Rampart Rd and Laporte Ave.”
- vii. Jessica Kramer – Thinks there is a strong engagement process in the beginning. Sometimes it’s hard for people to react in a broad way. Consider what the engagement process is after some of these solutions are more concrete. Understanding that maybe it’s not the final TDMP when it goes public in May/June, something like: if we were to consider these things, what would we rate as higher priority?
 - 1) Devan Durand – Talked internally that if we need to slow down to engage everyone through the process and get it right, PTS is dedicated to doing that. Will get best results and creative solutions to make sure we go through the process to gather information.
- viii. Kacie Thielman – when are you hoping to get feedback from Kimley Horn?
 - a) Devan Durand – Kimley Horn knows that PTS is doing the announcement of the planning efforts currently. Planning to do a test focus group with PTS team next week to make sure not confined by their own thoughts and processes. Then

make sure all focus groups after are diverse and have good representation. PTS will send an email to everyone from the presentation where you can go to sign up to be further involved in focus groups.

- ix. Brendan Hanlon asks in Teams chat, “I may have missed this, what is the adoption process?”
 - 1) Dave Bradford – for the final adoption, this plan will go into the campus master plan like last time. Will eventually go to Master plan Committee to be submitted into campus master plan. Will go to VPUO and in process will get feedback from Public Safety team as a stakeholder as well.
- x. Brendan responds – What is “adoption” meaning, and when is final, final? When is input included, sounds like that is iterative. Is there a passive way to participate on their own time? A survey component?
 - 1) Devan Durand – Every year there is a multi-modal split survey. Kimley Horn is evaluating the survey to ensure it is valid with the way the questions are worded, recommend edits, and use survey going forward (part of Phase II through SOURCE to our population. Can sign up on PTS webpage too.)
- xi. Gargi Duttgupta – When the master plan is completed, it goes through leadership and Board of Governor presentation, to approve the master plan.

3. Request for Approval: Proposed Guidelines for Accessory Structures (Jessica Kramer)

- a. Discussed draft guidelines at PDC in October 2022. Coordinated further with Housing and Dining Services.
- b. Updated since Oct. 2022:
 - i. Temporary Structure guidelines:
 - 1) Added “Temporary food related trailers - No DRC approval required. Note that Environmental Health Services and other applicable reviews may be required.”
 - ii. Permanent Structure Guidelines:
 - 1) Added Mountain Campus to outlying CSU properties.
 - 2) Added that in Family Housing areas, premanufactured structure and structures with composite siding or metal siding are allowed for garden functions only.
 - iii. Last draft guidelines emailed to PDC on 1/11/2023.
 - 1) Added cart enclosure with covered bicycle rack, bicycle parking enclosure, and covered cart structure guidelines.
 - a) Examples include at Ammons Hall on the northside – has an enclosure for security and one was added at A/Z addition for screening and to have a gate for security.
 - b) We have a service cart policy that notes where these locations can be for parking. Regardless of where people may want to put them, they still have to go through rigorous process to ensure coordination with landscape, irrigation, parking, access, and emergency services.
 - c) These guidelines are more for what is allowed where and within what viewsheds or not allowed in certain key areas of our campuses.
 - iv. Additional comments this week:
 - 1) Add “Solar panels may be added to permanent structures, and are encouraged, where feasible.”

- a) Any accessory structure would need to be engineered to withstand structural load of solar panels as well as have the capability and adjacency to connect to existing utility infrastructure.
- b) At Feb. 2020 meeting, PDC reviewed and approved guidelines for solar panels: Solar installations allowed in parking lots, bike shelters, on buildings, and ground mounted with prior approval of the specific location by the Physical Development Committee. Installations only allowed on assets that have a projected life of 20 or more years.

