

Physical Development Committee (PDC) 10/20/2023

Location: Virtual on Microsoft Teams

PDC Voting Participants:

Jillian Zucosky (Classified Personnel Council), Sadie Kinney-McGrath (College of Liberal Arts), Kacie Thielman (Risk & Public Safety / University Police Department), Santiago Di Pietro (College of Natural Sciences), Jon Walter (University Advancement), Wiley Barnes (Office of VP for Research), Steve Burn (Risk & Public Safety / Central Receiving), Dave Bradford (Risk & Public Safety Parking and Transportation Services), Sue James (Office of the Provost), Paula Mills (College of Agricultural Sciences), Christie Matthews (Administrative Professional Council), Mark Paschke (Warner College of Natural Resources), Melinda Smith (Faculty Council), Marcelo Plioplis (MarComm), Tonie Miyamoto (President's Sustainability Commission), Monica Latham (College Liaison Department of CSU Libraries), Tom Satterly (Facilities Management), Jamie McCue (Division of IT), Beth Adams (College of Health and Human Sciences)

Absent PDC Voting Members:

- ASCSU rep – TBD
- Athletics – Chris Ferris
- Scott College of Engineering – Mark Ritschard
- College of Liberal Arts – Ryan Claycomb (delegate came)
- College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences – Bob Kaempfe
- Office of Inclusive Excellence – Ria Vigil
- Office of General Counsel – Jason Johnson
- Office of the President – TBD
- Office of VP for Student Affairs – Mike Ellis
- Risk & Public Safety / Communications – Dell Rae Ciaravola
- Student Disability Center – Justin Dove
- University Advancement – Katie Brayden (delegate came)

Ex-Officio:

Gargi Duttgupta, Julia Innes, Stacey Baumgarn, Ashraf Fouad, Terry Schlicting, Ali Raza, Tracey Abel

1. Glass walls and glazing in buildings and safety concerns

- a. Gargi – This topic came to PDC in reference to the issue of safety in a potential active shooter situation with glass walls and glazing in buildings. Safety is a concern for the campus community. An analysis from a site walk of buildings on campus was completed under Risk & Public Safety (Marc Barker). Gargi asked about the draft report and Marc Barker confirmed that glazing was not part of the study.

- b. Gargi shared examples in PowerPoint showing glass walls inside Chemistry Research, Biology, and BSB. Active shooter situation is generally an interior issue. As a university, usually want to maintain free access to public spaces / buildings.
- c. Santiago – Wanted to bring forward the concern. Was wondering what entity, if not PDC, would be appropriate to discuss these concerns. A dept chair had concerns brought forward by faculty (after Michigan State and UNC incidents) and asked if the university is developing a policy or has a procedure to deal with an active shooter situation. Concern for buildings that have more glass on both exterior and interior walls.
 - i. Should we consider approaches such as glazing of glass walls?
 - ii. Should we consider spaces that have locked doors (spaces not for students) that only personnel need to and could access?
 - iii. There will be policy and communication pieces to this discussion.
 - iv. One way the university has responded to this concern is the recent update to building floor plans: No longer easily accessible to everyone outside of CSU; still accessible to those within CSU. <https://www.fm.colostate.edu/floorplans/>
- d. Gargi – PDC usually doesn't discuss interior of buildings, but this need to be considered from an exterior perspective? The exterior is within PDC purview. PDC does not do building design approvals, but items that have an impact on campus experience and campus character are a subject that this committee could weigh in on/discuss.
- e. Sue – Recommends consulting with Police Dept (PD) who do the active shooter training. Would they consider incorporating aspects of building design within the training? Concerns could include classrooms in central areas or if PD would have recommendations on glazing or shades that can come down.
- f. Kacie – Active assailant training (Run, Hide, Fight) is available by request. Working to make specific trainings mandatory, but they are not currently. Please reach out to Kacie to request the training (kacie.thielman@colostate.edu). It's a free, 90-minute training.
 - i. It is a general training, discussing the approach of Run, Hide, Fight, which is the nationally recognizable model for higher education. The training does not do lock down or lock out drills.
 - ii. CSU is an open campus. Hard to control all buildings on campus.
 - iii. If there is time at the end of the training, the group can briefly go over specific scenarios within the group's space.
 - iv. Kacie can do a CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) site survey – full analysis of a building. This is offered for free.
 - 1) <https://www.cpted.net/>
 - v. Kacie can do a full site walk through. She would share the immediate concerns she sees from a risk management / threat mitigation standpoint. Can look at where the glazing is and what are the pros and cons of glazing and building materials.
 - vi. Visibility is important for PD when responding to an emergency.
 - vii. The first priority in the university is education/learning. Safety is not the first priority, but we need to learn to operate in a safe manner in the environment that the university builds for us. Example: For education glass can be a benefit; for being able to lock yourself away it is not a benefit.

