



# MINUTES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

---

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garcia at 5:31 pm.

## 2. ROLL CALL

### Members Present:

Councilor Michael Garcia (left at 5:56 pm)  
Member Yvette Serrano (arrived at 5:38 pm)  
Member Khal Spencer (presided the meeting at 5:56 pm)  
Member Sky Tallman  
Member Judith Gabriele  
Member Yolanda Eisenstein  
Member Bruce Finger  
Member Rob Morlino

### Members Excused:

### Others Attending:

Romella Glorioso-Moss, Staff Liaison

## 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**MOTION:** Councilor Garcia moved, seconded by Member Eisenstein, to approve the Agenda as amended.



# MINUTES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

**VOTE:** The motion was on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Councilor Garcia, Member Spencer, Member Tallman, Member Gabriele, Member Eisenstein, Member Finger, Member Morlino

**Against:** None

**Abstain:** None

Chair Garcia moved to amend the Agenda by moving up Agenda Item #11 after Agenda Item #4 Approval of the Minutes.

## 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 11, 2021

**MOTION:** Member Spencer moved, seconded by Member Gabriele, to approve the as presented.

**VOTE:** The motion was on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Councilor Garcia, Member Spencer, Member Tallman, Member Gabriele, Member Eisenstein, Member Finger, Member Morlino

**Against:** None

**Abstain:** None

## 5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC



# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

Tim Rogers, Trails Program Manager, Santa Fe Conservation Trust

I'd like to add my comments on the Sandoval-Montezuma Intersection Project because I was not able to say my comments at the March meeting since I am not a BPAC Member.

I want to say that southbound Sandoval should have a bike lane (per Bike Master Plan, not to mention complete streets) that should not be precluded by a bump-out. Everyone is seeing this at 90% for the first time and we are not even getting a reply.

I also want to re-state that traffic calming by the city in the form of bump-outs and median islands with no consideration of needs/opportunities for bike lanes has cost Santa Fe dearly on several very important bikeways in the last five years - Alta Vista, Hospital Dr., W Alameda. "Bump-outs" work great where there is parking. For example Montezuma Ave. at Sandoval is OK to bump-out because there is parking on all legs, that is the space being "bumped-out" and the reason why bicyclists can get through by taking the travel lane.

On Alta Vista e. of St. Francis Dr. (a/k/a "Bike Route 66") and Hospital Dr. (one of Santa Fe's original 1993 "Bike Routes") the bump-outs could have been restricted to one side of the road, and bike lanes added on each side. Instead significant parking was added to south side of Alta Vista, and on Hospital Dr., the entire southbound side of the road is "bumped out" to effectively provide space for two legal parking spaces and a bus stop. The City once said bike lanes could be put in even after this work but I find it far more likely that we will suddenly find an expansion of parking (and with no more justification for it than at Alta Vista St.).

Median islands on W Alameda for River Trail crossings could have been designed to allow space for an eastbound (uphill) bike lane, which was already called for in the Bike Master Plan of 2012. In none of these cases, nor for new Rail Trail Crossing of Alta Vista St., was existence, need, or even previous planning for bike lanes considered by the City. (Thankfully the Rail Trail Crossing problem was amended through a change order and we now have bike lanes on that stretch of Alta Vista St.).

Southbound bike lane on Sandoval is not only desirable and feasible in the spirit of Complete Streets, but it's listed in the Bike Master Plan and would directly complement/reinforce bike wayfinding to Railyard about to be implemented (esp given problems with Guadalupe St.). It should not only be accommodated by this



# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

project at Montezuma and Sandoval but it should be integrated into it.

If we are to call ourselves multi-modal, we need to get away from these monolithic "traffic calming" projects that have minimal planning and minimal review before city commits itself to whatever their contractors have drawn up. I completely understand that the bump-outs reduce pedestrian crossing distance as well as traffic speed but they should not come at the expense of bike lanes - which ALSO narrow the roadway to reduce speeds and pedestrian exposure.

