

1                   **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
2                   **BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3   The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory  
4   Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held  
5   January 21, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government  
6   Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.  
7

8   **MEMBERS PRESENT:**     George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)  
9                                 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT Rep)  
10                                Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)  
11                                Albert Casillas (proxy - Dona Ana County Rep)  
12                                David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)  
13                                Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)  
14                                Scott Farnham (City of Las Cruces Rep)  
15

16   **MEMBERS ABSENT:**     Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)  
17                                 Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla)  
18                                 Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Community Rep)  
19

20   **STAFF PRESENT:**        Andrew Wray (MPO)  
21                                 Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO)  
22                                 Tom Murphy (MPO)  
23

24   **OTHERS PRESENT:**     Ben Widner  
25                                 Leah Baca (CLC)  
26                                 Lisa LaRoque (CLC)  
27

28   **1. CALL TO ORDER**

29  
30   Meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.  
31

32   **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

33  
34   George Pearson asked for a motion to approve the agenda.  
35   David Shearer motioned to approve the agenda.  
36   Mark Leisher seconds the motion.  
37   All in favor.  
38

39   **3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

40  
41   George Pearson opened the floor for nominations.  
42   Leslie Kryder nominated George Pearson to continue as Chair.  
43   Mark Leisher seconds the nomination.  
44

45   Andrew Wray closed the floor for nominations and asked if the Committee was in favor of  
46   Mr. Pearson’s nomination to signify by saying aye.

1 All were in favor.

2

3 George Pearson asked for a nomination for Vice Chair.

4 Leslie Kryder nominated herself to serve as Vice Chair.

5 Jolene Herrera seconds the nomination.

6 All in favor.

7

8 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

9

10 **4.1 October 15, 2013**

11

12 David Shearer motioned to accept the minutes for October 15, 2013.

13 Mark Leisher seconds the motion.

14 All in favor.

15

16 **5. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

17

18 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

19

20 **6.1 Recommendation to Policy Committee of Pike/Ped Contact Resolution**

21

22 At a previous meeting the BPAC reached consensus on moving forward with a resolution to  
23 the MPO Policy Committee. Below is a proposed text for the resolution:

24

25 **Whereas**, The MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, CITY  
26 OF LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, and TOWN OF MESILLA have all adopted  
27 *Complete Streets* policies recognizing the need to consider vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian,  
28 and transit modes when planning for and implementing transportation infrastructure, and  
29

30 **Whereas**, the CITY OF LAS CRUCES has been recognized as a Bronze Level Bicycle  
31 Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists, and will need to reapply for  
32 continuing recognition by July 2015, and  
33

34 **Whereas**, the League of American Bicyclists guidelines for Bronze Level Bicycle Friendly  
35 Community designation suggests one bike program staff person for each 77,000 of  
36 population, and  
37

38 **Whereas**, the CITY OF LAS CRUCES has recently crossed the 100,000 population mark,  
39 included in the DOÑA ANA COUNTY population of about 215,000, and  
40

41 **Whereas**, the MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Policy  
42 Committee recognizes the importance of bicycles as a viable mode of transportation, its  
43 importance for public health, and as an economic force both locally and through tourism,  
44

45 **Therefore**, let it be resolved that, the MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING  
46 ORGANIZATION Policy Committee recommends that each member entity (CITY OF LAS

