The Committee on Facilities was responsible for reviewing the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking. The Committee members for this year included from the Faculty: Michael McGarvey, Chair; Bernard Shapiro; Joshua Klein; Eric Marsh; Diane Spatz; Rachel Weinberger; Stephanie Weirich; from Penn Professional Staff: Janine Remillard and Ellen Mueller, Weekly-Paid Professional Staff: Thomas Wilson and Linda Satchell; from Graduate Students: Henry Friedman and Marissa Rosen; from the Undergraduate Students: Lindsay Tsai and Aaron Lewis. The Committee’s Administrative Liaison was David Hollenberg, University Architect, and the Committee was staffed by Taylor Berkowitz, Senior Planner, Special Projects, Office of the University Architect. The Committee held 6 meetings over the academic year. The Committee had one subcommittee specifically charged with monitoring open playing green space.

The Committee was asked specifically in its charges for this year to:

1. Continue to study and monitor lactation spaces and policy on campus. This charge will result in a formal recommendation from the committee in this year’s report.

2. Continue to monitor parking on campus and specifically whether the Committee’s concerns regarding parking continue to be addressed.

3. Continue to monitor the extent and use of green space on campus and receive updates on the progress of the Penn Park and Shoemaker Green.

4. Continue to monitor and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety. This charge will result in a formal recommendation from the committee in this year’s report concerning Guardian drive.

5. Review and discuss the committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given highest priority for the committee’s work in AY 2012-2013.

In addition to these charges the Committee addressed several areas of new business during the year, which included the safety of major intersections on campus, the condition of
landscaping and trees on campus, concerns with parking and transportation on campus, concerns regarding the University’s energy policies and energy conservation, and finally concerns regarding external lighting around Franklin Field.

The monitoring, liaison, formal recommendation system worked well for our committee, as did the addition of formal responses to recommendations from the 2011 report from the university. These were received at our first meeting. Anne Papageorge and Marilyn Kraut responded to our recommendation about lactation spaces on campus and concerns regarding the safety of Guardian Drive. These responses will be reviewed later in this report as last year’s recommendations and responses have generated further formal recommendations and improvements.

The remainder of the report has four sections. The first section of the report reviews how the Committee’s work on several of its original charges and new business issues were addressed through the Committee’s monitoring role. The second section reflects how the Committee used its liaison and invited guests to resolve any issues that were brought to its attention during the year. The third section deals with further formal recommendation that the Committee will make which have evolved from its investigations regarding lactation centers on campus. The fourth section reviews the Committee’s own recommendations for topics or continuing topics to be addressed the following academic year.

**Monitoring:**

The Committee monitored the extent and use of green space on campus.

There were concerns raised in the committee regarding the condition of trees and landscaping on campus particularly how the trees in Penn Park would be cared for in future. Robert Lundgren and Robert Flowers presented the Committee with an overview of the campus and the specific maintenance plans for Penn Park. The campus has 200 different species and over 7,000 individual trees. Penn works with the Morris Arboretum staff to inventory the campus and to get a new software system to help with the cataloging. There are thirteen urban park staff that oversee the 80 acres from 31st to 40th Street. Brickman Group is contracted to perform all of the landscape maintenance. The Penn campus has been composting all of the leaves on campus since the early 1980s. We are working toward becoming chemical-free, with the exception of fighting diseased species. The landscape projects incorporate recycled and salvaged materials as much as possible. There are over 550 trees in Penn Park with a mix of lawns, meadow grass, and athletic fields. As the park matures, it will look more like native woodland landscape. There is a water reclamation system for irrigation. Integrated pest management is used rather than insecticides in Penn Park. There are eleven gardeners and three hard surface staff, all of
whom are receiving specialized training. It was also explained to the Committee that maintaining trees in an urban setting, particularly on roadways, is challenging. When trees develop disease in this setting sometimes large groups need to be sacrificed for the good of other plantings. It is the goal of the landscaping and arborists to have healthy mature trees in all available street spaces whenever possible. The Committee was satisfied with the explanations provided by Mr. Lundgren and Flowers and will continue to monitor this issue over time.

Overall, the Committee is pleased with the plans which are being undertaken by the University concerning green space and open playing green space, but there are plans to continue to monitor this issue.

