

ALL-UNIVERSITY TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 22, 2018

PRESENT:

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

ABSENT:

CLABEAUX, DAI, GAJDA, GROLL, GUSTAFSON, KINNEY, KIRBY, LAING, MARTENIUK, RUTAN, SLOAN, VELIANOFF, WINKLER

GUESTS:

MITCH HUBER, Student

CALL TO ORDER:

1501

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS:

NICHOLLS welcomed the committee and attendees introduced themselves.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

NO approval of Agenda – quorum not met.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF JANUARY MINUTES:

NO approval of January minutes – quorum not met.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY MINUTES:

NO approval of February minutes – quorum not met.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. AUTTC Moped Forum (All)

NICHOLLS noted the proposed Moped Forum is on the agenda for tomorrow, Friday, March 23 @ 12:30pm.

- NICHOLLS reflected on PRUSH's email; that the university was not willing to send a campus wide email to announce the event.
- NICHOLLS shared her opinion that if the university was not willing to publicize this important information related to safety/security of staff and students then discussion to cancel the event should be considered.

TROOST questioned if a room had been reserved and suggesting that signage be posted if cancelled.

PRUSH stated his willingness to be present and plans to move forward with forum sharing information and answering any questions.

CALDWELL questioned PRUSH if forum had been publicized on the Police Dept. social media sites and through Housing.

PRUSH noted that the forum was announced through the Police Dept. via social media and Housing via Capt. Cooper.

- PRUSH noted ASMSU invitation to the Police Dept., next Tuesday, to an assembly addressing and sharing moped information.

NICHOLLS discussed the outline of the forum; highlighting on the rules/regulations, the rationale behind the change, providing map of designated moped spaces, layout of timeline, and finishing with questions and answers.

CALDWELL shared his concerns on the forum presentation; what is expected from committee members in attendance, and worried that committee is not prepared enough.

NICHOLLS noted the forum was for those willing to come and to voice their opinions with committee providing feedback.

PRUSH questioned committee members, if any had reached out to their constituents.

WOLFE noted that flyers/handouts were made available to their customers.

b. AUTTC Reporting Line (Nicholls, Prush, Troost)

NICHOLLS recapped on last month's discussion on the reporting line and how change has evolved over time. Discussion arose on the benefit of this committee to report to Satish.

- NICHOLLS highlighted on a meeting with Satish Udpa and Wolfgang Bauer to gather their opinion of the reporting line. In attendance was POTTER and WANDYEZ.

TROOST reported back on his recent attendance at a Mobility meeting, noting that Satish wants to keep the reporting lines in place as they are, but to utilize AUTTC as a sounding board where ideas can bounce back and forth.

- TROOST also commented on Satish's suggestion that the AUTTC Chair sit on the mobility committee, as well as, incorporating a blend of both groups.

c. Restructuring/Reformatting of Recommendation Committee (Prush)

PRUSH proposed for consideration to the committee an idea which involves all dynamics of recent change within the university's leadership, as well as the committee itself. Suggesting the AUTTC be morphed/changed/restructured into a "forum committee - AUTTF" meeting once or twice a year.

- PRUSH suggesting the forum could be widely publicized/marketed to provide public address and possibly touch on the following:
  - Ideas for future plans
  - Changes on campus

- Safety initiatives
- Reintegrating "Tracks" (subcommittees to follow up on certain topics)
- Incorporating different topic sessions and utilizing input from large forum attendance
- Outreach/participation that would connect with mobility planning
- Community feedback via "AUTTF"

TROOST implied that a forum of such size would require extensive planning and cost, but could possibly incorporate the City of Lansing, East Lansing, and Meridian Twp. to speak on certain issues/topics. Offering 2 or 3 smaller forums per year or even 1 every semester with an open house format would be more doable.

HUSSAIN questioned if there are any other committees using this type of forum or just AUTTC and would it be successful; maybe installing a trial period to monitor success.

PRUSH agreed to the idea to test a forum outline for a couple of years.

HUSSAIN suggested to sway from a large costly forum event, keeping it simple in case there is no interest from public.

NICHOLLS was concerned with having to deal with organizing, registration, booking room and food; keeping it to once a semester and focusing on marketing and presentation.

PRUSH suggested targeting particular audiences at certain times of the year (ex. staff/faculty in the fall and students in the spring or vice versa) giving more focus to users.

