1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

George Pearson asked for a motion to approve the agenda. David Shearer motioned to approve the agenda. Mark Leisher seconds the motion. All in favor.

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

George Pearson opened the floor for nominations. Leslie Kryder nominated George Pearson to continue as Chair. Mark Leisher seconds the nomination. Andrew Wray closed the floor for nominations and asked if the Committee was in favor of Mr. Pearson’s nomination to signify by saying aye.
All were in favor.

George Pearson asked for a nomination for Vice Chair.
Leslie Kryder nominated herself to serve as Vice Chair.
Jolene Herrera seconds the nomination.
All in favor.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 October 15, 2013

David Shearer motioned to accept the minutes for October 15, 2013.
Mark Leisher seconds the motion.
All in favor.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Recommendation to Policy Committee of Pike/Ped Contact Resolution

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

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore, let it be resolved that, the MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Policy Committee recommends that each member entity (CITY OF LAS
CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, and TOWN OF MESILLA) designate a staff member to be the bicycle/pedestrian contact.

Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation and asked for a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Pearson: We had a pretty good discussion of this in our meeting last July and everyone was pretty much in agreement that this was a good idea. As stated in the Resolution we are past 100,000 in population in the City of Las Cruces and the League of American Bicyclists recommends a designated staff person for each 77,000 population in the City so this is kind of a way to get the entities to designate somebody so that there is a single contact point for bike/ped issues rather than if somebody has a question it’s well where do you go, well go see him, go see whoever and I think that’s kind of how this came about, any further discussion.

Unknown: Say again, when was this discussed?

Pearson: In July.

Shearer: July, okay, (inaudible) that it was in the October minutes, I just wanted to check, thank you.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify a couple of things. So we’re recommending this to the Policy Committee for them to take to each of their boards, is that what we’re doing? So the City will take it to City Council to designate somebody, the County will take it to the Board of Commissioners......

Pearson: What I would expect to happen is that once we pass this then staff will bring this Resolution to the Policy Committee as an action item for their decision whether to approve it or not and if they decide to approve it then it’s up to the members of the Policy Committee to bring this to their governing councils, is that correct.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair that would be correct.

Herrera: Thanks Mr. Chair and I also just had one other comment that I want to make clear to this Committee and then I’ll bring it up again at the Policy Committee, since this person will be acting on behalf of the City or the County or the Town I don’t think it’s appropriate to have MPO staff doing that function simply because it’s not how that grant is administered, so to have Andrew or any of the other MPO staff acting in this capacity as part of the MPO wouldn’t be appropriate.

Pearson: Right, I agree with that. I think that’s part of the reasoning for bringing this forward because in the past, particularly to the City it’s pushed off some of
things onto the MPO staff and Andrew you can correct me but I believe FHWA had an audit or close to an audit, I don't know if it rose to a level of a finding but it was a comment at least that the MPO was spending too much time on City specific items.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, yes that’s correct. I can’t remember whether it was a finding or a comment myself at the moment but it was definitely something that was impressed upon us that it was a practice that needed to be stopped so we are trying to comply with that directive.

Pearson: Any other comments on this?

Shearer: Can I ask again what the duties would be of this person.

Pearson: I think it would be up to the City or to the governing entity but as a contact point typically it would be a place where a citizen had some kind of, you know they wanted to find out more about bicycle lanes, if they wanted to find out road condition reports or anything, sidewalk conditions or whatever, it would be a single contact point and if it also presumed it would be a job title or part of their job description so that that person would then be the first contact point for the public and also presumably for the staff members of that entity.

Shearer: So PIO bicycle policy or what or just general information on bicycle use and facilities that are available in this MPO area?

Pearson: I think all the issues that have come up, typically, at some point I've kind of envisioned when the Safe Routes to School funding position was a possibility it was discussed that that might be a half time position and the other half might be a bike/ped coordinator position at the City level and it was discussed that that might land in the Community Development Department. Community Development planning issues and they are well versed with contact with the public so I think that is kind of the level where.....

Shearer: If its duty being assigned to somebody employed is it requesting that they be given a (inaudible) aid under...........

Pearson: Well, it would be staff, yes. However the entity pays for their staff yes.

Shearer: And the previous concern was that the MPO staff was spending too much time on this.

Pearson: Yes.

