

ALL-UNIVERSITY & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 18, 2018

PRESENT:

CALDWELL, CLABEAUX, HUSSAIN, MARTENIUK, NICHOLLS, PETROFF, POTTER, PRUSH, SHROYER, SILVER, SLOAN,  
TROOST, WANDYEZ, WINOWIECKI, WOLFE

ABSENT: DAI, GAJDA, GROLL, GUSTAFSON, KINNEY, KIRBY, LAING RUTAN, VELIANOFF, WEBBER, WINKLER

CALL TO ORDER:

1501

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS:

NICHOLLS welcomed the committee and attendees introduced themselves.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

POTTER moved to approve agenda.

SILVER 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

Approval of agenda.

ALL in favor.

NO abstentions.

NO oppositions.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER MINUTES:

SILVER moved to approve minutes.

MARTENIUK 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

Approval of November Minutes.

ALL in favor.

NO abstentions.

NO oppositions.

PRESENTATIONS:

a. Status of Move Safe Campaign (John Prush, DPPS)

PRUSH updated the committee on the Move Safe Campaign (MSC); highlighting on a past visit from Sierra Medrano (DPS Communications Representative) who is currently working with a student to produce a MSC video for social media usage or any other forms of communicating with campus and community.

- PRUSH mentioned that MSC keychains have been purchased and are being handed out as a promotional item by the police department.
- PRUSH noted that the recommendation for the sidewalk stickers has been passed on and is being considered.

NICHOLS questioned the content and script of video.

PRUSH noted that the video reflects an interaction between campus police and the MSU community; including campus police, students and faculty/staff.

- PRUSH noted that Lt. Dan Munford and Sierra Medrano will now manage and take on the responsibility of the Move Safe Campaign.

b. Moped Parking Locations (John Prush, DPPS)

PRUSH stated that 1186 is the current number of registered mopeds to date.

- PRUSH noted that through the registration process the department has been able to determine that of the 1186 mopeds registered, 805 are registered to students living off campus and remaining number are associated to students living on campus.
- PRUSH mentioned that along with Landscape Services several lots (22, 64, 70, 74) are now housing pilot moped parking spaces; each space accommodating 5 mopeds with perpendicular lines.

SLOAN noted concern of how mopeds will pull out of spaces.

PRUSH noted that Sierra is working with ASMSU to help with the pilot process and requested any suggestions to be helpful.

HUSSAIN questioned once designated spaces are in place can students still park at the bike racks.

PRUSH noted that once the designated parking rules are in place, mopeds will no longer be able to park at the bike racks and must use a motorized vehicle space.

PRUSH presented a campus map reflecting moped designated parking areas being considered. (red dots indicating viable for conversion in a non-gated lot)

- PRUSH noted 84 spaces under consideration with slight concentration at residential halls. (creating about 420 individual moped spaces)
- PRUSH noted the need to seek additional lots, such as 79 for transient use for off-campus commuters.

CALDWELL questioned if any communication has been made with campus worker groups, unions or staffing groups on their concerns for lost permit spaces.

PRUSH stated that no contact has been made yet, but most complaints received have been focused towards moped sidewalk driving.

- PRUSH noted a recent meeting w/IPF working to identify any other “new” areas that could be incorporated solely for moped parking that would not take away from current spaces.

TROOST noted on this discussion; stating his concerns that little room exists (ex. Main Library) in doing so.

MARTENIUK questioned if all 84 spots on the map were current parking spaces.

PRUSH noted that the 84 spots on the map are actually spaces and not all of them are designated employee parking.

PETROFF noted that RHS has made several attempts to reach out to the Parking Office regarding moped parking; now with a contingent map engaging in discussion on this topic is crucial.

- PETROFF commented on the concerns that RHS has with the possible loss of spaces in and around the residential halls; mainly for visitors coming to dine, deterring generated revenue.
- PETROFF also commented on the fierce competition with campus housing and city of East Lansing; noting that the parking could possibly hinder generated revenue at residential halls.
- PETROFF stated that 200+ RHS team members have now been relocated to 1855 Place; opening up parking areas on the eastside and across campus. Hoping that faculty/staff can be flexible in their prospective as we move forward to resolve the moped parking issues.

PRUSH stated that the department has been in contact with Jane Emery/RHS, as well as Sierra Medrano has made contact with Cassie Cotton/RHS regarding marketing and communications.

WANDYEZ questioned how moped spaces will be labeled and is still concerned that the general student population will never accept the fact that a moped is a “registered motor vehicle”.

PRUSH noted that “all” moped spaces will be signed and will fall under Prohibitions and Restrictions regarding violations.

TROOST disagreed with WANDYEZ; stating that mopeds are a motorized vehicle and student body needs to be educated and accept the rules.

NICHOLLS stated that students need to accept policy and let change take effect.

TROOST questioned what possible ruling could take effect at 6pm when the gates go up in some lots; regarding if mopeds will be allowed to park.

PRUSH noted that consideration has been made especially in lots in and around the main library, possibly incorporating multi-use spaces where after a certain hour the permitted space would open for moped parking.

NICHOLLS noted to committee of their responsibility to share moped information/map and to publicize future forum to help the movement and share comments/thoughts.

TROOST noted the need to continue to evaluate the layout and design of the moped parking spaces; still concerned with some layouts.

POTTER noted his visit to the University of Maryland and how their designed moped parking incorporates re-ods, helping to secure the mopeds when parked.

TROOST noted that the use of re-rods or loops could hinder grading or plowing.

SILVER questioned with the proposed 84 spots could this impact the cost of permits for faculty/staff.

PRUSH stated that there would be no impact to faculty/staff permit costs.