TROOST commented that a forum can sometimes be more concentrated on one particular topic and suggested better attendance if set up as an open house with different stations; managing questions and answers more efficiently through a drop-in event.

CALDWELL noted his opinion on two observations of the forum suggestion:

1. Moving forward with a forum would still require the committee to meet prior in planning these events; still/same time demand.
2. Since AUTTC is a Board created/mandated committee, would this change be so radical that Board approval would be necessary or just a change in by-laws.

HUSSAIN questioned if there was a timeline in place to incorporate such change.

PRUSH stated that there was no timeline, just a proposal requesting feedback.

NICHOLLS noted committee would have to vote; no quorum at hand.

SILVER shared her opinion that the present committee has a strong diversity of faculty/staff and students and feels that the committee's monthly meetings are more effective than moving forward with a forum.

#### ELECTIONS(S) – INTERIM (2017-2018) AND NEW (2018-2019) CHAIR:

NICHOLLS noted that due to no quorum, unable to hold elections; this will be her last meeting.

HUSSAIN asked if anyone knew of potential candidates.

POTTER mentioned a previous past committee chair who might possibly be interested in serving as interim.

CALDWELL questioned who would appoint the chair replacement if there are no nominees.

NICHOLLS stated the Academic Governments Committee would forgo and attempt to fill seat.

- NICHOLLS addressed committee if anyone would be interested in filling the open chair.

WANDYEZ addressed the possibility of himself holding interim for just the April meeting.

NICHOLLS stated again that someone is needed to chair the April 2018 meeting and someone to move forward and chair the 2018-2019 academic year.

- NICHOLLS suggested on emailing committee, since no quorum, to vote on WANDYEZ (student representative) to hold interim chair for April meeting.
- NICHOLLS stated since no objection she will seek election through emailing committee to obtain a vote for interim chair. Chair for next year will not be filled due to no quorum.

CORRESPONDENCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

WINOWIECKI shared a correspondence regarding Lot 92 with complaints and concerns of lighting and safety during dark hours and requesting the ability for faculty/staff to park in Lot 100, stating that Lot 100 is underutilized. Concerned individuals also reached out to the parking office and were given options if wanting to park in Lot 100 to either purchase a leased space or a commuter permit. These were not realistic options and concerned individuals are requesting consideration for committee review.

PRUSH stated that several comments were received through AUTTC website and the Clinical Center listed below:

<u>Concerns</u>	<u>Reply</u>
-Lot 100 concerns of poor lighting	-New carports have been installed throughout with additional lighting
-Lot 92 concerns of poor lighting	-New carports have been installed throughout with additional lighting and with an additional 100 spaces
-Concerns of pedestrians crossing Service Road	-Student engineer has performed speed study with data reflecting no major concerns for pedestrians
-Why can't Lot 100 be utilized by F/S	-Lot is a pay lot used by patients, visitors and permitted med. students...if displaced for F/S usage then other space would then need to be created for those displaced. Desire is to leave lot 100 as is.

- PRUSH noted that Stephanie O'Donnell will reply to these comments.

TROOST commented on the lighting issue; are the concerns vended more towards the roadway lighting levels verses the parking lot lighting levels (traveling from bright into dark).

PRUSH stated that no study has been conducted, but can place a request for IPF to facilitate a light meter measure.

- PRUSH recalled a proposed plan dated for 2019 to add a traffic light at Bogue and Service; helping the flow and speed of traffic.

- PRUSH noted that the installation of flashing lights has also been considered, but is very expensive. Recently receiving a notification letter from the Michigan Uniformed Traffic Control Standard that this type of light is not recommended/approved; gives false sense of safety.
- PRUSH commented on a recent meeting with Lynette Budenaers from the Clinical Center addressing this matter.

POTTER questioned if the “flexible in-road” pedestrian signs have been displayed/used in this particular area.

PRUSH replied that the signs have been placed out quite frequently.

WINOWIECKI questioned if the correspondence at hand is really a safety issue regarding the crossing of Service Road or a proximity to the front door of the building parking issue.

PRUSH directed response to TROOST.

TROOST stated that the university has no set standards in place for parking proximity.

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, April 19 @ 3:00pm – International Center Spartan Room B

ADJOURNMENT:

1607

NICHOLLS requested to adjourn meeting.

No quorum – COMMITTEE in agreement of adjournment.