1 CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, and TOWN OF MESILLA) designate a staff member to be  
2 the bicycle/pedestrian contact.  
3  
4 Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation and asked for a recommendation to the Policy  
5 Committee.  
6  
7 Pearson: We had a pretty good discussion of this in our meeting last July and everyone  
8 was pretty much in agreement that this was a good idea. As stated in the  
9 Resolution we are past 100,000 in population in the City of Las Cruces and the  
10 League of American Bicyclists recommends a designated staff person for each  
11 77,000 population in the City so this is kind of a way to get the entities to  
12 designate somebody so that there is a single contact point for bike/ped issues  
13 rather than if somebody has a question it's well where do you go, well go see  
14 him, go see whoever and I think that's kind of how this came about, any further  
15 discussion.  
16  
17 Unknown: Say again, when was this discussed?  
18  
19 Pearson: In July.  
20  
21 Shearer: July, okay, (inaudible) that it was in the October minutes, I just wanted to  
22 check, thank you.  
23  
24 Herrera: Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify a couple of things. So we're recommending this  
25 to the Policy Committee for them to take to each of their boards, is that what  
26 we're doing? So the City will take it to City Council to designate somebody,  
27 the County will take it to the Board of Commissioners.....  
28  
29 Pearson: What I would expect to happen is that once we pass this then staff will bring  
30 this Resolution to the Policy Committee as an action item for their decision  
31 whether to approve it or not and if they decide to approve it then it's up to the  
32 members of the Policy Committee to bring this to their governing councils, is  
33 that correct.  
34  
35 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair that would be correct.  
36  
37 Herrera: Thanks Mr. Chair and I also just had one other comment that I want to make  
38 clear to this Committee and then I'll bring it up again at the Policy Committee,  
39 since this person will be acting on behalf of the City or the County or the Town  
40 I don't think it's appropriate to have MPO staff doing that function simply  
41 because it's not how that grant is administered, so to have Andrew or any of  
42 the other MPO staff acting in this capacity as part of the MPO wouldn't be  
43 appropriate.  
44  
45 Pearson: Right, I agree with that. I think that's part of the reasoning for bringing this  
46 forward because in the past, particularly to the City it's pushed off some of

1 things onto the MPO staff and Andrew you can correct me but I believe FHWA  
2 had an audit or close to an audit, I don't know if it rose to a level of a finding  
3 but it was a comment at least that the MPO was spending too much time on  
4 City specific items.  
5  
6 Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, yes that's correct. I can't remember whether it was a  
7 finding or a comment myself at the moment but it was definitely something that  
8 was impressed upon us that it was a practice that needed to be stopped so we  
9 are trying to comply with that directive.  
10  
11 Pearson: Any other comments on this?  
12  
13 Shearer: Can I ask again what the duties would be of this person.  
14  
15 Pearson: I think it would be up to the City or to the governing entity but as a contact  
16 point typically it would be a place where a citizen had some kind of, you know  
17 they wanted to find out more about bicycle lanes, if they wanted to find out  
18 road condition reports or anything, sidewalk conditions or whatever, it would  
19 be a single contact point and if it also presumed it would be a job title or part of  
20 their job description so that that person would then be the first contact point for  
21 the public and also presumably for the staff members of that entity.  
22  
23 Shearer: So PIO bicycle policy or what or just general information on bicycle use and  
24 facilities that are available in this MPO area?  
25  
26 Pearson: I think all the issues that have come up, typically, at some point I've kind of  
27 envisioned when the Safe Routes to School funding position was a possibility  
28 it was discussed that that might be a half time position and the other half might  
29 be a bike/ped coordinator position at the City level and it was discussed that  
30 that might land in the Community Development Department. Community  
31 Development planning issues and they are well versed with contact with the  
32 public so I think that is kind of the level where.....  
33  
34 Shearer: If its duty being assigned to somebody employed is it requesting that they be  
35 given a (inaudible) aid under.....  
36  
37 Pearson: Well, it would be staff, yes. However the entity pays for their staff yes.  
38  
39 Shearer: And the previous concern was that the MPO staff was spending too much time  
40 on this.  
41  
42 Pearson: Yes.  
43  
44 Shearer: So it would have to be non-MPO staff.  
45

1 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Shearer, yes because we are federally funded. We are not just  
2 local.  
3

4 Shearer: Right okay, so you are imposing something on the local....  
5

6 Pearson: We are suggesting that they take it over. That they step up where there is a  
7 need for it and we're trying to identify that there is a need for it also I think with  
8 this.  
9

10 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Shearer, if I may, another part from my perspective would be we  
11 really need someone to be a point of contact especially on development  
12 review immediately leaks to mind with an eye to bicycling issues because  
13 even when MPO staff was participating on a very deep level with City staff  
14 regarding bike issues we still were not on the receiving end of a lot of  
15 construction drawings, things like that, really nuance details that needs to be  
16 examined that even back in the day MPO staff was not really in a capacity to  
17 look at because it was not, it's just not part of our function so we're, I don't  
18 want to speak for the will of the Committee but it's my interpretation that the  
19 Committee is attempting to close that gap.  
20