Shearer: So it would have to be non-MPO staff.
Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Shearer, yes because we are federally funded. We are not just local.

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

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

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

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

Wray: Okay and staff member of City or County, leave that up to the Policy Committee.

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

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

Shearer: No, you are suggesting only that the three members, is that........

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

Shearer: Okay, thank you.

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

Shearer: Are there any stipulations that it must be staff member or it must be a paid employee?
Someone spoke but not into the microphone.

Shearer: Okay, thank you.

Pearson: Yeah the Resolution designates a staff member and I think that is who we expect to do our work is staff because just going back to previous like last year's bike (inaudible) activities there was a fairly decent volunteer effort but the volunteer effort didn’t get very far with certain things that require cooperation from the City so this would give that volunteer effort a contact point with the City and then we could get the answer yes or no rather than oh that sounds like a good idea and that’s where it ends.

Shearer: Thank you.

Pearson: And I don’t think this would diminish at all what the MPO staff currently does in these areas.

Wray: No, we would still focus on these issues from a regional perspective that MPO staff just cannot be engaged in activities on behalf of one specific jurisdiction.

Pearson: Any other discussion on this? Oh and your other comment, in the July discussion we don’t have a City staff representative here today but during July Jerry Cordova was the City representative and enthusiastic about the idea of having this kind of a person designated. No further discussion so we need a motion and a second still I think.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Shearer: I move to approve the motion in a proposal.

Leisher: I second that motion.

Pearson: Hearing a motion and a second for Item 6.1, all in favor state aye.

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

6.2 Recommendation of Approval of Update to MPO Bylaws

The new Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) which took effect July 1, 2013 necessitates revisions to the MPO bylaws.

Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.

Kryder: Mr. Chair, I just was curious since I’m actually reading this for the first time. We have 11 members on our Committee and I note that there are seven of us
here and there seem to be people that I have seen before but I’m wondering are there folks that are regularly not in attendance?

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

Wray: Mr. Chair, Scott Farnham is here.

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

Committee members introduced themselves.

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

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

Pearson: And the other position is vacant.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.

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

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

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

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

Pearson: That sounds fine to me. I think that is staff’s area to fine tune that but I think written including email or written so that it is, strictly speaking if you read that
somebody would have to write a letter and deliver it somehow but I think email is accepted these days.

Wray: That is correct so we can consider that amendment made.

Pearson: And then it’s just a matter, there is no need to vary the wording on the three committees.

Wray: No, I wouldn’t think so.

Pearson: That’s all I have, any other comments on this?

Herrera: Mr. Chair, just one more thing. On the removal procedure, so attendance is required at all committee meetings, if a committee member fails to attend 75% of the regularly scheduled meetings, that whole part, I wonder if we should put something in there about if they haven’t notified MPO staff kind of like a no show thing so if they have an excused absence for some reason then…

Pearson: Carlos is the, that’s the other one that we missed, the pedestrian representative and he sent an email today that he is sick, so I suppose we can consider that an excused absence so maybe verbiage about unexcused absences rather than I don’t know.

Herrera: That might not be appropriate. It’s just something that I wanted to bring up for discussion.

Wray: Well, it might be appropriate but I’m not very good at coming up with legalese sounding language on the fly.

Herrera: Me neither.

Kryder: It seems to me that if a, per another section in here, each of the entities or governmental agencies have designated an alternate then there really should be no reason why one or the other would not be in attendance; however, for community members of the committee who do not have alternates designated then that’s a different sort of a situation. The other question I have though, 75% it’s a nice number but I have no idea how many meetings we actually have in a year so there is a whole like counting thing going on that could get kind of difficult.

Wray: I believe we have eight meetings during the year so that would and I’m terrible at math but something on the (inaudible) of six.

Pearson: I think it only becomes an issue, well to also clarify with allowing to assign a proxy that could be done as recently as an hour before the meeting and it’s not, our practice has been that the member could designate anybody as a
proxy as long as they notify, make the notification and I think that’s what timely
is that……..

Wray: In BPAC history you are more conversant in that aspect of it than I am so I
don’t know what historical precedents more hold sway as far as that goes.

Pearson: I think before I was on the Committee, Mark had a practice of emailing me
about three o’clock and saying can you make it and I did. The committee was
fine with that so…………..

Kryder: Could I make an alternate suggestion Mr. Chair. It still requires some
accounting but perhaps if we said something like if they miss three
consecutive meetings or something along those lines.