## **6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER AGENCIES**

- a. Multi-modal Transition Study Updates, Amy Bell, Project Consultant
- b. Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization, Erick Aune, AICP, SFMPO Officer
- c. Santa Fe Conservation Trust, Tim Rogers, Trails Program Manager

## **7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTIONS**

- a. 90% Design Plan Review of Camino Entrada Roundabout Project (Romella Glorioso-Moss, Staff Liaison; Thaddeus Yazzie, PE, Souder, Miller and Associates; and Sky Tallman, BPAC Planning and Funding Subcommittee Chair)

Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. This project is at 90% design and is fully funded by the City so it won't be reviewed by NMDOT. This project is mainly a roundabout project that will be constructed at the intersection of Camino Entrada E-W and Camino Entrada N-S to safely accommodate the increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic associated with the new Southside Transit Center that will be built on Camino Entrada. ADA compliant sidewalks, including improvements to lighting and storm drainage are included in the project. The cost estimate for construction is \$1.6M. City Staff which is the Roadway & Trails Staff, River and Watershed Staff, Traffic Operations,



# MINUTES

SFMPO and Parks reviewed the plan last Monday. The SFMPO and Traffic Operations Manager have suggested a number of changes that are all bicycle and pedestrian focused. There were six changes on the plan that I'll ask the Consultant Mr. Thaddeus Yazzie to describe to the Committee. And I would like to express my appreciation to this Consultant – Souder, Miller and Associates because this is the very first time that I was involved in 90% design plan review that the consultant accommodated all the changes Staff recommended. Thank you.

Mr. Thaddeus Yazzie: Good evening everyone. This is Thaddeus Yazzie from Souder, Miller and Assocs. Romella provided BPAC background summary of Camino Entrada Intersection Improvement Project. In addition to the Roundabout the project also includes intersection improvements to Cerrillos Rd/Wagon Rd/ Camino Entrada and ADA ramps/pedestrian ramps and as Romella mentioned the City reviewed the plan last Monday. And to summarize the major comments:

- From SFMPO – widen the sidewalk from 6' to 10' on Camino Entrada E-W from Southside Transit Center E to the Camino Entrada/Cerrillos Rd intersection and across to the E side of the intersection of Camino Entrada.
- Insulation and upgrade of traffic detection signal system to accommodate bicycles and scooters going E-W on Camino Entrada to Wagon Rd and from Wagon Rd to Camino Entrada. We had full discussion on this with our Traffic Engineer, Romella and Traffic Operations Manager.

Staff Liaison: And another major addition is the addition of a Bike Box on Cerrillos and Camino Entrada Intersection.

Mr. Yazzie: Yes, the addition of a Bike Box on Camino Entrada E bound at the Cerrillos Rd intersection. We are currently reviewing the NACTO Guidelines to verify we are able to implement that.

Member Tallman: I'm glad to hear that. Thank you Thaddeus. That was a nice presentation. One of the things we are going to say was to widen the sidewalk at least on the N side and make it multi-use path. So I'm glad that it has been already taken care of.



City of Santa Fe

## MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

One other thing that is common on roundabouts and you can see this at Community College on Richards Ave. before bicyclists get to the roundabout they can choose either to enter the lane of traffic going around or they can have a little ramp to jump up on the sidewalk and I think that will be a welcome addition here since the curve radius is so wide especially coming off of Cerrillos. The cars can really speed up there. I think if a bicyclist is less comfortable they might want to use the multi-use path there so I will suggest to add slip ramps from the road on to the multi-use path.

The Bike Box that you are going to add at Cerrillos, is that connected to any bicycling markings on the pavement leading up to the Bike Box? Cause that's sort of a wide road from what I could gather from the drawing. It was not very clear.

Mr. Yazzie: There is a sharrow on the E of Camino Entrada going to Cerrillos Rd. intersection. There is also sharrow on Wagon Rd. So we implemented sharrow on both E & W bound on the E lane of Camino Entrada roundabout.

Member Tallman: Okay. It's not on the roundabout itself but there's a bicycle lane on Cerrillos Rd. going past Camino Entrada/Wagon Rd. and it's not all clear to me how bicyclists are supposed to continue straight down Cerrillos because there is not any sort of marking to get to the other side of the T-bone there or where the bicycles are supposed to go there. And as you know cars



# MINUTES

are going by you at 35 MPH. So, I'm not really sure if merging is what is expected or it's just kind of left out to the user try not to die. But you know I think some markings or maybe even tightening the curve radii on Wagon and Cerrillos so the cars really have to come to almost stop to turn could make it a much safer intersection.

Also, where the project meets at Cerrillos the median comes up to the cross walk and I think it would be a great safety feature to add a median island on the other side on the inside portion of the cross walk so it will be a protected pedestrian island there.

Mr. Yazzie: For what reason?