- viii. It's up to the needs and priorities of the department, and Kacie can teach them how to be safe in that environment.
- g. Kacie – Regarding locking doors and access control for individuals, the campus is mostly open access for anyone. There are particular areas that the abnormal user cannot be in. Proximity reader access can serve areas like research labs or computer labs, but would need to consider cost, getting it installed, who controls the access, and making sure the access is up to date.
 - i. Had this conversation recently with the Powerhouse. They allow approved/authorized guests and guests that are expected, but their spaces are not for the general public. There are other areas like the library or the plaza that are open to the public.
 - ii. PD would have access to all of the spaces.
- h. Kacie – There is no standard lock down/lock out procedure at CSU like K-12 has. Be careful and consult with PD before beginning to create procedures or work on a response for your building. There is no CSU universal policy or plan for active assailant situations. Right now, it is up to the building, and in working with the building proctors, to build up their emergency response plan with the emergency manager (Ken Quintana). (i.e., What does a response in this building look like in any emergency? How do you notify people?)
 - i. There is a university-wide notification system already in place at CSU.
 - ii. Be careful about locking doors. Consider if people are fleeing other buildings and if access is cut off to those in need. Discussions needed with Kacie and Ken for this.
 - iii. There is a shelter in place that would be run through dispatch and the CSU notification system.
- i. Santiago – Yes, this answers his initial concerns. Did not know about the PD training. Didn't know buildings could have their own specific plans under the wider policy. In MRB, there is a radioactive source, so very few people can go into those restricted areas. Realizes restricted/locked areas do exist already in some ways. He can report back to dept chair that they can implement plans specific for their buildings but would need to consult with PD, make sure PD is aware, and there is consistency.
- j. Kacie – Want to make sure not putting other populations at risk without knowing it when looking at emergency response. Depends on the materials in the building and the type of people that access the building – all deserve a different response plan and have a different need. Ken Quintana manages all the building emergency plans and can provide a template. Look to see if you have an updated emergency plan for your building. Can customize trainings based on what the concerns are.
- k. Melinda – Will be discussing this at the next Faculty Council Executive Committee. Faculty are concerned about this issue. Melinda will reach out to Kacie to invite her to Faculty Council to provide this information to the group.
- l. Gargi – Kacie clarified that there is no university wide policy because of access control needs, but plans can be created on an individual basis. Having uniform access control where everything can be shut down tends to have an incarceration outlook, so it is difficult to manage that within the higher education world.
 - i. The information Kacie has needs to be shared university wide. The PDC can't do more than ask leadership to bring in policy for active assailants. Crime prevention

through environment design – what role does that have? And where should that sit as we move forward building our campus? May be worth having conversations about this early on when doing building designs.

- m. Santiago – buildings can have their own policies, but who is this vetted with? How does that work?
 - i. Kacie – it starts with Ken Quintana who oversees all building plans. He provides a template and help along the process. Please copy Kacie on the discussion. They work closely together on adding the active assailant response to that plan. Ken works with the requestor on fire, medical, and natural disasters as well.
 - ii. When looking at CPTED, Kacie is part of the review process for any building or new structure that has been approved to be built. She gives comments in Bluebeam regarding fire, emergency access, and building materials. These are only recommendations.
 - iii. Kacie – Tampa Florida is at the forefront of CPTED. It is written into their bylaws for the city that any new buildings must fall within CPTED guidelines/policies before approved. Kacie would like CSU to move toward this approach. Not just a recommendation but something that has to be complied with before it is built on campus, to build in principles (i.e., natural surveillance, maintenance, lighting) to make people feel safe in environments. By the way the building is constructed and how the materials are used, it would aim to deter crime in the first place.
- n. Gargi – PDC is about the physical environment. We do have new large major buildings. Discussed topic at the last Design Review Committee regarding Clark and if people have voiced concerns. Perhaps this is already being discussed, already doing a CPTED analysis with projects. If not, maybe there is an opportunity for the Clark project to engage with this. As designing, pull in Kacie to help review it to offer recommendations for the environmental design for crime prevention.
 - i. Tracey – there are many things to consider beyond glazing. Cameras, locations, moving people all day long every hour on the hour. There is not even a first set of floor plans for Clark until mid-November, so can't begin discussing until then (early Schematic Design set).
 - ii. Gargi – Having input will make us better. The reality is that even building code updates come out of bad incidences, such as a fire or active shooter situations, so it helps to be proactive. If there are other projects coming up, good to involve Ken or Kacie at the review phase.
 - iii. Kacie has the national CPTED designation for the CSU PD. There are a few within PD that have the CPTED recognition. They would be doing site surveys. She is currently part of the Bluebeam review providing recommendations or suggestions. Ultimately, Kacie would like to see bylaws for any new buildings coming to campus that, instead of recommending, these things need to be checked off or addressed from CPTED perspective to move forward. On anything where there may be a place for this, Kacie asks Tracey to reach out to connect with her on it.
 - iv. Tracey – when the program plan starts, there is usually narrative but no design yet. Need to understand how to capture that narrative. Sometimes a program plan will sit on a shelf for 5 years before the state approves it, even after funding has started,