21 Shearer: Okay and staff member of City or County, leave that up to the Policy  
22 Committee.  
23

24 Wray: Well, we would have to leave that up to the jurisdictions, whoever they would  
25 task and it depends on whether or not the member of the Policy Committee go  
26 back to their jurisdictions and implement it.  
27

28 Shearer: So you are suggesting only that the three members, is that.....  
29

30 Wray: Well, yes because I mean let's take historically speaking what was happening  
31 basically MPO staff was doing things for the City but then not for the County,  
32 not for the Town so even then there were things that were being neglected  
33 that should be covered so we're trying to insure that that does not happen in  
34 the future.  
35

36 Shearer: Okay, thank you.  
37

38 Pearson: On a practical matter we couldn't expect Mesilla to hire anybody for the  
39 staffing position but we might expect that the Public Works Director knows  
40 about it and so would be available either assigning whatever staff that person  
41 has or answering these kind of questions themselves being aware that it is an  
42 issue that they would be responsible for.  
43

44 Shearer: Are there any stipulations that it must be staff member or it must be a paid  
45 employee?  
46

1 Someone spoke but not into the microphone.  
2  
3 Shearer: Okay, thank you.  
4  
5 Pearson: Yeah the Resolution designates a staff member and I think that is who we  
6 expect to do our work is staff because just going back to previous like last  
7 year's bike (inaudible) activities there was a fairly decent volunteer effort but  
8 the volunteer effort didn't get very far with certain things that require  
9 cooperation from the City so this would give that volunteer effort a contact  
10 point with the City and then we could get the answer yes or no rather than oh  
11 that sounds like a good idea and that's where it ends.  
12  
13 Shearer: Thank you.  
14  
15 Pearson: And I don't think this would diminish at all what the MPO staff currently does in  
16 these areas.  
17  
18 Wray: No, we would still focus on these issues from a regional perspective that MPO  
19 staff just cannot be engaged in activities on behalf of one specific jurisdiction.  
20  
21 Pearson: Any other discussion on this? Oh and your other comment, in the July  
22 discussion we don't have a City staff representative here today but during July  
23 Jerry Cordova was the City representative and enthusiastic about the idea of  
24 having this kind of a person designated. No further discussion so we need a  
25 motion and a second still I think.  
26  
27 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.  
28  
29 Shearer: I move to approve the motion in a proposal.  
30  
31 Leisher: I second that motion.  
32  
33 Pearson: Hearing a motion and a second for Item 6.1, all in favor state aye.  
34  
35 All in favor, motion passes 7-0 (3 members absent, 2 vacant positions).  
36  
37 **6.2 Recommendation of Approval of Update to MPO Bylaws**  
38  
39 The new Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) which took effect July 1, 2013 necessitates  
40 revisions to the MPO bylaws.  
41  
42 Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.  
43  
44 Kryder: Mr. Chair, I just was curious since I'm actually reading this for the first time.  
45 We have 11 members on our Committee and I note that there are seven of us

1 here and there seem to be people that I have seen before but I'm wondering  
2 are there folks that are regularly not in attendance?  
3

4 Pearson: Well, we have, right now we have two vacant positions, the Town of Mesilla  
5 citizen position is vacant and the City of Las Cruces staff position is vacant.  
6

7 Wray: Mr. Chair, Scott Farnham is here.  
8

9 Pearson: Okay, well we should have done a roll call. Okay, I'm sorry, so why don't we  
10 do that. Why don't you introduce yourself and your position?  
11

12 Committee members introduced themselves.  
13

14 Pearson: Okay so that leaves Mesilla staff and that position was appointed but that staff  
15 member hasn't been here for except for once as I recall.  
16

17 Wray: Mr. Chair, that is correct. I believe he attended the August meeting of last year  
18 but that is the only one.  
19

20 Pearson: And the other position is vacant.  
21

22 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.  
23

24 Pearson: Well maybe we should continue this discussion during staff comments and talk  
25 about attendance requirements, any further comments. The item that I noticed  
26 was on appointment of an alternate member it's in three positions in the, three  
27 places one for each of the committees and the Policy Committee says agency  
28 or board shall submit written notification in a timely manner, does email  
29 constitute written notification?  
30

31 Wray: Mr. Chair, my understanding of the interpretation has always been that it does.  
32

33 Pearson: Okay, does that, well my comments are whether that should be explicitly  
34 stated and then my other comment would be that the same wording for one  
35 committee be replicated for the other two committees because I think the  
36 intent is the same for all the committees.  
37