Member Tallman: The cross walk parallel to Cerrillos on Camino Entrada between the two turning islands. Does it make sense? So the median comes right up to the cross walk and the median had another piece to the opposite side of the cross walk so the cross walk will be contained by the median rather than inside the median.

Mr. Yazzie: On Camino Entrada?

Member Tallman: On Camino Entrada at Cerrillos.

Mr. Yazzie: We'll take a look at that and verify with the N bound and W bound turns to ensure that there are no conflicts.

Member Tallman: The same thing on the E bound lane there. The turning radii is super wide even though there are sharrows to get to that turn box. Cars would be turning right on Cerrillos would be going fast because they can. So if that turning radius could be tightened so the cars could go a little bit slower when they approach Cerrillos, I think that would be a great safety improvement as well.

Last comment, sidewalk N side of Camino Entrada appears at the end of the 2nd driveway W of the roundabout.

Mr. Yazzie: That's the end of our project – at the W leg.



# MINUTES

Member Tallman: Project does not go beyond that? So I guess the City needs to figure out what to do with the sidewalk because it drops the people off in the middle of nowhere.

Mr. Yazzie: We are building a ramp for that for the western most driveway on the N part of W leg there. We're building the ramps for future connection and there will be ADA accessible ramp. The sidewalk will provide access to the Habitat for Humanity and existing building on the NW quadrant of Camino Entrada intersection.

Member Tallman: One last thing on Camino Entrada South. The first driveway that comes off offers a real obtuse angle so cars that come thru the roundabout and not slowing down and comes thru into that driveway and make pedestrian crossing distance significantly longer just having that angled entrance and so I think it would be pedestrian safety added to having that closer to a right angle entrance into that first driveway.

Mr. Yazzie: On the Southern leg?

Member Tallman: S leg on the W side.

Mr. Yazzie: First driveway just to the roundabout?

Member Tallman: Maybe it's not how it's impacted but maybe how it is drawn. It's drawn like a very wide angle.

Mr. Yazzie: Yeah, essentially we have Southside Transit Center design show there but essentially there is a parking lot. They have to come out at S side and they will be going slower speed as they exit the roundabouts and essentially have to make almost a U turn. We verified this with turning movements of the passenger vehicle and the radii we're able to come up to accommodate that short turn there into the parking lot.

Member Tallman: It creates a precarious situation for pedestrians. Anyway those are our comments.



# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

---

Mr. Yazzie: Okay. We'll take a look at that and then we'll discuss these with Romella and see what can be implemented into the project as we move forward. Thank you.

Member Tallman: Thank you very much.

Vice Chair Spencer: I have a quick question for someone on the project. You mentioned that there will be a bicycle and scooter detectors. Are those optical or magnetic or what are they sensitive to? What is the sensitivity and would they respond to say aluminum or carbon road bicycles?

Mr. Yazzie: I believe the camera detectors on traffic signals ... from there the CoSF traffic operations will address the detection zones for scooters and bicyclists where they normally sit as they normally wait for the light to turn from red to green.

Vice Chair Spencer: Thank you.

Member Morlino: Are you aware of any existing examples where in the City at the moment those detectors are used at intersections?

Mr. Yazzie: I'm not too sure. I believe they are used at signals right now but which intersections ...I don't know which ones.

Member Morlino: Yeah, I'm not aware of any intersections at Santa Fe that can detect bicycles.

- b. 90% Design Plan Review of Agua Fria-Cottonwood Intersection Improvements Project (Romella Glorioso-Moss, Staff Liaison; Matthew Nighbert, PE, Souder, Miller & Assocs.; and Sky Tallman, BPAC Planning and Funding Subcommittee Chair)

Staff Liaison: This project is fully funded by NMDOT and at 90% Design Plan. This project came about because in 2012 a study was conducted by Worcester Polytechnic University for the SFMPO on vehicle crash analysis. As part of this analysis, they looked at intersection crashes throughout the region, placed a severity value on them and ranked the intersections based



# MINUTES

on crashes per million entering vehicles. The intersection at Agua Fria and Cottonwood was the highest ranking intersection which means the unsafest intersection not only in the CoSF but in the SFMPO region. So that's the background information for this project. The Consultant for this project is Matthew Nighbert of Souder, Miller & Associates (SMA) and he's here with us tonight. Matthew, please.