so that is a challenge. How have the needs changed from previously approved funding? For upcoming future buildings, the narrative needs to identify the key elements. Tracey agrees that they can look at it for upcoming projects.

- o. Kacie shared PDF in teams chat on how to apply CPTED on college campuses. She can send additional documentation or research to anyone who reaches out.
- p. MOTION: PDC recommends to the Faculty Council, Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, and the VPUO: (1) Any future new buildings should have the input of CPTED analysis at the program and design stages as part of the stakeholder process. (2) Share and socialize the information that CSU has the ability to make individual building safety plans if you contact CSU PD and emergency response. This will be shared with the councils and VPUO.
 - i. Kacie Thielman makes the motion.
 - ii. Sue James seconds the motion.
 - iii. Voting in approval, supporting the motion: Monica Latham, Christie Mathews, Paula Mills, Steve Burn, Mark Paschke, Marcelo Plioplis, Jillian Zucosky, Jon Walter, Tom Satterly, Sue James, Melinda Smith, Dave Bradford, Jamie McCue, Santiago Di Pietro, Beth Adams, Wiley Barnes
 - iv. Sadie Kinney-McGrath abstains from voting.
 - v. No objections stated.
- q. Tracey adds that they had a lot of these discussions for emergency response during the LSC remodel, conversations about where students would go and how they get a hold of family. Agrees there needs to continue to be discussion on it.
- r. Gargi reminds the PDC that there is a representative from Faculty Council, APC, and CPC on the PDC to bring forth the recommendations and socialize the information about the training and individual plans. There is not an ASCSU rep currently, but we did reach out to them to try to identify one.
- s. Gargi – Having the analysis does not necessarily mean that is the path one follows, just that Kacie/PD would review the plan and share good ideas to consider.
- t. Gargi – Expanding on what Santiago mentioned earlier, about a year ago, the floor plans were freely available on CSU websites, and they could be accessed by CSU constituents and the general public. Because of incidents that have occurred across the nation, Space Committee voted and approved to make the floorplans no longer easily accessible to non-CSU constituents. Need to have a NET ID or reach out with a valid business case.

2. Proposed changes to PDC charge:

- a. Gargi – Some of the comments in the roundtable discussions were: what does experience mean? Tactical seems to be operational and PDC is not really operational. Based on comments, made some minor changes to the charge.
- b. Gargi – There is still room to potentially define the overlap and differences between what the PDC does, the Design Review Committee (DRC) and the Master Plan Committee (MPC) – that will be part two of updating the charge. Didn't think it could be done as a standalone of PDC because some of it will need CSU leadership input regarding the future of all the committees and where they should overlap.
- c. Kacie – appreciates the defined charge being written out, putting parameters around what the PDC is responsible for, which eliminates some of the other stuff that creeps in.