38 Wray: I think it probably should be explicitly stated and we can add in language to  
39 that effect and make it parallel across all of the, I have the BPAC language  
40 right in front of me and I don't want to have to dig for the other ones, so do you  
41 want it to read "designation by writing, including email", have it read like that or  
42 shall submit a letter or email to the MPO Officer designating an alternate  
43 member?  
44

45 Pearson: That sounds fine to me. I think that is staff's area to fine tune that but I think  
46 written including email or written so that it is, strictly speaking if you read that

1 somebody would have to write a letter and deliver it somehow but I think email  
2 is accepted these days.  
3  
4 Wray: That is correct so we can consider that amendment made.  
5  
6 Pearson: And then it's just a matter, there is no need to vary the wording on the three  
7 committees.  
8  
9 Wray: No, I wouldn't think so.  
10  
11 Pearson: That's all I have, any other comments on this?  
12  
13 Herrera: Mr. Chair, just one more thing. On the removal procedure, so attendance is  
14 required at all committee meetings, if a committee member fails to attend 75%  
15 of the regularly scheduled meetings, that whole part, I wonder if we should put  
16 something in there about if they haven't notified MPO staff kind of like a no  
17 show thing so if they have an excused absence for some reason then...  
18  
19 Pearson: Carlos is the, that's the other one that we missed, the pedestrian  
20 representative and he sent an email today that he is sick, so I suppose we can  
21 consider that an excused absence so maybe verbiage about unexcused  
22 absences rather than I don't know.  
23  
24 Herrera: That might not be appropriate. It's just something that I wanted to bring up for  
25 discussion.  
26  
27 Wray: Well, it might be appropriate but I'm not very good at coming up with legalese  
28 sounding language on the fly.  
29  
30 Herrera: Me neither.  
31  
32 Kryder: It seems to me that if a, per another section in here, each of the entities or  
33 governmental agencies have designated an alternate then there really should  
34 be no reason why one or the other would not be in attendance; however, for  
35 community members of the committee who do not have alternates designated  
36 then that's a different sort of a situation. The other question I have though,  
37 75% it's a nice number but I have no idea how many meetings we actually  
38 have in a year so there is a whole like counting thing going on that could get  
39 kind of difficult.  
40  
41 Wray: I believe we have eight meetings during the year so that would and I'm terrible  
42 at math but something on the (inaudible) of six.  
43  
44 Pearson: I think it only becomes an issue, well to also clarify with allowing to assign a  
45 proxy that could be done as recently as an hour before the meeting and it's  
46 not, our practice has been that the member could designate anybody as a



1 proxy as long as they notify, make the notification and I think that's what timely  
2 is that.....  
3  
4 Wray: In BPAC history you are more conversant in that aspect of it than I am so I  
5 don't know what historical precedents more hold sway as far as that goes.  
6  
7 Pearson: I think before I was on the Committee, Mark had a practice of emailing me  
8 about three o'clock and saying can you make it and I did. The committee was  
9 fine with that so.....  
10  
11 Kryder: Could I make an alternate suggestion Mr. Chair. It still requires some  
12 accounting but perhaps if we said something like if they miss three  
13 consecutive meetings or something along those lines.  
14  
15 Wray: I do want to interject here Mr. Chair, as was mentioned before we are kind of  
16 trying to keep the language between three committees as parallel as possible.  
17 Inserting something like into the Policy Committee section is kind of difficult.  
18 Staff is reluctant about that one.  
19  
20 Herrera: Mr. Chair, Andrew if I remember at the Policy Committee meeting didn't they  
21 have discussion about excused absences because, for instance, Trustee  
22 Bernal is absent for a number of meetings but he had a really good reason.  
23  
24 Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, I don't remember the conversation that was at the  
25 Policy Committee. I remember discussing it, basically having the same  
26 discussion with TAC. I don't recall the nature of the conversation. I don't  
27 doubt that you are correct and that it was mentioned because it's a very  
28 obvious point to this is an example of that so.....  
29  
30 Pearson: Well the removal procedure sounds like that would have to happen at one of  
31 our regular meetings, is that correct.  
32  
33 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair, it's not something that can just be done, poof you're not on the  
34 Committee any longer.  
35  
36 Pearson: So that means it would have to be an action item that's on the agenda so we  
37 would have to probably specifically identify the member that is being removed  
38 as part of the agenda.  
39  
40 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.  
41  
42 Shearer: Mr. Chair, so if you are trying to keep it standard, if you look under the Policy  
43 Committee they have if you are absent more than 2 consecutive meetings then  
44 more or less they may be removed, make petition.  
45  
46 Wray: I was wrong, it is there.

