



Colorado State University Alternative Transportation Fee Advisory Board 2021-2022

March 21, 2022

LSC 312

Approved

Recorded by: Helen Flynn

I. Call to Order - 5:30pm

II. Attendance

Name	Title	Affiliation	Present?
Mark Kohn	Chair	Executive Board	X
Helen Flynn	Vice Chair		X
Micheal Townsend	Financials		X
Grace Feuerborn	Secretary		
Adam Vance	Representative	ASCSU At Large	X
Ken Kinneer	Representative	ASCSU At Large	X
XX	Representative	Ag Sciences	
Rob Long	Representative	Business	
Tatum Flatt	Representative	CVMBBS	X
Colin Hill	Representative	Engineering	X
Micheal Needham	Representative	Graduate School	X
Meghan Scaggs	Representative	HHS	X
Jacob Pendergast	Representative	Liberal Arts	X
David Wise	Representative	Natural Sciences	X
XX	Representative	Undeclared	

Lucas Bunger	Representative	Warner College	X
---------------------	----------------	----------------	---

III. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

IV. Open Items

- The Spoke:
 - michael N: loved it, feel good about funding
 - michael D: ditto
 - Jacob: loved it, good project
 - Colin: fees would be well allocated through this group
 - Lucas: ditto
 - Adam: agree
 - Cole: yes
 - Ken: yes
 - Meghan: love the sustainability aspect, need to diversify staff but they did touch on that
 - tatum: agree
 - David: agree, in terms of diversity I agree
- Bike Security and Education:
 - david: I like the idea, U-locks are good but expensive, not totally sure about the cameras, but I would fund the u-locks
 - Tatum: u-locks are good but not always effective, decent proposal
 - Meghan: like the cameras because they should deter people from stealing, fund u-locks first, then cameras if extra money
 - Ken: I do not support the cameras as much as the u-locks, even “dummy” cameras would deter a thief and be much cheaper, cameras don’t necessarily capture useful footage
 - Cole: abstain
 - Adam: agree with Ken, camera presence and signage would decrease theft, this is the project that I would suggest less funding for
 - Michael T: I don’t think we should fund cameras that were not apart of the original presentation, we need to follow ATFAB procedure
 - Lucas: like the u-locks, don’t love the cameras

- colin: I like the u-locks, but I would like to know more about the cameras, if we have spare funds I would partially fund the cameras, didn't like the distribution methods of the u-locks
- jacob: liked the project and the bike locks, like the idea of cameras but not sure how that would effect the budget
- michael D: pro-camera, I like the "dummy" camera idea, but would also be willing to spend \$5000 per camera, theft should be traceable with cameras
- Michael N: don't love the distribution of the u-locks, but I am still in favor of the locks and potentially a trial run of the cameras
- Covered Bus Shelters:
 - Colin: neutral, seems expensive but its legit
 - Lucas: these are helpful for people with disabilities, do not require maintenance funds from us, this project speaks to diversity, equity and inclusion
 - Adam: like the ADA and solar, would like to see full funding
 - Cole: abstain
 - Ken: highly rated, no concerns, there is a need for this on campus
 - Meghan: agree with the equity portion, agree with full funding
 - tatum: abstain
 - david: fits environmental aspect, extra safety, great project proposal
 - Michael N: good project, good design, we should fund as many of these as possible
 - Michael D: agree
 - Jacob: I had not considered how this would help increase equity on campus, I will adjust my scores to reflect that
 - Michael T: each one is \$35,000 including labor, etc
- Phemister Trail:
 - Aaron: *re-explained project and options for funding*
 - Adam: Do we think that this project will be inevitably funded with or without us? I think this is bound to happen without us.
 - Cole: wasn't here, but I like the idea of a bridge
 - Ken: I don't think that we should consider this project independent of funding, but there is a definite need in this area, we should consider that this project may have other sources of funding

- Meghan: excellent presentation, all of the number/facts were clear and well thought out, I understand that it is expensive, I would like to have the lighting improved
- Helen: *to clarify* we will not be saving any money this year, we are spending all of this, we have a lot extra because of Transfort
- Tatum: abstain
- David: I did not like this project, there a bike lane on the other side of the street, I would rather fund another project
- Michael N: I bike there a lot, it is an unsafe intersection, my understanding is that this is on CSU property, so FOCO won't handle it
- Aaron: it covers both city and CSU property, the city is hesitant to touch it
- Michael N: I still think it should be funded
- Michael D: I really like this project, I would like to see the bridge funded at a minimum, in terms of the expanded project I think that the pavement is an improvement, I agree with Meghan in that I would like there to be an addition of lighting, is red lighting a possibility?
- Aaron: we can ask, they can say no and possibly decline the award
- Michael D: I would say that we want the bridge, then lighting (eco friendly, and safety conscious) and pavement
- Jacob: I agree with Helen that we need to spend our money, I liked this project
- Colin: I like the bridge, it would get good use, I don't like the dramatic change in cost
- Lucas: my comments have already be mentioned
- Michael T: we will need to take a motion to re-award funding in a way that David Hansen wants
- Stats Alley:
 - Ken: I don't think this is a huge inconvenience at this point, I think that the cost was high, I would not support this project at this cost
 - Adam: I think that this would decrease safety on campus, I don't like this project or the cost, I like the idea of improving the space, but I don't think this is an area that should become a developed trail

- Lucas: Not much to add, most people just take the oval or tilt, very few people use this area on a bike
- Colin: I like this project, it would prevent people from riding the opposite way on the oval, something needs to happen, but this is not necessarily the answer, it ends near a parking lot which I don't love
- Jacob: people ride against traffic on the oval, I would still do that even if this path was built, I don't think that this project is useful
- Michael D: neutral
- Michael N: pretty neutral, I don't know the area that well
- David: it is a tight turn, I could see some accidents in the area even with the trail improvements
- tatum: no comment
- Meghan: I agree with things that have already been said
- Ken: have you (Mark) approached David Hansen about making it a slow zone?
- Aaron: the area would have 2 slow zone signs on the ground, its an encouragement tool, not an enforcement tool, this would prevent people from riding one way against the flow of traffic
- Mark: why wouldn't we just put in a contraflow bike lane?
- Aaron: not enough space
- Ken: Rams Ride Right is being funded by us, we could ask them to concentrate more efforts over there, not necessarily as a condition of funding but just as a suggestion

Plan for the rest of the evening:

- update our scores
- decide on a tentative ranking

For next meeting:

- solidify ranks
- consider funding options
- VOTE

V. New Business

VI. Post Meeting Action Items

Action:	Assigned To:	Deadline:

VII. Motions Made

- **Motion 1- Approval of Minutes**
- **Motion 2 - approve**
- **Etc.**