2010-2011 University Council Committee on Facilities

April 2011

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; Charles Branas; Femida Handy; Janine Remillard; Witold Rybczynski; Walter Wales; Rachel Weinberger, from **Penn Professional Staff**: Lisa Anzalone and Ellen Mueller, **Weekly-Paid Professional Staff**: Steven Hauber and Linda Satchell; from **Graduate Students**: Henry Friedman and David Streim; from the **Undergraduate Students**: Jon Monfred and Edward Ober. 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. The Committee held 7 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. Examine issues related to general-use space not controlled by specific schools. It should begin with a careful survey of the existing space and of the current unmet needs for such space.

2. Assess the progress that the University is making in bicycle and pedestrian safety. The new South Street Bridge is expected to reopen in late 2010, and the committee should note the effect of this opening on both vehicular and bicycle traffic to and from the campus.

3. Monitor the extent and use of green space on campus and receive updates on the progress of the Penn Park. Although Penn Park will probably not be complete by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year, the committee should monitor its progress and plans for understanding how it will be used by students, by other members of the Penn community, and by individuals from outside the Penn community.

4. Space at the north end of Penn Park has been reserved for "future development." Discuss with University planners what is being considered for that development, and whether it will eventually present an opportunity to plan for facilities that would be a draw for all of the Penn community and which might help integrate the east campus with the rest of the University.

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 2011-2012.

In addition, to these charges the Committee addressed several areas of new business during the year which, for the most part, fell under charge number 1 above, and included an investigation of status of lactation rooms on campus and condition of Guardian Drive, which will result in a
formal recommendations from the committee. The Committee also reviewed issues that were brought to the Committee regarding Parking, ADA accessibility on campus, condition of Hamilton Walk, issues of package delivery to Greek houses, inappropriate use of automatic handicap doors on campus, and Hutchinson gym renovations. The new monitoring, liaison, formal recommendation system worked well for our committee in its first year.

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 several issues that were brought to its attention during the year. The third section deals with two formal recommendations that the Committee will make which evolved from its investigations regarding lactation centers on campus and condition of Guardian Drive. 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. The Committee had a presentation on Shoemaker Green from Edward Sidor and Marc Cooper, from Facilities Design and Construction Management. Construction of Shoemaker Green is scheduled to commence in the spring of 2011. It was determined that the space will be mostly passive, open green space with design principles similar to that of College Green. The space incorporates sustainable characteristics. Shoemaker Green will be used casually and also for special events such as Penn Relays. Consideration will be given to provide access to Penn Park during construction and improvements will be made to the 33rd Street Crosswalk to slow traffic and make it safer for pedestrians.

Mark Kocent, Principal Planner, spoke to the committee about Penn Connects and updated the committee on Penn Park. Penn Connects is a thirty-year campus master plan. Phase I is nearly complete (2005-2010), with Phase II underway now (2010-2020). Penn Park will open in Fall of 2011. Circulation through the Park will be possible from the Walnut Street Bridge to the Hollenback Center and to the Palestra and Weiss Pavilion. Once Penn Park is open, construction on Shoemaker Green will begin. Access to Penn Park from campus will remain open via the newly widened sidewalk in front of Weiss Pavilion. The green space subcommittee toured the Penn Park construction site with Mike Diorka from Department of Recreation. Overall, the committee is pleased with the plans which are being undertaken by the University concerning green space and open playing green space but plans to continue to monitor this issue.