The Committee continues to monitor the University development particularly the eastward expansion and the use of the Grays Ferry site. Anne Papageorge gave an overview of Penn Connects Plan 2.0. This version of the campus master plan is different from the first in that it focuses on new construction and large renovations projects, separates the projects into those that will take place within the next phase and then beyond, and incorporates the Grays Ferry property. The plan was created by a Committee consisting of a cross-section of the University. There are five themes in Penn Connects 2.0: 12 Outstanding Schools; Research and Clinical Care; Living/Learning; Campus and Community; and Past and Future. There are a number of new and renovation projects that are planned within each theme. The Grays Ferry property will have a flexible framework to allow for development based on market demand. The plan is currently being explained to stakeholder groups including the Facilities Committee on University Council and will be finalized this semester.

The Committee continued to monitor the progress that the University is making regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety. For the most part the Committee has been pleased with the progress the University has made in these areas, although the Committee still has concerns regarding Guardian Drive. We are happy to report the university has begun to address these issues.

The safety concern regarding Guardian drive was brought to the Committee’s attention from members of the Committee due to concerns from their constituents in last year’s report. Guardian Drive is a service drive that begins at Fagin Hall and the Johnson Pavilion and runs west towards University Ave. The drive is open to vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Because of development in this area of campus, it has become an increasingly frequent area for pedestrian foot traffic. In the estimation of the Committee, the overall condition of the drive with regards to pedestrian use is poor. It does not have sidewalks in some areas. Where sidewalks are present, they are in poor condition, particularly on the west end near Anatomy and Chemistry. As such, most pedestrians just walk on the street. The Committee feels these conditions may pose an injury risk to
pedestrians. Admittedly, the Committee does not have knowledge of or documentation of injuries occurring on the drive. The committee formally recommended in last year’s report that repairs and renovations to Guardian Drive be given a higher priority so that potential for pedestrian injury can be lessened. Anne Papageorge provided a response to our recommendation about Guardian Drive at the beginning of this year. Miss Papageorge commented that no substantial work to Hamilton Walk or Guardian Drive would take place until the building projects along the walks are complete. Locust, Woodland, and Hamilton Walks are prioritized over Guardian Drive. FRES did agree to investigate the area to see if there are patches or some interim work that may help the issues. Patches to the existing sidewalk occurred this Spring and FRES has hired a consultant to study the deliveries, traffic patterns, and pedestrian safety on Guardian Drive. The consultant will make recommendations of how to improve the pedestrian experience and safety along Guardian Drive. The Committee will continue to monitor this area and would like to continue to see improvements that will improve the pedestrian experience particularly sidewalks.

The Committee is concerned with safety of several major intersections around campus. As these concerns have grown one of our faculty members, Rachel Weinberger was able to incorporate this research into her curriculum. The students from the Transportation Methods Class gave three presentations on the following intersections: Guardian Drive at University Avenue and Curie Boulevard; South Street Bridge at Convention Avenue and I-76; 34th Street from Walnut to Spruce Streets. The Guardian Drive intersection is confusing due to poor sidewalks and confusing traffic signs. The students have proposed the following as solutions - to make Guardian and Curie one-way streets (with additional signage and signs as necessary), complete the sidewalks on Guardian Drive, and only allow commercial vehicles on Service Drive. South Street Bridge and Convention Avenues appears dangerous for pedestrians due to traffic turning left off of University Avenue, and turning right from campus onto University Avenue. The proposal is to increase the left turn lane time, move eastbound bus stop toward the west slightly, and add banners to the light posts to calm traffic. I-76 has similar conflicts – the proposed solution is to have raised speed tables at 76 exits, add a green buffer and make automatic pedestrian crossing signals. At 34th and Walnut Streets, the students suggest bumping out the curb on the northwest corner, moving the bus stop to the west side of 34th Street, and the signal timing across 34th Street on the south side. The students suggest consolidating the signage and adding a speed limit of 15 mph mid-block. At the Spruce Street intersection, the roads need to be repainted and resurfaced, color the bicycle lane, switch the bike and parking lane on Spruce Street, and move the bus stop to other side of Spruce Street. The committee will make one formal recommendation based on this work concerning Guardian Drive. It will also make pedestrian and bicycling safety a priority for next year. Of particular concern is that, although bicycling is an important part of campus transportation system, there is a feeling that bicyclists are not following traffic laws on streets around campus, putting themselves
and others at risk of injury. The committee remains concerned about pedestrian and bicycling safety on campus and will continue to make it a priority.