1  
2 Shearer: That's their removal procedure.  
3  
4 Wray: I was not aware that that language was present. Well then we can make that if  
5 the Committee so desires we can put that language into the BPAC section.  
6  
7 Herrera: I think to keep it consistent we should and then also further down in the  
8 removal procedures it still takes a vote by the Committee to remove somebody  
9 so.....  
10  
11 Pearson: So it's still going to be an agenda item.  
12  
13 Herrera: Right, so I mean there is still I guess opportunity for that person to not be  
14 removed from the committee.  
15  
16 Kryder: At the risk of expressing lots of opinion, I like the removal procedure on three;  
17 maybe we should just adopt that.  
18  
19 Pearson: Which three are you talking about?  
20  
21 Kryder: Page 3.  
22  
23 Herrera: I agree and since the Policy Committee is really the Committee that is going to  
24 be making the decision on these bylaws, we just take theirs an example for  
25 everybody  
26  
27 Pearson: I think that is quite appropriate.  
28  
29 Wray: So move the language from the Policy Committee section and put in the BPAC  
30 section with obviously the appropriate adjustments of terms i.e. PC to BPAC,  
31 etc.  
32  
33 Pearson: Which then gives us consistency, has the TAC worked the phrase out?  
34  
35 Wray: They have looked at it in a discussion item only since they have more  
36 meetings we have a little more flexibility to be able to bring it. We would have  
37 liked to have brought just purely for discussion but again we are trying to move  
38 this along.  
39  
40 Pearson: So you will have the opportunity to suggest to them that they can also make  
41 that consistent.  
42  
43 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair.  
44

1 Pearson: Okay, any further discussion, so should we have a motion with suggestions as  
2 presented to staff, is that sufficient or should we numerate some of the  
3 changes?  
4

5 Wray: In my opinion a motion with changes suggested to staff would be more than  
6 adequate.  
7

8 Pearson: So I'll hear that motion.  
9

10 Kryder: I move that we adopt the removal procedure that is proposed for the Policy  
11 Committee on page 3 and apply that to the BPAC with the appropriate  
12 changes of committee names etc.  
13

14 Pearson: Well, I think what we need is an approval to recommend the bylaw changes to  
15 the Policy Committee with the suggestions that we've discussed at this  
16 meeting.  
17

18 Kryder: Ok, I can't repeat that but I do move that.  
19

20 Shearer: I'll second that.  
21

22 Pearson: Okay, we have motion to approve the bylaws with recommended changes that  
23 staff has well under control, all in favor, aye.  
24

25 All in favor, motion passes 7-0 (3 members absent, 2 vacant positions).  
26

## 27 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 28 **7.1 City of Las Cruces Bicycle Friendly Community Certification**

29 Andrew Wray gave a presentation.  
30

31 Pearson: Absolute drop dead date for the City to reapply is July 2015; I'm pretty sure  
32 because I contacted the League on this because I had that question.  
33

34 Wray: Oh, okay I guess we misunderstood, we thought that the application would lapse  
35 come January 1 of next year but we may have been mistaken on that.  
36

37 Pearson: That was my understanding. That's what I have in my head and I can go back  
38 and double check that email which might be a prudent thing to do since you  
39 came up with a different date but.....  
40

41 Wray: I have to say, Mr. Chair that was just a date I was told so I did not actually look  
42 that up myself. This is received information on my part.  
43  
44  
45