The Committee continued to monitor the progress that the University is making regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety. The new South Street Bridge reopened in late 2010 and the Committee noted an improvement of vehicular and bicycle traffic to and from the campus. The Committee again benefited from an update from Mark Kocent concerning the progress that the University is making in this area. The University works with the City and PA Department of Transportation to restore bike lanes as needed. Public Safety enforces the parking regulations on campus, including double parking. Public Safety and FRES engage in the Share the Road
campaign to help educate the Penn community in pedestrian and bicycle safety. Signage for bicyclists and pedestrians are discussed among FRES, Public Safety, and UPHS and are part of the transportation conversations with the City. The University has begun to add bike corrals around key areas of campus. One example of a bike corral is at 36th and Walnut Streets, on the south side. Additional signage and markings have been added to the 34th Street intersection between Walnut and Spruce Streets. The University has installed speed lumps that will calm traffic without interfering with emergency vehicles. Similar traffic calming measures will be taken at the 33rd Street intersection between Walnut and Spruce Streets. The University is also working with the City to designate areas, approximately three parking spaces long, for Penn Bus pick-up and drop-off as well as deliveries to area businesses along major corridors. The Schuylkill River Development Corporation has plans to widen the sidewalks along the Walnut Street Bridge by removing one lane of traffic, and placing lights in the portion of the sidewalk closest to the vehicular traffic, creating a larger buffer between pedestrians and the bicycle and vehicular traffic. For the most part the Committee has been pleased with the progress the University has made in these areas but during the year we were made aware of concerns regarding Guardian Drive and will make a formal recommendation concerning Guardian Drive in the third section of the report.

During the year several concerns were raised in committee regarding transportation and parking on campus. There were questions about how the parking fees are used and how parking subsidizes transportation or other programs. How are the parking facilities maintained? How are users assigned spaces, and can spaces be reserved within a garage? There were concerns about overcrowding in some garages. There were concerns raised that users were parking in handicap spaces and leaving their cars parked in garages for prolonged periods of time, particularly in garages that were crowded. There were also concerns regarding the cost of parking to individual users. There were concerns raised about safety in some garages as well. Based on these issues, the Committee was given an extensive overview from Marie Witt and Brian Shaw regarding the departments of parking and transportation. As a result of this review and subsequent follow up meetings with Ms. Witt and Mr. Shaw, most of the Committee’s concerns were resolved. Of particular interest, the University will begin ticketing illegally parked cars, likely beginning in May of 2011. There is also plan to move longer term student parking to one centrally located underutilized garage on campus thus eliminating some the congestion in some of the more crowded garages. Business Services is in the process of designating spaces for hybrids to complement the goals of the Climate Action Plan. Business Services will work toward making this information more readily available and improving overall transparency regarding where parking revenues are being utilized. The Committee was for the most part satisfied with current progress being made by the University regarding parking and transportation but the Committee also felt that this issue would require further monitoring in the future. There was a motion to form a subcommittee for this purpose for the following year.
During the year concerns were also brought to Committee’s attention concerning the American Disabilities Act and whether the University was meeting standards regarding university-owned buildings, particularly the Greek houses on campus. The Committee questioned if the University should contribute to the maintenance of the buildings since they own the property. Tom Hauber gave an overview of how renovations work within the Greek houses. There are 24 University managed Greek houses and 12 privately owned houses. There are not additional funds dedicated to the Greek houses at this time. In 2005, the University conducted a study of the Penn-managed houses to assess code upgrades, deferred maintenance and ADA. From 2005 – 2009, VPUL completed all code upgrades and life safety issues. Starting in 2010, they have focused on deferred maintenance projects. The Greek houses are not part of the allocated cost pool. Rather, they pay rent to the University. The fraternities and sororities are responsible for maintaining their houses and can work with VPUL to hire contractors to do repairs as needed. VPUL will continue to address ADA needs as they arise. Last year, a ramp and 1st floor bathroom were renovated in the ATO house to meet a student’s needs. VPUL has also gone back to the National Chapters to ask them for their help on deferred maintenance and ADA issues. Some of the houses are very difficult to make ADA compliant but we make as many accommodations as possible. VPUL is also reassessing the deferred maintenance needs of the houses in comparison to the 2005 study. Many of the needs were taken care of when the code upgrades were made, so they suspect that the need will be lower. Ryan Rose, the University liaison with the Architectural Barrier Removal Program (ABRP) and manager of ADA projects for FRES, further updated the committee on this issue. FRES get a sum of money every year from the FRF pool to use as needed. Most of the funds are used to retrofit student dorm rooms. It can cost $20,000-50,000 to fit specific needs for a student in a room that already complies with ADA code. Another reason most ADA upgrades are made on a case-by-case basis is that the need of each student, staff, or faculty member is specific and the code may change throughout the years, so a retrofit to a building today is not necessarily compliant in five years. A recent renovation included a ramp to the cafeteria in Hill House. Based on this information from Mr. Hauber and Mr. Rose, the Committee felt the University was meeting, if not far exceeding, the ADA standards. It should be noted that Committee felt that meeting the needs of any disabled member of University of Pennsylvania community should be of the highest priority despite any financial implications.

