CSUS Executive Safety Committee (ESC)

Tuesday, March 18, 2025, 11:00 am – 12:00 pm | ZOOM

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION ARE LISTED AT THE END
Note: If you no longer wish to be on the list, please get in touch with Risk Management Services, rms@csus.edu, (916) 278-6119

Call to order: 11:00 AM Gary Rosenblum

Review and approve minutes for February: Approved

Open Forum:

Old Business:

Fire Watch

Janie Mutchler: Good morning, everyone. First up—fire watch. We had a question about who qualifies, and the code doesn't set strict requirements. It just needs to be someone alert, able to watch for fire signs, call 911, and assist with evacuation. Fire watches are a temporary measure to ensure building surveillance when the fire alarm system is down. Approval comes from the fire code official, such as fire marshals or campus fire personnel. Any questions?

Jose Fuentes: I brought this issue forward because Chico had students performing fire watch, which raised concerns. After surveying 10 campuses, I found that 90% of the time Unit 6 handles fire watches due to fire alarm issues or maintenance needs. If they're unavailable, the responsibility moves to Unit 5, then residential life employees. Chico has formalized this process in writing to ensure clarity and prevent students from being assigned, as that poses liability risks. I recommend Sac State adopt a similar guideline to ensure fire watch is handled appropriately by Unit 6.

Janie: Yes, agreed we don't want students to do this. It's going to be Unit 6, doing most of it

Gary: We should also look into to see whether or not CSO's are able to do so.

Jose: Those are students.

Janie: Yes, but they are student employees.

Gary Rosenblum: Yes, they are. So, in the realm of observing and reporting on campus safety. Maybe it has an alternative or backup, if no one else is available.

Samuel Jones: I think this is worth discussing because I feel conflicted about it. We already provide our RAs with rigorous training on safety protocols, and they are the ones handling emergency situations in the building during regular operations. They are trained to respond and identify potential issues. So, when considering bringing in others to do a job that our RAs have already been trained for, it's an important conversation to have.

That said, I understand that mistakes can happen in high-pressure situations. However, we also have backup systems in place within our residence halls. So far, we've relied on our resident advisors to manage situations like fire alarms when necessary. Since I've been here, I believe we've only had to handle one or two such incidents, aside from cases where the power was out. I think it's worth mentioning that our RA's are not employees. They are student leaders and not considered as employees of Sac State.

Jose: Yeah, I'd recommend having a broader discussion with Facilities since our electricians handle a lot of the fire and alarm work. They could provide valuable insights that might be helpful in this situation.

Todd Dangott: I agree with you, Gary. I think the CSUs would be valuable to include in the discussion. Since they are student employees, their role is primarily to observe and report, so it's worth considering in conversation.

Christina Lofthouse: I don't support our CSO's having to do fire watch. I think a further conversation would be good. At the end of the day, they are still students.

Gary: Okay, we don't have students involved in this anyway. The training that Samuel described for his team clearly qualifies them well beyond a standard student with a cell phone. So, we'll set up an offline discussion, bringing together all relevant campus parties to establish written guidelines.

The focus will be on setting clear protocols for Facilities, as they handle fire alarm work that may require alarms to be turned off. Since they are the ones who determine when a fire watch is necessary, it makes sense for them to take the lead in that process. I don't believe anyone else on campus would initiate a fire watch situation.

We'll hold a meeting, review everything, and put together formal guidance so there's no ambiguity. This way, we have a clear, solid framework moving forward.

Building Evacuation for Mobility challenged update and review of Campus Safety Map

Janie: A concern was raised about their setup, so I had the opportunity to meet with Mary Lee. We walked through the two buildings, she's most concerned about—Sac Hall and Lassen Hall. I showed her where the evacuation chairs are located, as well as the designated areas of refuge.

Areas of refuge are designated safe locations for individuals with access or functional needs who cannot use the stairs during an evacuation. Since the building may be at risk, these areas are reinforced to provide protection while evacuation efforts are underway. If someone in a wheelchair or with mobility challenges needs assistance, the ideal locations to place them are either in an elevator lobby—since the fire department can access and operate elevators in an emergency—or in a stairwell with doors that close behind them for added protection.