1 Pearson: Okay so I think we don't have to scramble quite as much but it's good that we  
2 start on this process. The City of Santa Fe in the last round which would have  
3 been the February application date and I think they announced, no it wasn't  
4 February, it was the dry application and I think they announced about November  
5 or so. The City of Santa Fe received silver certification so it would be interesting  
6 to find out why the City of Santa Fe qualified for silver and what the City of Las  
7 Cruces would need to do to also become silver because the City of  
8 Albuquerque's application will cycle through at some point and I would imagine  
9 that they would also to ascribe for silver and I don't think we want to be left  
10 behind. Andy Hume of course was point person on this last time and last time  
11 the City of Las Cruces identified becoming the Bicycle Friendly Community as  
12 one of their action items in their Strategic Plan and I think because that was  
13 identified in the SP is why that happened and that application was made and we  
14 were successful because it was more than just filling out the application which I  
15 don't if you've seen that application but it was several pages long, many pages  
16 long.  
17  
18 Wray: It is 99 questions.  
19  
20 Pearson: So it's more than one person just working on that application but also it's the  
21 efforts of not only the MPO but the City Transportation Department, Community  
22 Development, PIO, all these entities that support bicycling to make Las Cruces a  
23 bicycle friendly community so coordinating all that. Andy had put together a  
24 Bicycle Friendly Task Force and I don't know if you still have those contact  
25 names.  
26  
27 Wray: The Bicycle Friendly Communities Engineering Task Force still meets quarterly.  
28 That was the meeting that we held. We kind of rolled that into one. As far as  
29 some of the other staff members that were active in that, some of them have  
30 moved on or are not a part of City staff any longer. MPO staff is also, due to the  
31 conversation had earlier regarding the directive from FHWA is also trying to prod  
32 the City staff into taking more charge of the process because in the final analysis  
33 it is the City of Las Cruces not the Mesilla Valley MPO that is being designated  
34 as bicycle friendly, so we are trying to approach it from that aspect of still being  
35 involved but trying to make sure that the jurisdiction is acting on its own behalf.  
36  
37 Pearson: Okay, is there a direction coming down from the City Manager and City Council  
38 to support this?  
39  
40 Wray: Mr. Chair, not to my knowledge. I don't know what level of awareness they have  
41 that this is even an issue that is coming up.  
42  
43 Pearson: Does City staff want to talk to us?  
44  
45 Wray: City staff declined.  
46

1 Leisher: Well, if it was in the Strategic Plan is it still there or has that been revised?  
2

3 Wray: Mr. Chair, to my knowledge the stated desire is still there. It's a question of  
4 implementation at this point because to speak with a historical perspective MPO  
5 staff did quite a lot of the work for the certification the last time around and that's  
6 just not going to be possible this time.  
7

8 Pearson: So it must have been the 2010 Strategic Plan it was actually a bullet item that  
9 said become a Bicycle Friendly Community and then the 2012 Strategic Plan it  
10 fell down to something as do bicycle stuff.  
11

12 Wray: It's not as prominent as it was I think because the City of Las Cruces received  
13 that designation it was perceived as a check box.  
14

15 Pearson: Right and now it's still a process that needs to evolve and continue which is why  
16 it would be good to know if it could be elevated again the Strategic Plan and how  
17 the City can respond to that.  
18

19 Kryder: Mr. Chair, I would be interested in seeing the application form that was submitted  
20 for the bronze certification and also the as yet to be completed unfilled silver  
21 application, in other words, to get a sense of what the difference is and what else  
22 would have to be done.  
23

24 Pearson: I don't think that the forms themselves designate, I don't think you apply for silver  
25 or bronze or whatever. I think it's a matter of if you are a City of this size and you  
26 have this many facilities, this many roadways, some percentage that's says if  
27 you've got 10 percent of your roadways with bicycle lanes versus 25 percent of  
28 your roadways with bicycle lanes might distinguish between bronze. Actually  
29 there is (interrupted).  
30

31 Kryder: But is there a laid out, a specified criteria like you're talking about percentages or  
32 something.  
33

34 Pearson: Well, the League does this but I have seen an info-graphic from the League that  
35 gives this kind of information. That's actually where this number in the previous  
36 discussion of 77,000 population for bronze level designation they say 77,000,  
37 well if you wanted to be a silver then it would be some other number, might be  
38 125,000 or you know I don't know what the numbers are without that info-graphic  
39 but that's kind of the guidelines so those kind of guidelines are available from the  
40 League and if a specific questions, they changed their website so I don't know if  
41 you can get the questions without actually signing up to answer them.  
42