Concerns were brought to the Committee regarding whether smoking would be allowed in Penn Park. Through conversations with Mike Diorka, Department of Recreation, this issue was clarified. During official events in Penn Park, smoking will not allowed and it will be enforced in the area of the event. There are no further limitations in the other areas of Penn Park.

Concerns were brought to the Committee regarding the loss of locker and shower space in the Hutchinson Gym during upcoming renovations. Dr. Diorka again clarified this issue for the Committee. During the renovation of Hutchinson, a reduced number of large lockers will be available for both men and women. The women’s showers will remain accessible and the Department of Recreation is working on a solution for the men’s showers. Although Dr. Diorka
could not guarantee this would be the case concerning the locker rooms in the Hutchinson Gym, he did say it was a priority and the committee was satisfied with recreations efforts in this area.

Admittedly, the Committee did not substantially address two of our charges during this academic year: dealing with space at the north end of Penn Park which had been reserved for "future development" and examining issues related to general-use space not controlled by specific schools. The chair felt that these topics were too broad to be adequately explored and that other issues raised to the Committee had higher priority. The Committee will address the lactation centers in its formal recommendations which one could argue fall under the general use space charge. The Committee will consider these broader charges in the future if the need arises.

Liaison

Several issues that were brought to the committee’s attention during the year were able to be handled through our liaison, David Hollenberg, who was assisted by some of our invited guests during the academic year.

One of the concerns was the condition of Hamilton Walk. Hamilton Walk is in poor condition and the Committee felt that restoration should be considered. After discussions with Mr. Hollenberg, it was discovered that several projects will be occurring around and on Hamilton Walk in the near future, thus any repairs that would be done will likely need to be redone given the extensive work that will be done there. The committee agreed with this assessment and will continue to monitor the progress on Hamilton Walk in the future.

Concerns were raised concerning difficulties for students living in Greek Houses having packages delivered. Marie Witt offered to look into a better way to have packages delivered to the Greek Houses. She has reported that the Executive Director for Business Services responsible for Housing, Off-Campus Services, Conferences and Dining had been meeting with Dr. Ajay Nair from the Associate Vice Provost (VPUL) regarding the issue of package delivery to the Greek Houses and that the issue would likely be resolved with packages being delivered to the college houses. Starting in Fall of 2011, Housing Services will be offering academic year parcel holding services to off-campus residents including those living in fraternities and sororities.

The committee was concerned with the number of people who use the handicap buttons on campus to open doors when they do not actually need the handicap button. It uses excess electricity and lets out a lot of heat and air conditioning from the buildings needlessly. The committee recommended a sticker or sign, or replacement button to be put on/near the handicap push-buttons that indicates something along the lines of “please use only when needed – help us
conserve energy”. FRES is currently actively working on appropriate signage that will accomplish this goal.

**Formal Recommendations**

**Guardian Drive** (Formal Recommendation)

**A. Investigation**

Relating to the Committee’s charge to monitor bicycle and pedestrian safety, a safety concern regarding Guardian drive was brought to the Committee’s attention from members of the committee itself due to concerns from their constituents. Guardian Drive is a thoroughfare which begins between Nursing School and Biomedical Library and runs to 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 the biopond. As such most pedestrians just walk on the street. The Committee feels these conditions may result in injury risk to pedestrians. Through discussion with our Liaison, David Hollenberg, we learned that future renovations are planned for Guardian Drive but timing of these renovations may not be in the near future.