- d. Sue James agrees.
- e. Mark Paschke – likes the edits to the charge. Thinks it may be unusual for a committee to write their own charge. Usually, it comes from an authority above the committee. Ultimately it needs to come from some authority, so it empowers the committee to carry out the charge rather than the committee acting unilaterally.
- f. Melinda – appreciates the edits and it being written out. Has been thinking about the name of the committee. It seems like the committee deals with campus experience so calling it the Campus Experience Committee may be more attractive or implies exactly what the committee does. Wasn't sure what physical development meant when she first was introduced to the committee. Thinks campus experience could convey the overall mission of the committee.
 - i. Gargi – From the other angle, experience could mean so many different things. The purview of the committee is to focus on the built environment, dealing with the physical development of campus. Experience can also mean other things, such as what MarComm works on or events, things that we don't provide input on. Appreciates the comment about defining what the experience is.
- g. Kacie – Could be helpful to create some type of organizational chart. Having a physical org chart of who oversees what committee and where do other committees fall in the organization from a visual aspect could be helpful.
 - i. Gargi – the intent is to have that. Want to get the input of leadership. Could add in defining what that experience is. Both Melinda and Kacie's comments are both considerations; we just don't have an answer right now for them. Wanted to make some changes that members had provided that could be made now.
- h. Gargi – The PDC has always known itself to be a voting committee with some authority, but the language said the PDC would make recommendations to the VPUO. But that's not the practice, not truly necessary unless the applicant does not like the decision of the committee, then they should have the opportunity to take it to the next level. It's not defined in the previous language though. PDC does make decisions, but PDC needs to define a pathway for disagreement with the decisions made. Took out the part about "make recommendations to VPUO" because PDC is a decision-making committee. Would the PDC agree that we would need to allude to it in the charge that if an applicant does not agree they would have recourse to take it up with the VPUO? Agreement spoken aloud from a few PDC members.
- i. Wiley - If we get someone to endorse the charge, what is the appropriate level of authority given the scope of what has been described?
 - i. Gargi – This committee makes decisions for obligations dealing with the physical environment and has been doing so for years. Once the committee agrees that they support the charge, PDC will take it to the VPUO before updating the website.
 - ii. Wiley – should it be the president of the university or the VPUO who gives the charge?
 - 1) Gargi – it has been the VPUO in the past, but Gargi is not saying that it needs to stay that way if people think something different.
 - 2) Tom – in the eight years he's been on this committee, VPUO has been the lead for representing PDC, for being the senior leadership

connection for the PDC. Tom will let Brendan Hanlon know about the discussion and to begin to get some feedback from him. Brendan's been in his role a year. Tom recommends that the VPUO at least be part of the senior leadership that PDC takes recommendations or waivers up to. There are other policies that allow a waiver process if a requestor can't comply with the intent of the policy. Typically, the VPUO for operational things (facilities or public safety) provides the final say on them. Tom would be interested in input from the new provost – if they would like to part of the decision-making and approval or waiver process, and ultimately would be interested in getting the President's feedback, since she was VPUO previously. This is a good discussion given the significant changes in leadership and public safety and facilities.

3) Sue writes in chat, "VPUO makes sense to me." Ali, Christie, and Kacie agree with Sue in chat.

- j. The charge edits / updates resonate with the committee. **ACTION: Gargi** will bring the charge to the VPUO to ask for approval before making the change to the website.
 - i. One thing not noted in the charge yet, but will be added in the future, is the defined process for appealing a PDC decision.

3. Proposed changes to PDC proposal lead times

- a. Gargi – To get on the agenda for any city council or public government, there are dates for when requestors need to submit the request or application. PDC discussed in round table discussions that the Campus Planning team does the due diligence when there is an application or something to be presented prior to the committee deciding, so the committee can be well-informed. It is difficult to do the due diligence when an item comes right before the PDC meeting. The committee needs to have a chance to look at the agenda in advance. If they have a conflict during the PDC meeting and if the subject matter is important to them, then they can be sure to send a proxy to the meeting. It can be difficult if they find out about the topic at the last minute. Based on PDC input, committee is adding language about there being an 8-week lead time. PDC meets once a month. Any application comes through 8 weeks before the meeting, so Campus Planning can spend 3-4 weeks doing the due diligence while also balancing all their other priorities, so it can be presented in the best fashion. This will be added to the updated PDC process. Any comments?
- b. Christie – Thinking of the recent request to put up short-term wrapping/marketing materials, Christie is wondering if an 8-week lead time may be too long on some items for shorter term planning. Does it apply to all processes, or are there exceptions to an 8-week timeline?
 - i. Gargi – Anything PDC does will have one offs. The difficulty is that very often a lot of requests come a couple of weeks before needing to be presented. Want to support the campus community, but it adds a lot of pressure and there is not time to consider the request holistically. As a general default process, the recommendation is to plan proactively rather than reactively to make better informed decisions. Don't want to make it the practice that everything comes up at the last moment.
- c. Kacie – agrees that a lead time is necessary but she doesn't know if 8 weeks is too long. What do other processes around the university look like? It's good to have more time than

less time to research matters and gather more information before making a decision, so less time is wasted on the presenter to make sure they have everything they need to present or make the request.