43 Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Kryder, I can send around the previous and the current  
44 applications. We have both of them so I can send them around to all the  
45 Committee members for your review.  
46

1 Kryder: Although I think Mr. Chair has pointed out that maybe I was asking the wrong  
2 question. What I'm really interested in is what are the criteria?  
3

4 Pearson: Well I will find that info-graphic and send that to Andrew so he can send that  
5 around too because that's on the League website and it's reasonably informative  
6 because it covers there are like five E's of consideration, engineering  
7 enforcement, evaluation, and two others that I can't of and so they have some,  
8 yeah education, I should have known that one.  
9

10 Wray: Was enforcement mentioned?  
11

12 Pearson: Yeah.  
13

14 (someone): Encouragement.  
15

16 Wray: There we go.  
17

18 Pearson: But there is some criteria for each of those areas that gives some guidelines so I  
19 think with those two things that would give a good guidance. On the Bicycle  
20 Friendly Task Force it was more than just City staff that did reach out to  
21 community members. I know I was part of that and some other bicycle  
22 community members were. At what point would you expect that that kind of  
23 effort might be made again to reach out to.....?  
24

25 Wray: We're doing it right now; this is our first step of that since there are citizen  
26 representatives on this Committee. This is our first step of outreach to the public  
27 so spread the word.  
28

29 Pearson: So any other comments, so is this a continuing discussion item that we might  
30 hear something from future meetings or how will this progress.  
31

32 Wray: I believe the intention was to have this continuing discussion item until the item is  
33 resolved.  
34

35 Leisher: Would coordination of this effort be something the bike ped position we were  
36 discussing earlier, would it be appropriate for someone in that position?  
37

38 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Leisher, yes exactly. Nail hit on head.  
39

40 Leisher: Okay, I think we know what we have to do.  
41

42 Pearson: So any other discussion then, any other comments, so I think we've got a good  
43 starting point and we'll send out those materials and continue from there and  
44 probably have this as a discussion item again in March.  
45  
46

1 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

2  
3 **8.1 Local Projects update – No updates**

4  
5 Leisher: Oh, I actually did have one thing come up. I've been getting regular pings about  
6 this from a friend of mine about possible speed reduction measures on  
7 Melendres between and I know this comes up; it's been coming up over the  
8 years, between Lohman and Main. That section of road that goes by Elephant  
9 Butte Irrigation District Office.

10  
11 Kryder: Needs to be slowed down or what?

12  
13 Leisher: Yeah, people drive 40-45 mph through there. I believe its 25 mph zone and he's  
14 been bugging me about bringing this up.

15  
16 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Leisher, I don't know anything about that but I can certainly get in  
17 touch with people who do and I can get a response to you.

18  
19 Pearson: Yeah, I think I commented there is the piece from, it's Amador at that point,  
20 Amador to Picacho, no not even that far, Amador to Las Cruces Avenue was  
21 reconstructed at some point and they added parking and also the concrete bulb  
22 extensions at the intersection and my comment there is that those are hazardous  
23 to bicycles and were a bad idea. I think it would be much better, it's actually a  
24 good facility, I'm quite sure it's on our bicycle facilities plan just putting in bike  
25 lanes, full on bike lanes there maybe parking and bike lanes or something would  
26 be a better idea than anything else. It would be something certainly investigated.

27  
28 Wray: Thank you, Mr. Chair; I was not employed by the MPO at the time when that was  
29 done so I have no knowledge of the thinking that went on at that time.

30  
31 Pearson: I think that was the City staff position on that piece of (inaudible).

32  
33 Leisher: That was before Morrow was there wasn't it? (someone coughed covering up  
34 words) was it after Morrow was put in right there off of.....

35  
36 Pearson: About that time because what's on the other side of the street.

37  
38 Leisher: Oh you are talking about the north side, oh okay.

39  
40 Pearson: The north side is the where the concrete extensions are put in and that promotes  
41 erratic driving for cyclists because they have to come out to go around and then  
42 some will tend to go back in to the where the parking is because there is; parking  
43 is there only when the church is in session.

44  
45 Leisher: I had to swing by to avoid a cyclist just a few days ago right there on that stretch.