**B. Recommendation**

The committee is recommending that repairs and renovations to Guardian Drive be given a higher priority so that potential for pedestrian injury can be lessened.

**Lactation Centers and Rooms:** (Formal Recommendation)

**A. Investigation**

The concern that the University may not be meeting the needs of nursing mothers due to lack of University-wide lactation centers was brought to the committee’s attention from its constituents. The Committee felt this was an important issue and spent a significant amount of our time this year investigating this issue and developing a formal recommendation. The committee benefited from discussions with Felicity Paxton from the Penn’s Women’s Center, Marilyn Kraut from the Division of Human Resources, and Dr. Diane Spatz, Associate Professor of Health Care of Women and Childbearing Nursing. While reviewing this issue, we found that the Human Resources Division has been working with its representatives in the Schools and Centers to roll
out the Health Care Reform Act of 2010 legislation. 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 breast feed and to pump breast milk while on campus. We also learned that the University is lagging behind others in addressing this issue. For example, Children’s Hospital of Pennsylvania has an extensive program with an expectant mother’s website and program along with 14 designated lactation rooms on its campus. Harvard has 20 spaces.

B. Benefits of Breastfeeding to mothers, their children, and the University

Almost all women who breastfeed their children will find it necessary to breastfeed and pump breast milk outside their homes. Specialized lactation rooms allow nursing mothers to pump breast milk while away from their homes in a safe, private, comfortable area. Pumping while at work or school allows nursing mothers to store milk for future use and maintain their milk supply. The committee feels that every mother should have the right to choose to breast feed and have access to lactation rooms at the University of Pennsylvania.

It is clear that there are benefits of breast feeding for both nursing mothers and their infants. Breast feeding protects infants against infection and promotes immunological development. It reduces the incidence of SIDS, reflux, and allergies. It has been shown to improve both development and intelligence. Breast feeding has benefits for the mother in delaying fertility, lowering cancer risk, improving emotional health, and decreasing osteoporosis. There are benefits to society in general due to vaccine effectiveness and decreased medical expenses. It is recommended that all babies receive human milk exclusively during their first 6 months. There are confirmed benefits to the mother and infant extending past the first year of life. Many women discontinue breastfeeding early because of concerns about maintaining lactation within the work or academic environment. Other women delay returning to work or school, or do not return at all, because they feel it prevents them from exercising this choice.

Research shows that providing a lactation support program is not only highly desired by breastfeeding employees who return to work after childbirth, but it can also improve an institution’s return on investment by saving money in health care and employee expenses.

1. Reduce turnover rates (86-92% of breastfeeding employees returning to work after childbirth when a lactation support program is provided compared to the national average of 59%);
2. Lower absence rates (up to half the number of 1 day absences)
3. Improve productivity
4. Raise morale and loyalty
5. Lower medical costs and health insurance claims for breastfeeding employees and their infants (up to three times less for breastfeeding employees)

Despite the benefits of breastfeeding it has been shown that only 33% of US infants are exclusively breastfed at 3 months. A contributing factor in this is that both students and working
mothers may be caught between breast feeding and returning to work or school due to lack of institutional support for breastfeeding and pumping.

C. Current conditions on campus

1. Response to the Health Care Reform Act of 2010

The Health Care Reform Act of 2010 included a Lactation Amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requiring employers to provide FLSA covered employees: (This is weekly paid staff at Penn)

   a. A reasonable break time for an employee to express breast milk for her nursing child for 1 year after the child’s birth each time such employee has need to express the milk; and

   b. A place, other than a bathroom, that is shielded from view and free from intrusion from coworkers and the public, which may be used by an employee to express breast milk.

The law applies only to weekly paid staff. To its credit, the Penn Division of Human Resources is developing a policy that will apply to all staff at Penn, not just the weekly-paid staff. It is clear from our discussion with Human Resources that the lactation center policy is something that it considers a priority. In the Human Resources policy, it is stated that it will provided information and specs for offices that wish to develop state-of-the art lactation spaces or something more than the minimum requirements of this legislation. It is also stated that it will work with Quality of Workers Life Office to see how things are going and if need is exceeding school/center options for space.