Not every building has an evacuation chair, and those that do typically only have one. Additionally, the chairs are heavy and cannot easily be transported upstairs. They can, however, be brought down a floor if needed. If an evacuation chair isn't available or practical to use, individuals with mobility needs should be taken to an area of refuge to wait for assistance. This is the best practice for ensuring their safety during an emergency.

Michael: This is part of the training for floor marshals, right?

Janie: Yes, this is what we teach out building coordinators and our floor marshals. We remind them that these are the designated locations to leave individuals because there may not always be enough evacuation chairs available in a building.

Brent Moffat: Are areas of refuge a requirement for buildings. Do we just need signage in those buildings? Or are the requirements we need to meet for those areas?

Courtney McLeod-Golden: It is requirement per fire code that requires area of refuge in bridge and stairwell areas for wheelchairs.

Brent: Are there any stipulations against call boxes or do we just need signages in those buildings?

Courtney: Typically, there is signage. I can double check the requirements.

Janie: Many of our buildings were built under older codes, so they may not have proper signage or call boxes. However, the absence of signage doesn't necessarily mean a location is unsuitable for temporarily leaving someone during an emergency. In most of our buildings, signage is minimal or nonexistent. For example, some areas of refuge are located in front of elevator lobbies, but if the space is too open, it may not feel like a secure place to leave someone.

It's important to assess stairwells and elevator lobbies to determine the best locations. In Sequoia Hall, for instance, the elevator lobby is a good option because it is enclosed, allowing someone to wait safely for the elevator, with a stairwell nearby as an alternative. However, in some buildings, stairwells are not large enough to accommodate wheelchairs. In our case, we determined that the internal stairwell was not suitable, so we use the external stairwells as the best alternative.

Since every building is different, I recommend reviewing your specific buildings to identify the safest and most practical locations for leaving someone in an emergency.

Laurie Pittman: If we've identified that the evacuation chairs can't go up but can go down. Is there any reason not to move them to the highest floor in that building.

Janie: I'm not sure what our reasoning was when we installed the first round of evacuation chairs. In fact, I'm not even certain what the thought process was at the time. I'm also unclear on the rationale behind the second round of installations. I believe Don was involved in determining the locations, but I'm not sure why we placed them in the middle of the buildings.

Don Nahhas: Those are done by whoever started as the chair maintenance. We've only added 2 or 3 since I've been part of this and those are in TSC on this 3rd and 5th floor.

Laurie: If signage is required, is there somebody we should go through to request that signage for the future?

Courtney: Possibly. The reason I got distracted is that I'm double-checking the requirements for areas of refuge. According to the code, they are not required at stairways in buildings that are fully equipped with an automatic sprinkler system installed per code. That could explain why some of our buildings don't have designated areas of refuge if they have fire sprinklers. I'm also reviewing the signage and communication requirements, which means I need to go through the code in detail. So, I want to ensure I provide accurate information, but I can't give a definitive answer now.

Gary: We can re-visit this next meeting.

Brent: If you are interested in having signs created the shop on campus can make custom signs. They are great to work with.

Michael: I'd like to suggest rather than having individual department to be responsible for doing this. Could that be something that facilities or planning could do a survey of all the buildings to see where it's needed.

Courney: I would consider it part of our ADA compliance. It may also be outlined in our campus ADA accessibility plan, so I'll need to check that as well.

Michael: Yeah and just following up to confirm—if it's not required, it would be helpful to have clear confirmation, so we know it's not something we need to address. Also, understanding what the alternative is would be great. Thank you!

Gary: We can follow up with the next meeting.

Courtney: Yes, I can give you a much better assessment of where we are at.

Gary: Everyone should be aware that the Chancellor's Office updated the emergency evacuation training requirement for all employees. As a result, we reset everyone on a new three-year cycle. In CSU Learn, the training also includes reviewing your personal evacuation plan, and we now have an updated evacuation plan checklist as part of the requirement. This checklist covers key aspects such as identifying rally points, assessing any specific evacuation needs, and determining if an evacuation chair is necessary. These elements are integrated into the new training, so I just wanted to mention that

Janie: I've added the link to the campus safety map, where all that information is available. A big thank you to Don for resolving the picture issues we were experiencing! Now, you can easily see the locations of AEDs, evacuation chairs, and the nearest blue light phones. Be sure to check out the interactive campus safety map for these details.

