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**Alternative Transportation Fee Advisory Board Academic Year: 2022-2023**

Date of Meeting: 3/20/2023

Ram’s Horn Conference Room

Recorded by: Trevor Hale

1. **Call to Order – 5:30pm**
2. **Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Title | Affiliation | Present? |
| Helen Flynn | Chair | Executive Board | Y |
| David Wise | Vice Chair | Executive Board | Y |
| Ken Kinneer | Financials | Executive Board | Y |
| Trevor Hale | Secretary | Executive Board | Y |
| Omar Soliman | Representative | ASCSU At Large | N |
| Allie Claar | Representative | ASCSU At Large | Y |
| Cady Gebhart  Ray Mendoza | Representative  Representative / Alt | Ag Sciences | Y |
| Brian Deegan  Andy Goeke | Representative  Representative / Alt | Business | Y |
| ~~Trevor Hale~~  Rachel Hernandez | Representative  Representative / Alt | CVMBS | N |
| Zachary Cramton  Lilly Perez | Representative  Representative / Alt | Engineering | Y |
| Emily Gordon  Justin Hudson | Representative  Representative / Alt | Graduate School | Y |
| Kiana Smith  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | HHS | Y |
| Jacob Pendergast  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | Liberal Arts | N |
| Rachel Jacks  Anna Parry | Representative  Representative / Alt | Natural Sciences | Y |
| XX  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | Undeclared | N |
| Lucas Bunger  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | Warner College | Y |

Has Quorum Been Reached? Yes  / No

*“Quorum shall consist of seven (7) voting members”.*

[ATFAB Bylaws, Article V, Section 5](https://atfab.colostate.edu/atfab-bylaws/)

*“Voting members shall consist of student members of undergraduate college councils, a student member from the Undeclared Leadership Council,  a student member from the Graduate School Council, and two student-at-large members. Associate members shall not have voting rights unless the primary representative from their area of affiliation is not present to vote.“*

[ATFAB Bylaws, Article III, Section 1](https://atfab.colostate.edu/atfab-bylaws/)

1. **Open Items**
   1. Approve Minutes from Previous Meeting
2. **New Business**
   1. **Deliberation on proposals**