c. Discussion

- i. Kacie Thielman – First time on PDC. Regarding, the covered bike racks, etc., is that being discussed on this committee or on another committee, and is this plan starting to set those standards?
 - 1) Jessica Kramer – The standards are not necessarily what they look like, but more of the approval process of where they are allowed, can go or not go, on campus. For example, don't want to see it covered bike parking viewable from the Oval. Sometimes departments buy a tuff shed on their own and don't talk to Facilities Management about it. The guidelines help indicate who needs to be involved. Make sure people from different colleges and departments come through Facilities Management, go through the process and are assigned a project manager, and understand costs and why they can't just go buy a tuff shed and put it where they want. It also gives guidelines to the project manager from the beginning.
 - 2) Kacie Thielman – I know we have covered bike parking by University MAX station and garages. Could be conflicts if there will be cameras, then possibly don't do covered, or if covered, then maybe lose the element of camera surveillance. Easy for people to get out of view/hide for that.
 - a) Good to know for approving locations, though may not put into the guidelines.
- ii. Chris Ferris – From Athletics Dept. perspective, we are on board with what we're trying to achieve. Would there be an opportunity or language that could be considered regarding temporary structures on main campus. Athletics has teams that practice at the track and there is no storage. The budget to build a permanent structure doesn't exist right now. In the middle of project with a new softball facility and soccer facility, which will help including title nine compliance, but wondering about an opportunity to collaborate to find a solution that might not right now be a permanent structure that we don't have the budget for.
 - 1) Jessica Kramer – In facilities we're cognizant of understanding why requests come through for temporary structures or types of structures that are meant to be temporary but eventually never really go away. We're trying to set some standards/guidelines. The Campus Planning section wants to work with partners, understand what your needs are and where we can help find solutions. Wouldn't necessarily allow temporary structures, but we do want to help people to try to find ways to work through that. We have the tough job of trying to make sure we don't set precedents. It's tricky because what people envision to be temporary structures, end up staying and people forget about them being temporary.

- 2) Chris Ferris – Athletics has javelin throwers. Can't leave a javelin outside, need to secure the equipment, but don't have vehicles readily available to transport javelins. There is an operational component. If there could be language introduced for a process of review of extenuating circumstances, that could give comfort that there is an opportunity to review the challenge that exists.
- iii. Sue James – Understands what Jessica means about temporary structures becoming permanent. What do you do when people don't follow the guidelines? Have you thought about the accountability/enforcement part?
 - 1) Jessica Kramer – Even with policies, there are things that go against policies. Who gets to be the enforcement? The Design Review Committee and design planning, would try to find out where something appears, educate people about it, whose it is and why they need, how to mitigate it, understanding they may have spent money. Don't necessarily want to put that process in the guidelines, but we have discussed that internally.
 - iv. Brendan Hanlon – To Chris's question about an identification of solutions, what is the problem we're solving? Is it that these temporary options don't aesthetically conform to certain standards and is it also because they are temporary structures the longevity is not sustainable? Is it possible to have a requirement where a group who wants to consider an option like this has to buy up to a certain standard? Doesn't get to Chris's point of limitation on budget and financial capacity but are there ways to buy up an option that provides for a solution for an organization that does a far better job of aesthetics and/or the longevity of a facilities. Nobody wants a bunch of one-off assets across campus, especially in our most aesthetically sensitive areas, of a lower quality to buy cheaply but also ends up being derelict because ends up being 15- or 20-year asset.
 - 1) Jessica Kramer – These guidelines do talk about different kinds of permanent structures. Some of these accessory structures that we will allow are more of a premanufactured-type building with a substantial roof that doesn't look like a tuff shed. It is a step up and it is still a large ask from a financial standpoint. Part is functional and aesthetic, and part is the perception of constantly running out of space. We have also seen a lot of academic bldgs. have put in pods—metal trailers—that proliferate. They are deemed more economical than putting an addition onto a building, but they don't look very aesthetic. Example of one added at the Painter Center and people from other bldgs. like Biology can look down and see it. The Richardson Design Center asked to put a pod next to brand new beautiful bldg., so it seems like we're not taking advantage of our more permanent storage capacities. We've struggled with trying to determine what works from an aesthetic and financial basis.
 - 2) Brendan Hanlon – Can understand how you grapple with it, where if you buy up aesthetics and permanency, the budget solution becomes more challenging.
 - v. Gargi Duttgupta – Appreciates the issue that Athletics has regarding storage. Everyone talks about the aesthetic character of the main campus and that's how these recommendations came into existence because it came down as something desirable. The Facilities Management team wants to be good partners. Cost is always an issue for most programs. Maybe there is an opportunity to talk about things when capital projects are