Emergency Operations Plan Review report

Lastly, I'll go over the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) review. The review is now complete, and the final draft is set to be submitted. It will first go to our PD Chief, then our AVP of Risk Management, and finally to the President for signature. By the end of this week, I should have the final copy, and I'll be providing one for Student Health for their accreditation.

The primary focus of the EOP review was layout adjustments—I streamlined the formatting and reduced some of the table of contents. Additionally, we added a couple of new sections to the hazard annex. One addresses protests and civil unrest, while the other introduces a Campus Response Team. This team would handle lower-level incidents that don't require full EOC activation but still need monitoring. While we already have a Campus Action Response Team for student-related issues, rallies, and protests, this new section outlines a process for handling situations that may require an "EOC light" approach.

For the next revision, we'll be focusing on hazard mitigation planning, as well as evacuation procedures—including campus-wide evacuation plans.

We're holding a tabletop exercise with our EOC team, and several of you have been invited to participate. The focus will be on mass evacuation. If you're attending the meeting, please prepare yourself with relevant information for your area. For example, if you're in housing, consider how you would evacuate your students and where they would go if they needed to be off campus for an extended period, such as a week.

Gary: That's still working in progress, but in the meantime, the current EOP has been reviewed. Everyone had the opportunity to go through it if they volunteered to tackle the extensive document—some of you did. One of the EOC's roles is serving as the campus review body for emergency operation plans, so thank you, Jamie. This is always an open topic if anyone wants to discuss it further.

COVID Safety training question

Gary: Moving on to COVID training, I've submitted a request to our learning management system to remove any requirement for COVID safety training for new employees or any related topics. It will still be available on a voluntary basis for those who wish to revisit it, but it will no longer be mandatory for any reason.

Jeanne Harris Van Dahlen: Will you leave it for health care providers, since we still have to abide by CDPH.

Gary: No, it'll stay where it is. We are just taking out the learning module requirements; CSU learn. Where new employees won't get it.

Jeanne Harris Van Dahlen: Our new employees need it.

Gary: It will be available. If you'd like to automate it through CSU Learn, we can coordinate with them to schedule it for your employees as they come on board. With that, I don't anticipate any further questions.

New Business:

Transportation Demand Management Plan

Jeff Dierking: Hello, everyone! Hope you're all enjoying the Executive Safety Committee meeting.

The campus is required to have a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, and UTAPS is currently developing a new one as part of the Campus Master Plan. We've partnered with Alta Planning and Walker Consultants to lead this effort, and after several months of work, we're excited to present our progress and gather your feedback on key transportation-related issues.

This comprehensive plan addresses travel behavior, congestion reduction, parking demand, alternative transportation options, and long-term campus mobility improvements.

With that, I'd like to introduce Amy Johnson from Alta Planning, who will share a brief presentation. We look forward to your valuable input to help shape this important plan.

Amy Johnson: Thanks, Jeff! I'll go ahead and share my screen—let me know when you can see it.

Great! As Jeff mentioned, the university is developing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, and I'd like to quickly introduce myself. I'm Amy Johnson, a Planning Associate at Alta Planning + Design, representing both my firm and our partner, Walker Consultants, who are leading the parking component of the plan.

Transportation on and around campus presents various safety challenges, from traffic congestion to pedestrian conflicts. Today, we're looking for your insights to help prioritize strategies and critically assess our approach through a safety lens**.**

Agenda for the day:

1. Project Background – A brief overview to get everyone up to speed.
2. Findings Review – Key data and existing conditions analysis.
3. Strategies & Themes – Emerging recommendations based on our research.
4. Feedback Session – A 10-minute discussion on strategy refinements.
5. Wrap-up & Q&A – Open discussion and next steps.

TDM overview: At its core, TDM is about influencing travel behavior to improve mobility, reduce congestion, enhance air quality, and lower parking demand. The strategies fall into categories such as services, infrastructure, parking management, subsidies, and education.

Project Progress
Since launching in Fall 2024, we've completed:

- An existing conditions inventory
- On-campus tabling events
- A community-wide survey
- A walking and biking infrastructure assessment
- A full-day parking analysis to identify usage patterns

We are now in the strategy development phase, gathering feedback from campus committees to refine our recommendations. After today's discussion, we'll integrate your input, present the refined strategies to the Transportation Advisory Committee, and finalize the plan.
With that, let's move into the needs assessment findings. Any questions before we dive into the data?