* Finance chair recommends that 85% of total funds be allocated to projects in order to maintain a healthy cushion for unforeseen setbacks (like pandemics)
* Chair points out that a blank score in the score sheet does not count as a score of zero. It does not count at all.
* Statistics Alley Project
  + Warner: Covered shelters are a much better option for funding
  + ASCSU Allie: project is not necessary
  + Nat Sci: not enough space. Also, would there be enough usage?
  + Business: there is an improvement in safety, but is it better than other options? Could we consider educational programs, or just trying to get people to go the right way around the Oval?
  + Secretary: Agree with previous points on usage
  + Vice Chair: concern for non-reflective railings jutting out and causing safety concerns.
  + Engineering: educational initiatives aren’t strong enough to address this problem. This project will work in a overall plan to increase connectivity on campus, so it should be seriously considered.
    - There are future goals to extend the project to include more bike routes in new areas. This project is valuable for that reason
  + Finance chair: this project has improved from last year to make it more safe for pedestrians.
  + Grad school: This project is intended for a small group of students who break the traffic rules. The students will continue to break rules rather than go out of their way to use this proposed improvement
  + Ag sci: nothing else to add
  + HHS: the proposal doesn’t add anything to campus.
  + Ag sci: if we had an unlimited budget we could carry this out. They mentioned in the presentation that Glover renovation could create opportunity for future extensions. But for now, this shouldn’t be a priority.
  + Consensus: this project is low priority
* Hughes Way Raised Crossing
  + Finance Chair: there’s a really big safety issue at hand here. We should at least partially fund this project to pay for raised crossing, and leave out the flashing signs (as they mentioned in the presentation they could be removed if necessary). We could consider other options? Using reflective panes, more lighting etc?
  + Engineering: It should be funded with or without the flashing beacons; there is potential for the project slowing traffic.
  + Vice Chair: we should look from every perspective: cyclist, pedestrian, car. The bump is useful for everyone, the light would clog things down and become a problem for congestion.
  + Secretary: we should prioritize health and safety over time saved or lost in congestion
  + Business: the best option is the pedestrian stop light (red flashing light like on Laurel St.), however this is not included in the proposal. The flashing beacon might incentivize parking off-campus, which would in-turn solve the congestion problem.
  + Nat Sci: agree with previous points
  + ASCSU: agree with funding either the beacon or bump but not both.
  + Warner: as for the timing it should be long enough to allow ADA accessibility. Traffic flow is important, but peoples lives are more important. The combination of speed bump and beacon makes me feel most safe, personally.
  + HHS: the combination of bump and beacon is best.
  + Ag sci: the beacon will make it safer at night and make pedestrians more confident. Maybe we could fund the bump now and fund the beacon later.
  + Grad school: that crossing is very unsafe currently. Prioritizing safety often comes at the expense of car convenience, so we shouldn’t get hung up on that problem in this case.
  + Ag sci: my friends have expressed interest for the project.
  + Engineering: the concern of shortening beacon timing isn’t valid here, because cars can still pass during the flashing as long as there’s no pedestrians. The beacon will only add to the project, not remove value.
  + Vice Chair: we should consider how the congestion affects students who live far away and must drive to campus. We should try to avoid hurting people who drive cars.
  + Warner: Hughes Way was recently made a two-way street. The university has already conceded to car infrastructure in the past. Let’s consider the history and future of Hughes as we consider what to prioritize.
* Covered transit shelters
  + Note: Shelters are $60k a piece.
  + Bus: the shelters add good markers for people. This project can be scalable to allow fluctuations in funding. Really good project overall
  + Nat sci: we can’t fund in entirety, but overall a good project
  + ASCSU: we should consider funding the shelters now and funding the electronic signs later.
  + HHS: agree with funding the shelters separate from the signs
  + Ag sci: we should fund it in some capacity; agrees with separating the shelters from signs. Didn’t know that some stops existed until she noticed the signs. Those good visual markers could increase usage and awareness
  + Grad school: agree with previous points. Very visual bus stops are important for international students, who are in a new, strange place.
  + Finance chair: visibility is very important for increasing usage. The electronic components should be funded with the shelters, not separately. SFRB expects $450k spent on proposals. Advocates for not funding Statistics alley, and funding 4 out of 5 covered shelters with electronic components included.
  + Engineering: the audio and electronic components are important since they decrease barriers to entry and increase usage. The audio component is relatively cheap compared to the total ask. We should fund 4 shelters with the audio component rather than 5 shelters without this addition.
  + Vice chair: if we need to, we should consider partial funding. The Newsom stop and others are more important than the Lake St Garage location
  + Secretary: agree with previous points on funding stops in their entirety rather than leaving out the electronic components.
  + Business: increasing ridership is really important here. The best way to decrease barriers to entry is increasing visibility and adding electronic components that decrease barriers to entry.
  + Engineering: doesn’t agree with Lake St being the least important. Question: can we specify which locations we’re going to fund?
    - Chair: yes, we will send our motion to the proposer, who can decide if they will take the money.
  + Finance chair: adding a stop to Lake St will decrease traffic. Funding other locations over others is problematic due to unforeseen changes in future usage.
  + Chair: facilities has their own priority list based on internal statistics, so we don’t necessarily have to give them our priority list if we decide to partially fund.
  + Grad School: Facilities priority list comes from research
  + Advisor: we can still give them our priority if we want to show what our wants are.
  + Ag sci: are the LED screens already on existing shelters?
    - Advisor: yes they have been added to all shelters recently.

1. **Meeting Ajourned**
2. **Template for Roll Call Vote:**

*“All members specified in Article III section 1 shall have one vote. Quorum must be present before a vote can be taken. Votes should be based on funding rules articulated in Article VII. A majority (more than half) of the present voting members must vote in the affirmative for an item to pass, else it fails.”*

[ATFAB Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 1](https://atfab.colostate.edu/atfab-bylaws/)

*“In the event of a tie, the Chairperson should break the tie with a vote.”*

[ATFAB Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 4](https://atfab.colostate.edu/atfab-bylaws/)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Motion to …  Motion proposed by … | | | |
| Name | Title | Affiliation | Vote |
| Helen Flynn | Chair (only Tiebraker) | Executive Board |  |
| David Wise | Vice Chair | Executive Board |  |
| Ken Kinneer | Financials | Executive Board |  |
| Trevor Hale | Secretary | Executive Board |  |
| Omar Soliman | Representative | ASCSU At Large |  |
| Allie Claar | Representative | ASCSU At Large |  |
| Cady Gebhart  Ray Mendoza | Representative  Representative / Alt | Ag Sciences |  |
| Brian Deegan  Andy Goeke | Representative  Representative / Alt | Business |  |
| ~~Trevor Hale~~  Rachel Hernandez | Representative  Representative / Alt | CVMBS |  |
| Zachary Cramton  Lilly Perez | Representative  Representative / Alt | Engineering |  |
| Emily Gordon  Justin Hudson | Representative  Representative / Alt | Graduate School |  |
| Kiana Smith  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | HHS |  |
| Jacob Pendergast  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | Liberal Arts |  |
| Rachel Jacks  Anna Parry | Representative  Representative / Alt | Natural Sciences |  |
| XX  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | Undeclared |  |
| Lucas Bunger  XX | Representative  Representative / Alt | Warner College |  |
| Result | The result of the motion is … | | |