funded, that we build in storage space. A new bldg. like Richardson should not run out of space so quickly. It's always an issue of how to minimize costs, but that is difficult in the long run because then FM operations teams have to do fenagling when things have been there 15 or 20 years. These are considerations that need to come into play when looking at projects on main campus. It's not one size fits all, but it may be something to consider overall. When you have challenges, the FM team always collaborates with partners. We have to be equitable with everyone and we're not the ones making the decision in the final analysis and all of that comes into play. Always happy to talk on case-by-case basis. Regarding Sue's comment about enforcing the guidelines – maybe the committee needs to decide how to approach enforcement. We want to be good shepherds, don't want to be prescriptive through the guidelines, trying to do the right thing collectively. May be good for the committee to have a discussion and make some decisions on enforcement.

- 1) Sue James – PDC members could help and support Facilities Management when finding themselves in difficult enforcement situations.
- vi. Kacie Thielman writes in Teams chat, "I need to step out early. I'm in agreement with Chris F. There should be a way to request permission for accessory structures that meet the need of a particular department. And maybe determine what temporary is. My vote is yes. There definitely are more discussions that need to be had in regards to aesthetics and the requirement to meet those guidelines. Thank you."
- vii. Jessica Kramer – Are we ready to make a decision on this or is there a need for more offline discussion on this with leadership? Does this still put too much of a burden on some departments? Working with a policy that did give some leeway, Jessica always got the questions of – What determines the leeway? Who determines that? Trying to find a way to set aside some of the ambiguity. We run into the risk of setting a precedent for some being allowed to do it and others not.
- 1) Gargi Duttgupta – The first baseline to make clear is that Facilities Management did not put these guidelines out because we believe in A, B, or C. It's been understood for years from leadership and colleges that the main campus character, facades, and how we want main campus to look is important; the image is important, which is why these guidelines came about. It is not a Facilities Management agenda. We have a PDC voting group, so we should poll the group to ask if the group wants to revisit this with CSU leadership or if there is the desire to allow accessory structures on main campus.
 - 2) Jessica Kramer adds – this topic has been relevant on South Campus too. We have gone to great lengths and costs to eliminate temporary storage facilities that were seen from our newest facilities. Foothills Campus has some areas around the Jud Harper Complex in which some of those structures are not appropriate and some comments have been made as well. Most commonly seen on main campus, but also seen from south and foothills.
- viii. Mark Pashke writes in Teams chat – "I think that departments with temporary storage needs are often not aware that Central Receiving has an off campus warehouse facility available: <http://cr.colostate.edu/warehouse-services.html>"
- 1) Gargi Duttgupta writes in teams chat, "Agreed. But Athletics may have an issue with off campus storage."

2) Jessica Kramer – Has heard that the ongoing cost to rent the storage space is a barrier and they want the storage immediately available/adjacent to their bldgs.

d. Motion for Approval of the guidelines

- i. Sue James motions in the chat “I need to run to next meeting. I'm comfortable w/ these guidelines and would vote yes to support.”
- ii. Tom Satterly seconds the motion aloud and in the Teams chat.
- iii. Mike Ellis writes in teams chat, “I'm also supportive of what you've assembled. Thanks for your good work here.”
- iv. Ria Vigil writes in teams chat, “I support.”
- v. Jessica Kramer says that she received a message from Monica Latham and Tonie Miyamoto that they could not attend today but that they approve in absentia.
- vi. Mark Paschke writes in teams chat, “I vote to approve.”
- vii. Stephanie Wagner writes in teams chat, “Per Ryan Claycomb - he votes yes.”
- viii. Mark Ritschard writes in teams chat, “I support the motion.”
- ix. Paula Mills writes in teams chat, “Yes” in support of the motion.
- x. Dave Bradford writes in teams chat, “I support this.”
- xi. Bob Kaempfe writes in teams chat, “I support this.”
- xii. Hands raised in favor include Justin Dove and Jim Sites.
- xiii. Members present who are opposed or abstain from voting: Beth Adams, Steve Burn, Amy Barkley on behalf of Sue Doe, Chris Ferris.
- xiv. Approved based on PDC quorum, which is one more than half the voting members present to vote during a meeting: 15 in favor and 4 opposed or abstained from voting.