- d. Kacie – doesn't know how marketing around the university works with putting up information for banners on buildings and windows. Does that fall under the purview of PDC, since it is a temporary item versus a permanent physical structure?
 - i. Gargi – This does fall under the purview of PDC and is defined in the charge because they are exterior, even if temporary (e.g., temporary branding and temporary signage). The 8-week lead time is a start and maybe there will be modifications in the future, but PDC needs to start somewhere. All the people coming to this large committee are trying to make informed decisions for CSU community, but it is difficult to make those decisions without providing the data and due diligence.
 - ii. Tonie writes in chat, "I have appreciated that both permanent and temporary exterior signs, branding, banners, etc. have come to PDC."

4. Proposed changes to facility naming process

- a. There are two types of naming: (1) Naming a building after a person or a family from a donor or honorary. That type does not involve the PDC; it is overseen by University Advancement, and they go to the Board of Governors for final approval. (2) Function based naming previously voted on by PDC. Input from the roundtable discussions was for FM to do the work and PDC did not necessarily feel it was necessary for them to decide, but just to share info at the PDC. The proposed change is it will become informational rather than decision-making; there will not be a PDC vote for approval, but it will be provided as a PDC informational agenda item. If there are issues with the name when brought informationally, input is always welcome.
- b. Kacie – dispatch needs to be informed of any updates to names.
 - i. Kacie asks in chat if she can get the full list of current names to share with the appropriate folks.
- c. Sue – in the past PDC discussed not naming buildings based on the function going on in the building because then the building name changes if the function changes.
 - i. Mark P. and Julia agree with Sue in the chat that PDC did discuss that in the past.
- d. Kacie – Some buildings also have names to mask what happens in the buildings, so groups don't disrupt what's going on in that building. Kacie doesn't care to be in charge of the final name. She does think it is a good idea that PDC provide guidelines for how buildings are named. What particular guidelines and considerations need to be followed?
 - i. Julia adds in chat the guidelines that PDC discussed in the past for the Naming Process, located on website: <https://www.fm.colostate.edu/pdc/>.
 - ii. Kacie thinks this meets what she is thinking as guidelines and will comment further after reading the guidelines.
- e. Is PDC okay with FM & Campus Planning making a decision on the name and then bringing it to PDC as an informational agenda item?
 - i. General agreement from PDC members.

5. Consider: Changing day of PDC meeting/Meeting in person?

- a. Gargi – PDC meets on the third Friday of the month. Heard from some PDC members that sometimes they have to send proxies on Fridays. With 29 members it can be hard to change

the date but is this something PDC should explore? In the past PDC met in person, then moved to virtual during the pandemic. Would PDC like to consider meeting in person as other committees are also moving to in-person? Would they prefer to remain virtual?

- i. Sue James says it will be hard to change the time but she's okay with it if it is possible. Also prefers meeting in person.
- ii. Kacie asks in chat if the meeting is recorded and agrees she would like to meet in person.
 - 1) Julia – Meeting is not recorded but could be if people wanted this.
 - 2) Gargi is not sure that recordings should be publicly available though.
 - 3) Julia takes minutes and posts them to the PDC webpage each month that PDC meets.
- iii. JZ - What about trying in-person meetings quarterly, and then virtual during the other times? Could help with building conversations and being strategic with conversations that need more engagement. Spoke about this approach in CPC.
- iv. Melinda asks in chat if hybrid would be possible.
- v. Tonie writes in chat that she prefers virtual, particularly if on Fridays.
- vi. Mark P. writes in chat that hybrid would be a good compromise.
- vii. Sadie writes in chat, "The CLA rep does not work on Fridays and she makes an exception to join outside of her work hours. In person would not be preferred unless the day moves to Monday-Thursday."
- viii. Marcelo writes in chat, "If it's in person it's best not to be Fridays for me. Hybrid or virtual is OK for me as well."
- ix. Gargi – noticing comments in chat about hybrid, but hybrid meetings do not function as well as all in-person or all virtual.