NICHOLLS noted concern with map; that each particular space needs to be more identifiable (each red dot); emphasizing how important for displaying at forum.

PRUSH noted that the map is on a high-res pdf with fairly clear visibility, noting actual parking lines.

NICHOLLS requested any thoughts or ideas on when/where/how to plan the forum.

POTTER noted ASMSU's willingness to help collaborate.

NICHOLLS noted best time would probably be a Friday; low class schedule and greater meeting space availability.

- NICHOLLS suggested using the largest meeting room available; using a doodle poll for February prior to spring break.

CALDWELL stated on the vision of this forum and how it will affect many different individuals across campus; stressing the importance to work with different university groups to partner and participate in planning.

NICHOLLS noted we need to plan for a large number in attendance and use main server email.

TROOST noted February as best timeline; possibly staging it from 3pm to 5pm or have several open forums on one particular day.

SLOAN suggested forum to not coincide with spring break; comparing to the student feedback at end of last academic year.

NICHOLLS suggested the Friday prior to spring break week.

POTTER suggested to PRUSH to use permit holders mass email list.

PRUSH noted the possibility in doing so.

SILVER suggested at lunch hour to accommodate faculty/staff.

PETROFF noted his concern if one forum would really be enough.

NICHOLLS suggested two forums back-to-back/same day (ex. 12pm – 2pm & 4pm – 6pm)

CALDWELL asked NICHOLLS to highlight on the outline of the forum.

NICHOLLS stated a presentation combination from TROOST/PRUSH outlining the specifics involved with the new policy and then the chance for individuals to react and give their input/feedback.

CALDWELL questioned PRUSH if he was under any pressure to have moped policy moved from pilot to full implementation by a certain date.

PRUSH stated the department's expectations are that moped spaces be incorporated and available for 2018 Fall Semester.

TROOST suggested pulling in Wolfgang Bauer and his committee to assist with forum.

NICHOLLS noted emailing Wolfgang Bauer to assist; possibly adding to next agenda for discussion.

SLOAN questioned PRUSH on the current number of moped sidewalk driving violations, if they have increased.

PRUSH noted that without hard data available not sure of exact numbers but, it seems to have increased since enforcement has been stepped up.

WINOWIECKI questioned the ratio of permits sold to the number of actual spaces available.

PRUSH questioned WINOWIECKI if he was proposing a cap on moped permits sold.

MARTENIUK questioned if a cap on registered vehicle permits exist.

PRUSH noted that some permits do have a cap; notable around resident halls.

WANDYEZ noted his concerns if enough moped spaces will be available; that students may still struggle finding parking and then falling back to parking at bike racks.

PRUSH agreed with the comment and is open for any suggestions.

POTTER questioned if the commuter lot (89) would be an option for parking a moped and then walking/bussing from lot.

PRUSH noted that this option would probably not set well with students, but if wanting to acquire 1200 spaces (one for each moped) then possibly this could be implemented as a backup plan allowing moped permits to utilize the commuter lot at no additional charge.

NICHOLLS noted again that she will contact Wolfgang to get his initial recreation; sharing basics of parking/map along with tentative times for forum and move forward.

#### DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Parking Violations Fines/Fee Structure (All)

PRUSH shared the fine schedule set by ordinance (Board of Trustees) which has not been modified in several years. Currently, experiencing a tipping point in meter violations; where as it is easier to park/not pay and accept the violation which allows a 24hr. grace period of a \$10 payment.

- PRUSH proposed the amendments below:
  - \$15 meter violation increased to \$25 (\$20 if paid within 24hrs.)
  - \$100 handicap violation increased to \$125
  - \$25 prohibitions/restrictions (ordinance 31) violation increased to \$35
- PRUSH highlighted on the current fine escalation fees set by the parking department:
  - \$10 late fee applied after 7 days
  - \$5 administration fee applied after 10 days (overdue notice sent at this time)
- PRUSH proposed to modify amendment for fine escalation:
  - \$15 single late fee applied after 7 days (with no other charges applied)

SLOAN questioned comparable fees/fines to East Lansing.

PRUSH noted that East Lansing charges the following:

- \$20 meter violation
- \$35 majority (of all other) violations

CLABEAUX question why meter rates are \$1.80 per hour.

PRUSH noted meter rates have been incremented through the years, having been raised several years ago from \$1.50.

CLABEAUX suggested decreasing meter rates to combat parking issues (decrease the cost per hour and increase the meter violation fine).

CALDWELL noted that PRUSH made an interesting case for changing the fines at meters but is there a case to be made why the other fines should be increased.

PRUSH noted the number of violations has averaged per year, for the past 8 years, about 100,000; increasing the fines helps increase compliance.

NICHOLLS noted the current time and need to wrap up and pick back up fines/fees structure at February meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

WINOWIECKI requested PRUSH to reply to the questions outlined from November meeting:

1. Where are the funds allocated from moped parking? *Moped registration is the same as vehicle registration and falls under the parking maintenance fund.*
2. Are there any regulations in place for skateboards/longboards and where are they allowed...bike lanes, sidewalks? *Skateboards, longboards, roller skates and blades are not motorized and are permitted on sidewalks (not allowed in road or bike lanes).*
3. What is the current process and timeline for restriping/remarking parking lots and roadways? *We utilize a pavement rating plan that we work alongside IPF in calculating the grade and its life condition.*

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, February 15 @ 3:00pm – International Center Spartan Room B

ADJOURNMENT:

1629

NICHOLLS requested to adjourn meeting.

SLOAN motioned to adjourn.

WANDYEZ 2<sup>nd</sup> motion.

ALL in favor.