During the year, several concerns were raised regarding transportation and parking on campus. Brian Shaw gave an update on Transportation and Parking – specifically, he described three new initiatives that are expected to launch over the next couple of months. The first is ticketing for parking violations. Violators will have the opportunity to appeal and can pay and manage their tickets online. Permit holders will get three warnings initially. The program is designed to ensure spaces for monthly customers, limit violators, and enforce the low emission spaces. The second program is an enhanced carpooling program. The carpool will allow registered people to park in locations that they normally wouldn’t be able to due to a wait list or popularity. The third program is for occasional parking. You must live two or more miles away and have a driver’s license to qualify. The program entitles you to two free uses per year, and ten more uses at discounted rates either at Penn Park or the Garage at 40th and Walnut Streets. Staff and faculty members can be charged via payroll. The Committee was satisfied with explanations given by Mr. Shaw regarding transportation and parking and will continue to monitor this area.

Concerns were raised by the committee concerning the University’s energy use. The University is currently installing electric, steam, and water meters at the building level to determine more accurate usage. The UA is currently piloting a sensored lighting program with their EcoReps. Julian Goresko and Travis Douglas presented an overview of the Eco Reps program. It is a self-selecting, volunteer program that allows students, staff and faculty the opportunity to have a role in the implementation of the Climate Action Plan. The student program is included in the College Houses, Greek Chapters, and Hillel where the reps create programs and initiatives to increase awareness and work toward sustainability goals. The staff and faculty reps share best practices, work together on subcommittees, and serve as peer educators. Mr. Goresko and Travis Douglas encouraged individuals to have their department, school, or center have a Sustainability 101 presentation to help make work practices green and to identify or volunteer as an eco-rep.

**Liaison**

One issue was brought to the Committee’s attention during the year and was able to be handled through our liaison, David Hollenberg, and the Division of Facilities and Real Estate during the academic year. Concerns were raised regarding lighting around Franklin
Field. Particularly noted was some broken lighting on the Eastern side of the Field. This was addressed and the lighting was repaired or replaced during the semester.

**Formal Recommendations**

**Lactation Spaces (Formal Recommendation)**

*A. Investigation*

A concern was brought to the Committee’s attention from its constituents last year that the University may not have been meeting the needs of nursing mothers due to a lack of University-wide lactation centers. The Committee felt this was an important issue and spent a significant amount of our time over the past two years investigating this issue. An extensive review of the benefits of breastfeeding, a review of the University’s response to the Health Care Reform Act of 2010, the status of lactation centers on campus in 2010-2011, and design guidance of lactation centers can be found in last year’s report. Based on this investigation, the Committee made a formal recommendation last year which included:

1. Make access to lactation spaces throughout campus a priority.
2. Initiate a study to better assess the needs and resources on campus.
3. Develop a clear policy that breast pumping is accepted and supported at every level of the University for members at any level.
4. Increase the number of permanent lactation rooms that are open to the University community and are geographically dispersed throughout campus to meet the need.

The University did respond to our recommendation. Anne Papageorge and Marilyn Kraut responded to the committee in our first meeting. The University had worked on the issue during the summer and has made it a priority. The Division of Human Resources has rolled out a policy that goes beyond what the law requires. The policy and other materials are available from Human Resources online, listed under the “Penn’s Nursing Mothers Program”. Facilities staff initiated a mapping exercise to identify the current existing spaces and the criteria to determine their appropriate dispersion throughout campus. Distinctions needed to be made between the School/Center specific spaces and those that are open to the Penn community. The University and committee felt that visitor’s needs should also be taken into account. Both the need and the geographic location will continue to be assessed as both HR and FRES staff continue to work with the Women’s Center, Family Resource Center, and the Office of the Provost during the year. The Committee felt the response was appropriate. Despite this, the Committee was still concerned that the
University may need to make further progress to accommodate those in the Penn community who wish to make the choice to breastfeed and to pump breast milk while on campus.

The Committee benefited from discussions with Anne Papageorge, Vice President of Facilities and Real Estate Services, Felicity Paxton from the Penn’s Women’s Center, Marilyn Kraut from the Division of Human Resources, Anita Mastroieni and Lubna Mian from the Provost Office. It should be noted that the Penn Women’s Center, Family Resource Center, Graduate Resource Center, and members of GAPSA have spent a significant amount of time working on these issues and have provided assistance to the Committee.