Wray: I do want to interject here Mr. Chair, as was mentioned before we are kind of
trying to keep the language between three committees as parallel as possible.
Inserting something like into the Policy Committee section is kind of difficult.
Staff is reluctant about that one.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, Andrew if I remember at the Policy Committee meeting didn’t they
have discussion about excused absences because, for instance, Trustee
Bernal is absent for a number of meetings but he had a really good reason.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, I don’t remember the conversation that was at the
Policy Committee. I remember discussing it, basically having the same
discussion with TAC. I don’t recall the nature of the conversation. I don’t
doubt that you are correct and that it was mentioned because it’s a very
obvious point to this is an example of that so………

Pearson: Well the removal procedure sounds like that would have to happen at one of
our regular meetings, is that correct.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair, it’s not something that can just be done, poof you’re not on the
Committee any longer.

Pearson: So that means it would have to be an action item that’s on the agenda so we
would have to probably specifically identify the member that is being removed
as part of the agenda.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Shearer: Mr. Chair, so if you are trying to keep it standard, if you look under the Policy
Committee they have if you are absent more than 2 consecutive meetings then
more or less they may be removed, make petition.

Wray: I was wrong, it is there.
Shearer: That’s their removal procedure.

Wray: I was not aware that that language was present. Well then we can make that if the Committee so desires we can put that language into the BPAC section.

Herrera: I think to keep it consistent we should and then also further down in the removal procedures it still takes a vote by the Committee to remove somebody so…..

Pearson: So it’s still going to be an agenda item.

Herrera: Right, so I mean there is still I guess opportunity for that person to not be removed from the committee.

Kryder: At the risk of expressing lots of opinion, I like the removal procedure on three; maybe we should just adopt that.

Pearson: Which three are you talking about?

Kryder: Page 3.

Herrera: I agree and since the Policy Committee is really the Committee that is going to be making the decision on these bylaws, we just take theirs an example for everybody.

Pearson: I think that is quite appropriate.

Wray: So move the language from the Policy Committee section and put in the BPAC section with obviously the appropriate adjustments of terms i.e. PC to BPAC, etc.

Pearson: Which then gives us consistency, has the TAC worked the phrase out?

Wray: They have looked at it in a discussion item only since they have more meetings we have a little more flexibility to be able to bring it. We would have liked to have brought just purely for discussion but again we are trying to move this along.

Pearson: So you will have the opportunity to suggest to them that they can also make that consistent.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair.
Pearson: Okay, any further discussion, so should we have a motion with suggestions as presented to staff, is that sufficient or should we numerate some of the changes?

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

Pearson: So I’ll hear that motion.

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

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

Kryder: Ok, I can’t repeat that but I do move that.

Shearer: I’ll second that.

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

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

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 City of Las Cruces Bicycle Friendly Community Certification

Andrew Wray gave a presentation.

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

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

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

Wray: I have to say, Mr. Chair that was just a date I was told so I did not actually look that up myself. This is received information on my part.
Pearson: Okay so I think we don’t have to scramble quite as much but it’s good that we start on this process. The City of Santa Fe in the last round which would have been the February application date and I think they announced, no it wasn’t February, it was the dry application and I think they announced about November or so. The City of Santa Fe received silver certification so it would be interesting to find out why the City of Santa Fe qualified for silver and what the City of Las Cruces would need to do to also become silver because the City of Albuquerque’s application will cycle through at some point and I would imagine that they would also ascribe for silver and I don’t think we want to be left behind. Andy Hume of course was point person on this last time and last time the City of Las Cruces identified becoming the Bicycle Friendly Community as one of their action items in their Strategic Plan and I think because that was identified in the SP is why that happened and that application was made and we were successful because it was more than just filling out the application which I don’t if you’ve seen that application but it was several pages long, many pages long.

Wray: It is 99 questions.

Pearson: So it’s more than one person just working on that application but also it’s the efforts of not only the MPO but the City Transportation Department, Community Development, PIO, all these entities that support bicycling to make Las Cruces a bicycle friendly community so coordinating all that. Andy had put together a Bicycle Friendly Task Force and I don’t know if you still have those contact names.