A key goal of this plan is to meet CSU's requirement to update the TDM plan every five years. Beyond compliance, it also supports sustainable campus growth, assesses current and future parking needs, and ensures equitable and efficient transportation options for the campus community.

Community Survey & Mode Shift Feasibility Analysis
We conducted a campus-wide survey with about 1,500 responses—representing 4.5% of the campus population. Additionally, we performed a mode shift feasibility analysis by mapping student, faculty, and staff residential locations (using zip +4 codes) to assess viable commuting options. This helped identify reasonable travel times for different transportation modes.

Survey Findings
Our data revealed a significant increase in solo driving rates since pre-COVID, a trend seen regionally and nationally due to factors like remote work, health concerns, and changes in transit service. The biggest issue raised in the survey was campus congestion, followed by:

1. Bicycle & pedestrian safety concerns (on and around campus)
2. Parking challenges, particularly cost and availability
3. Potential solutions supported by respondents:
4. More telecommuting options (for students, faculty, and staff)
5. Improved public transit service (e.g., working with SacRT for better connectivity and frequency)
6. Expanded EV charging infrastructure

Parking Facility Analysis
Walker Consultants conducted a detailed parking study and found that, overall, parking demand is expected to remain below 85% occupancy, even with campus expansion. This is within an acceptable threshold, though some hotspots exist. We'll explore TDM strategies that can help distribute parking demand more evenly across campus.

Mode Shift Feasibility & Commuting Patterns
Our analysis showed that many students and some staff lack viable transit options, contributing to high solo driving rates. Faculty & staff travel an average of 14 miles per trip, while students average 23 miles—highlighting the challenges of long commutes.

Opportunities identified:

Strong potential for carpooling, vanpooling, and shuttle programs
Improved infrastructure to encourage walking and biking
Developing TDM Strategies
Using all collected data, we identified 71 potential TDM strategies aimed at reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips and improving mobility. To simplify prioritization, we grouped them into 12 themes across four categories:

1. Parking Management – Tools to regulate or incentivize parking behaviors (e.g., pricing strategies, priority spots).
2. Subsidies & Education – Financial incentives and awareness campaigns to promote alternative transportation.

3. Infrastructure & Services – Physical improvements (e.g., crosswalk enhancements, shuttle expansions, better pedestrian connectivity).
4. Programmatic & Policy – Broader policy shifts, such as remote work expansion, land use planning, and long-term implementation support.

Interactive Polling Exercise
Now, we'll engage in a live prioritization exercise using Mentimeter. Please open your phone or computer, visit menti.com, and enter the code displayed on the screen (or scan the QR code). This will allow us to gather your input in real time. If you're unable to participate now, we will share the presentation and survey link afterward.

Alright, we're moving into the first poll. There are four different polls, each representing one of the overarching categories we previously discussed. In this poll, we're asking you to rank the strategy themes within each category based on what you find most important. Your ranking can reflect your experience as an employee commuting to campus or incorporate a safety perspective—it's up to you. Any feedback you provide is valuable.
For clarity, parking optimization focuses on making the most of existing space, such as prioritizing carpool and vanpool parking or reallocating current spaces. Parking pricing is self-explanatory, while parking enforcement could involve increased surveillance or higher fines. Permit management may include stricter regulations on permit eligibility and designated parking areas.
I see we have 21 responses. Does anyone need more time?
It looks like parking pricing is the top choice, followed by parking optimization, parking enforcement, and permit management. Parking optimization just tied for first place—great! Thanks for your input; this will help us prioritize strategies within each theme.
Next, we're asking which subsidies or educational initiatives would have the greatest impact. This question focuses on ranking different modes of transportation—such as transit, walking/biking, and carpool/vanpool—based on where education and incentives should be prioritized. Our data suggests opportunities to improve all of these modes.
If you're using a mobile device, you can double-tap an answer choice to add it to the ranking, then use the arrows to adjust the order.
We now have 25 responses. Transit ranks first, followed by walking/biking, then carpool/vanpool.