46

1 Wray: I will get some information on that topic.  
2  
3 Pearson: Any other local updates?  
4  
5 Kryder: Mr. Chair, at one point I had brought some concerns with the section of Stern  
6 Drive going south from Boutz to Yale and I think we finally figured out that that  
7 might be DOT there, I'm not sure. Are there any plans to stripe it, put lights on it,  
8 reflectors, anything that would make it less hazardous at night?  
9  
10 Herrera: At this time, no, there aren't any. I can certainly bring that up with District 1 and  
11 see if there is something that we can. We can at least go out and look at it and  
12 see.  
13  
14 Pearson: Because I did hear the City Traffic Engineer told me of it at a meeting and you  
15 can see the evidence there. They are putting in a four way stop. They are  
16 putting in a new road from there is some new building in the RV park area. I  
17 guess that's Stern, no it might be something else, might not even be Stern at that  
18 point because it's a street that comes off of Avenida de Mesilla and then right  
19 now it kind of dead ends kind of halfway through and they are going to extend  
20 that all the way to Boutz and do a four way stop and it's not a good 90%  
21 intersection there either. I think Stern would be, I mean it's not a good  
22 intersection so they are going to have engineering difficulties there anyway.  
23  
24 Herrera: Well I'll definitely get with District staff tomorrow and see if we can go out and  
25 look at Boutz, well at Stern between the two areas that you talked about but then  
26 also what you are talking about Mr. Chair.  
27  
28 Pearson: Yeah because if they are putting that four way stop in there and that's NMDOT,  
29 NMDOT certainly has to be involved in that intersection.  
30  
31 Herrera: Yeah, I'm sure that somebody has information on that, I just don't have it right  
32 now so I'll look into it.  
33  
34 Kryder: Thank you.  
35  
36 Pearson: Because Boutz was recently reconditioned or resurfaced or micro-surfaced or  
37 whatever, made nice, fresh and new so now of course they are going to mess it  
38 up but new construction.  
39  
40 Shrearer: Local projects – NMSU – the hardcore Bike Friendly University Task Force  
41 continues to meet on a monthly or bi-monthly basis, so I just mention that. We're  
42 working with sustainability looking for some sort of bicycle rental program. That  
43 has been brought up a number of times so hopefully we'll work towards getting  
44 something in there, an RFP and so on. As far as just general upgrades, we've  
45 got in work orders for improvements to finish up some bike lanes on Arrowhead  
46 and designate several roads on there with sharrows on the road and some more



1 signage on Espina. It was just on hold for a while and some of the laser speed  
2 signs we put up, we've got two general laser speed signs but most of the inner  
3 campus is designated 25 mph so the laser speed signs have been very useful in  
4 reminding people it's 25 not 35 when they come onto campus especially from  
5 Union on Stewart. I think we're going to install a third one we just have to decide  
6 where is the most important location to put those and sort of separate out the  
7 general master plan so it includes a bicycle master plan for the campus.  
8

9 Leisher: I have a question related to this, I almost forgot. Once infrastructure is further  
10 along are you guys planning on educational outreach on campus?  
11

12 Shrearer: We have, we've joined and actually worked so there has been a bicycle 123  
13 regular class through the fall and then there should be at least one monthly at  
14 Peace Lutheran Church and then we've had, we just haven't been able to get the  
15 interest in the regular lab preliminary class. We put it on the calendar and  
16 brought it up a couple of times, had the instructors ready and the facility ready  
17 but we just haven't been able to get people to sign up.  
18

19 Leisher: It's going to take someone standing on corners with pieces of paper.  
20

21 Pearson: So what is the laser sign, I haven't seen, is that like a radar detector sign where it  
22 shows speed.  
23

24 Shrearer: Yeah basically coming from Stewart from Union moves towards the mall down to  
25 that intersection and as you turn on it picks up the vehicle and shows your speed  
26 and if it's over 27 I think, it starts to flash and so people do pay attention to it and  
27 the other one is on the other end of Stewart.  
28

29 **8.2 NMDOT Projects update**

30  
31 Jolene Herrera gave updates on:  
32 • US 70 from NASA Road to Aguirre Springs  
33 • North Main project  
34

35 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

36  
37 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

38  
39 Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.  
40

41 Leslie Kryder motioned to adjourn.  
42 David Shrearer seconds the motion.  
43 All in favor.  
44

45 \_\_\_\_\_  
46 Chair