During this year, our guest speakers gave an overview of the progress that has been made regarding lactation spaces on campus. They felt that the HR Policy has helped staff and faculty; however, it is still difficult for some students – particularly those in professional programs. They hoped to propose a policy that will be applied to all students, but this has proved challenging. The Committee continues to be concerned that our University policy does not address undergraduate or graduate students. We learned that this is an issue throughout universities in the United States. Developing a workable policy on this issue would make University of Pennsylvania the leader in this area. There have been issues with several designated spaces on campus not being adequate. At a minimum, the spaces should have privacy, cannot be a bathroom, and should have a comfortable chair. It is best if a sink and shelf is also in the room. The Committee and the guest speakers agree that they would prioritize having more spaces over improving the spaces that currently exist. In fact, if the room is too comfortable, it can become a problem with turnover for the space for only lactation purposes. FRES presented the results of their mapping exercise. A map was shared with the Committee so they could see how the lactation spaces were spread throughout campus. The spaces available for lactation more than doubled in the past three years. With an increased number of spaces, more women are utilizing the lactation spaces—and particularly those that provide hospital grade pumps. During this time, GAPSA has purchased three hospital grade pumps for campus spaces. However, many rooms still do not have pumps in them. The Committee feels that hospital grade breast pumps provide the advantage of women being able to express their milk more quickly and therefore return to other activities more quickly. The committee feels that GAPSA should not have continue to invest their resources to support pump purchases on campus. The Committee also thought it was a good idea to institute a HR pump purchase program for staff and faculty. There were also concerns raised that pumps that are purchased be standardized so that women do not need to purchase several different pump attachment systems. The Committee remains concerned that the availability of permanent space throughout campus, particularly in certain high volume buildings and schools, remains a significant issue. This includes a lack of permanent lactation rooms in Huntsman Hall and the Law School.
complex. The Committee is concerned that visitors do not have a space to nurse or pump on campus.

B. Recommendations

In summary the committee feels that mothers should not have to choose between providing human milk for their baby and returning to work or school. The University has already made a tremendous effort in this area, but the Committee feels it could do even more to support nursing mothers and their families.

1. The Committee continues to be concerned that our policy does not address undergraduate or graduate students. The Committee feels that students need to be formally included in our University policy. The policy needs to ensure that student mothers have access and time to use these spaces.

2. The Committee feels that the addition of more permanent spaces that are open to the entire campus community would help with recruitment and retention of students, staff and faculty. It would certainly make Penn a more family-friendly space. At a minimum, permanent spaces need to be added to Huntsman Hall and the Law School.

3. Spaces need to meet minimum standards, should have privacy, cannot be a bathroom, and should have a comfortable chair. It is best if a sink and shelf is also in the room. It is also important that lactation spaces be designed so that they do not encourage unnecessary repose.

4. The Committee recommends that an effort be made so that all permanent rooms on campus are equipped with a hospital grade pump. In addition, we recommend that all pumps purchased on campus are Medela Breast Pumps - therefore the same attachments can be used across campus and women do not need to purchase several different pump attachment systems. The Committee is concerned that GAPSA has been assuming the burden of buying lactation pumps on campus and would like to see the University assume this role.

5. The Committee suggests that the University initiate a pump purchase program for members of community who cannot get access to rooms with a permanent pump.

The Committee plans to keep this topic open for the next academic year. We look forward to hearing your response and hope that you share in our commitment to this issue.

Recommendations of Topics or Continuing Topics to be addressed for Next Academic Year
1. Continue to study and monitor lactation spaces and policy on campus
2. Continue to monitor parking and transportation on campus, including the potential expansion of the shuttle service to the Graduate Hospital Area.
3. Continue to monitor the extent and use of green space on campus and receive updates on the progress of the Penn Park and Shoemaker Green.
4. Continue to monitor and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
5. Monitor and receive updates on University development/Penn Connects Plan.
6. The Committee historically addresses new issues which come to its attention during the academic year. The committee is open to addressing new issues from University Council or its constituents in the upcoming year.

The Chair would like to thank the members of committee, David Hollenberg, Taylor Berkowitz and our invited guests for their contributions and dedication to the Facilities Committee and its report for this year.