Wray: The Bicycle Friendly Communities Engineering Task Force still meets quarterly. That was the meeting that we held. We kind of rolled that into one. As far as some of the other staff members that were active in that, some of them have moved on or are not a part of City staff any longer. MPO staff is also, due to the conversation had earlier regarding the directive from FHWA is also trying to prod the City staff into taking more charge of the process because in the final analysis it is the City of Las Cruces not the Mesilla Valley MPO that is being designated as bicycle friendly, so we are trying to approach it from that aspect of still being involved but trying to make sure that the jurisdiction is acting on its own behalf.

Pearson: Okay, is there a direction coming down from the City Manager and City Council to support this?

Wray: Mr. Chair, not to my knowledge. I don’t know what level of awareness they have that this is even an issue that is coming up.

Pearson: Does City staff want to talk to us?

Wray: City staff declined.
Leisher: Well, if it was in the Strategic Plan is it still there or has that been revised?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Kryder, I can send around the previous and the current applications. We have both of them so I can send them around to all the Committee members for your review.
Kryder: Although I think Mr. Chair has pointed out that maybe I was asking the wrong question. What I’m really interested in is what are the criteria?

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

Wray: Was enforcement mentioned?

Pearson: Yeah.

(someone): Encouragement.

Wray: There we go.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pearson: So any other discussion then, any other comments, so I think we’ve got a good starting point and we’ll send out those materials and continue from there and probably have this as a discussion item again in March.
8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

8.1 Local Projects update – No updates

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

Kryder: Needs to be slowed down or what?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pearson: About that time because what’s on the other side of the street.

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

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

Leisher: I had to swing by to avoid a cyclist just a few days ago right there on that stretch.
Wray: I will get some information on that topic.

Pearson: Any other local updates?

Kryder: Mr. Chair, at one point I had brought some concerns with the section of Stern Drive going south from Boutz to Yale and I think we finally figured out that that might be DOT there, I’m not sure. Are there any plans to stripe it, put lights on it, reflectors, anything that would make it less hazardous at night?

Herrera: At this time, no, there aren’t any. I can certainly bring that up with District 1 and see if there is something that we can. We can at least go out and look at it and see.

Pearson: Because I did hear the City Traffic Engineer told me of it at a meeting and you can see the evidence there. They are putting in a four way stop. They are putting in a new road from there is some new building in the RV park area. I guess that’s Stern, no it might be something else, might not even be Stern at that point because it’s a street that comes off of Avenida de Mesilla and then right now it kind of dead ends kind of halfway through and they are going to extend that all the way to Boutz and do a four way stop and it’s not a good 90% intersection there either. I think Stern would be, I mean it’s not a good intersection so they are going to have engineering difficulties there anyway.

Herrera: Well I’ll definitely get with District staff tomorrow and see if we can go out and look at Boutz, well at Stern between the two areas that you talked about but then also what you are talking about Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yeah because if they are putting that four way stop in there and that’s NMDOT, NMDOT certainly has to be involved in that intersection.

Herrera: Yeah, I’m sure that somebody has information on that, I just don’t have it right now so I’ll look into it.

Kryder: Thank you.

Pearson: Because Boutz was recently reconditioned or resurfaced or micro-surfaced or whatever, made nice, fresh and new so now of course they are going to mess it up but new construction.

Shreer: Local projects – NMSU – the hardcore Bike Friendly University Task Force continues to meet on a monthly or bi-monthly basis, so I just mention that. We’re working with sustainability looking for some sort of bicycle rental program. That has been brought up a number of times so hopefully we’ll work towards getting something in there, an RFP and so on. As far as just general upgrades, we’ve got in work orders for improvements to finish up some bike lanes on Arrowhead and designate several roads on there with sharrows on the road and some more
signage on Espina. It was just on hold for a while and some of the laser speed signs we put up, we’ve got two general laser speed signs but most of the inner campus is designated 25 mph so the laser speed signs have been very useful in reminding people it’s 25 not 35 when they come onto campus especially from Union on Stewart. I think we’re going to install a third one we just have to decide where is the most important location to put those and sort of separate out the general master plan so it includes a bicycle master plan for the campus.

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

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

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

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

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

8.2 NMDOT Projects update

Jolene Herrera gave updates on:
- US 70 from NASA Road to Aguirre Springs
- North Main project

9. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

10. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Leslie Kryder motioned to adjourn.
David Shrearer seconds the motion.
All in favor.

_______________________________
Chair