Moving on to the next question: infrastructure improvements. This section has more options, so here's some contexts:

- **First and last mile connectivity** includes improvements that help bridge gaps between transportation systems and campus, such as better access to the American River Trail or increased shuttle frequency from the 65th Street light rail station.
- **Pedestrian accessibility** focuses on campus safety and additional pedestrian-friendly facilities.
- **Shuttle improvements** could mean adding more shuttles or enhancing existing services.
- **Sustainable mobility amenities** include EV charging stations, expanded bike parking, or e-bike chargers to encourage sustainable travel.
- **Off-campus bike connections** involve working with the city to improve biking infrastructure and close gaps in the network.

We currently have 22 responses. Pedestrian accessibility is the top priority, which aligns with safety committee concerns, followed by first and last mile connectivity and transit improvements.
For the final poll, we're looking at programmatic or policy changes. The three options are:

- **Hiring additional staff** to focus on education, mobility, and safety initiatives.
- **Expanding remote work and learning** options, which was a popular request in the survey.
- **Land use and transportation integration,** which aims to reduce single-occupancy trips by coordinating with city planners and developers.

We have 21 responses so far—I'll give it 15 more seconds before moving to our final open-ended question.

Now, we welcome any additional considerations or recommendations. If you have thoughts beyond today's discussion, feel free to reach out afterward. Some key concerns already mentioned include:

- Grant funding opportunities for infrastructure projects
- Assigned parking strategies
- Integration of e-bikes and scooters
- Enhancing pedestrian, scooter, and bike safety
- Updating roadway markings
- Addressing limited transportation options

I'll leave the floor open for about 20 more seconds for any final thoughts.
Before wrapping up, I'll revisit our next steps. Your feedback today will help refine and prioritize our strategies moving forward.
That concludes our presentation. I'm Amy Johnson with Ulti Planning & Design—my contact information is on the screen. Please reach out with any additional feedback. Thank you!

IN ATTENDANCE:

*Safety Committee Labor Representatives

Gary Rosenblum, AVP of Risk Management
Yvanne Bolano, ASC II Risk Management
Don Nahhas, Software and Data Analyst of Risk Management
Lillian Mott, Risk Management Intern
Jennifer Murchison, Executive Director for Universal Access and Inclusion and ADA Coordinator
Amy Johnson, Alta Planning (external)
Thomas Scarry, Occupational Health and Safety Specialist of Environmental Health and Safety
Michael Keenan, OS Analyst of College of ECS
Janee Hardman, Industrial Hygienist of Environmental Health and Safety
Troy Bettcher, Senior ELR Specialist
Janie Mutchler, Emergency Manager of Risk Management
Adell Seibels, Workers Compensation Manager of Risk Management
Jeff Dierking, Director, University Transportation & Parking Services (UTAPS)
Oscar Castro, Student Assistant of CCE-Facilities
Tyler Harris, Director of Environmental Health and Safety
Brittany Anderson-Steele, Safety Manager of College of NSM
Todd Dangott, Director of Risk Management
Christina Lofthouse, Deputy Chief of Police Department
Jeanne Harris Van Dahlen, Senior Associate Vice President for Student Health, Counseling and Wellness
Courtney McLeod-Golden, Director of Planning, Design & Construction
Laurie Pittman, Director of Clinic Operations of SHCWS
Jennifer O'Neal Watts, Library Services Specialist
Brent Moffat, Physical Security & IT Manager of Police Department
Christina Lofthouse, Deputy Chief of Police Department
Jamal Thomson, Assistant Property Manager of UEI
Anne Bradley, Business Librarian and Assistant Department Head
Department Research and Instruction
Manuel Lopez Chief Steward of AC *
Nayeli Parra Gonzalez, Youth Protection Program Analyst of Risk Management
Chris Taylor, interim Associate Dean, Natural Sciences and Mathematics AY 24/25
Jose Fuentes
Samuel N. Jones, Associate Vice President for Campus Life
Pam Robertson, Health Education Assistant of SHS Clinic *
Mary Lee Vance, Director of services for Students w/ Disabilities & Testing Center

Freddy Orozco, Coordinator, Parking & Shuttle Operations
Melissa Trujillo, Library Services Specialist*
Margaret Reece, Director, Operational Effectiveness & Efficiency of CCE