Currently, when a need arises most Schools and Centers plan to have their Building Administrators identify a temporary space for accommodating nursing mothers’ needs. The burden is placed on a nursing mother in need of a lactation room to contact administrators to arrange the service. One could see how this could be difficult, particularly for students and graduate students. The committee feels this creates an unnecessary barrier and may result in women choosing not to breast feed.

2. Design guidance

The University offers guidance through the University Architect’s Office in Penn’s “Instructions to Design Professionals” found at http://www.facilities.upenn.edu/uop/Instructions2Design.pdf on pages 9 and 10 under “Accommodation of diverse populations”:

“The University is committed to providing accommodation to meet the diverse needs of its community. Design professionals are to consider the following in all new buildings, particularly buildings that serve a public function… “Incorporate lockable, private rooms that can be used for breast-feeding or routine medical procedures (such as insulin
injections, checking blood-sugar levels, and so on). Such rooms are to be equipped with a
comfortable armchair or daybed, with electrical power available adjacent to the chair.

“Recommendations can be accommodated in new buildings at minimal cost… and
providing places nearby that afford the privacy required for breast feeding or minor, self-
administered medical procedures. Design decisions regarding these matters are to be
made in the context of added costs, user demand, long-term maintenance, and security….
In all such private and lockable rooms, a panic alarm system is to be installed, integrated
with the building security system, to allow users to call for emergency assistance.”

3. Current lactation facilities on campus

The University of Pennsylvania does have lactation centers and rooms already in use:

1. The Family Resource Center in Houston Hall has private rooms which can be used
   without reservation.
2. Penn’s Woman’s Center at 3643 Locust Walk has private rooms that can be used without
   reservation.
3. Graduate Student Center at 3615 Locust Walk has private rooms that need to be reserved.
4. HUP has a lactation room in the maternity ward in the Silverstein building for patients
   and employee use. It should be noted that this is a locked unit so access is limited and
   there are concerns about infant safety that need to be addressed with each visit.
5. We understand that some Schools have lactation rooms that may be currently open to all,
   but if use is too great then they will be limited to schools. We are confirming that the
   following Schools have such lactation spaces.
   a. Annenberg
   b. Nursing
   c. Engineering

Overall, there is a dearth of established lactation space on campus for students, staff, residents,
and faculty. These rooms are in central campus, not within easy walking distance of most areas
of campus. While it is true that nursing mothers can go through the process of contacting
administrators to have temporary rooms established, this again seems burdensome and difficult.
Standard lactation rooms should have lockable door, sanitary, comfortable seating, a sink,
electrical outlet, appropriate lighting, and curtains for multiuser rooms. Thus, the committee
feels the University of Pennsylvania may not be providing an adequate number of spaces open to
the entire Penn community geographically spread throughout campus.

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 thinking about these
issues and have offered to provide assistance to the Committee, as appropriate.

D. 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, while making an effort in this area, could be doing more to support nursing mothers and their families. 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 both students and staff and would certainly make Penn a more family-friendly space. One could hire a consultant to determine easily converted spaces at appropriate geographic distribution throughout the campus that could serve students, faculty, and staff.

Further, the committee makes the following recommendations regarding lactation rooms on campus:

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.

In order to accomplish the above recommendations, the committee would like to capitalize on the existing expertise on campus and use them as a resource. The University and Committee may also need additional resources from the University to hire a consultant.

The committee plans to keep this topic open for the next academic year. In addition, we will form a subcommittee to monitor its progress. 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**

A. Continue to study and monitor lactation spaces and policy on campus (priority item).
B. Continue to monitor parking on campus and specifically whether the Committee’s concerns regarding parking continue to be addressed.
C. 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.
D. Continue to monitor and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
E. Monitor and receive updates on University development/Penn Connects Plan.
F. 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.