Mr. Nighbert: Thank you, Romella, thank you Vice-Chair. My name is Matthew Nighbert from SMA working on Agua Fria-Cottonwood Drive Roundabout Intersection Improvement project. As Romella said, it's a DOT-funded project. It's about \$1.5M estimated right now. We're at 90% and we submitted our 90% review from comments. And it's gone through quite a few iterations of changes over its design life plan. And even with that when we are doing our QC review for 90%, we looked at the crosswalk on Cottonwood Drive which I'm gonna dub as North leg. A little difficult because this whole thing sits on a diagonal. I will call Cottonwood Drive "North leg". It is a pretty steep crosswalk and we initially at 90% I think all of you had access to and reviewed. It eliminated that crosswalk; it definitely exceeded 2%. Tom Graham, the Project Manager on the City side and ADA Coordinator has asked us to look into option for maintaining and providing some means of pedestrian crossing across at North leg and we looked into that and we settled on a mid-block crossing parameter which does not need the requirement of a 2% cross slope. It can be steeper than 2%. So what we've resolved to do is move the crosswalk of the N leg further back and it's now at the far end away from the roundabout at the far end of the median node about 75'-80' away from the roundabout. We feel it meets the criteria for mid-block crossing. It is steeper than 2% but definitely less than 5%. This will also fall in line with future combinations of the Santa Fe River Trail that would be built at some point in the future. We do have that in mind. We are aware of that. Otherwise, I hope that that walk you through pretty good introduction of the project and if I left anything out; I'm sorry. If there are questions or comments I'm happy to take them now.

Member Tallman: Thank you Matthew. I'm glad that you considered a little bit putting a crosswalk on Cottonwood Drive but I wonder if putting a crosswalk 75-80' from the intersections will accommodate actual human behavior? Somebody is walking down Agua Fria on the north side, you know human



# MINUTES

behavior. They are not just to walk 75' out of their way to cross Cottonwood Drive and walk back and continue on Agua Fria. So I think you have to set-up a situation people are going to make unwarranted crossings at the intersection because that is convenient. So I wonder if there is some way you could treat the grade or you can meet ADA requirements having the further out one and maybe one at a steeper slope at the intersection that maybe less desirable but in particular respect

Mr. Nighbert: So we looked at several options.

Unfortunately, we're really constrained. We're tying into the bridge a little bit N of the roundabout. We're already cutting into existing grade and if we go any deeper we have to provide retaining walls on the South side of the roundabout. I hear what you're saying about providing a sidewalk that does not meet ADA but again you're basically setting up the scenario where you are excluding the disabled in a purposeful situation. It's not necessarily a compromise since we can do short of trying to cut into already built up properties and providing a retaining wall along the south side of the roundabout in a constrained scenario. This is our interpretation of PROWAG. I definitely understand your concern about people taking the shortest path... I definitely see that. I don't know the destinations of the pedestrians occurring along the North side of Agua Fria across Cottonwood Drive. It's kind of unattainable number but it's a possibility because of the bus stop for NE of the leg?

Member Tallman: How about installing a speed table and putting the cross walk on the speed table and speed table itself can kind of even things out?

Mr. Nighbert: I think that would just make a horrendous bump on the road. That solves one part of the problem but as you level out that ten feet from the crosswalk you have then to meet grade as you come out of that and we just don't have space for that. It's almost 4% coming out of the roundabout and to level off the 2% you have to go back to almost 6-8% just to get back to the grade before you get back to the bridge. And there is a driveway on the East side of Cottonwood Drive before you get to the Santa Fe River. We're really space constrained. It is not that we don't want to do this. We would love to provide a crosswalk at the roundabout as it normally be but fortunately,



# MINUTES

topography and already built-up conditions boxed us in to where we don't feel we can easily provide that. But we will look into this and see if we can accommodate that.

Member Tallman: I wonder if there could be some creative way to maybe not provide a marked crosswalk but provide some safety feature to acknowledge the fact that people are going to cross whether or not it is a marked crosswalk. And people may not be the design that you're intending for how people use the intersection but will people use the intersection but will people use it but cross the cross walk easiest to cross. So I think we need to anticipate that behavior will take place and make it as safe as possible.

c. Zia Trail Updates and other Pertinent Trail Issues (Romella Glorioso-Moss, Staff Liaison)

Staff Liaison: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I'd like to request all Members to look at p.17 of your packet. There is a lot line adjustment plat. At the direction of the Chair at our last meeting, I met with Land Use Department Director, City Property Manager and the SFMPO Officer to discuss what we can do with Zia Trail. And as you can see on p.17 of your packet in the subdivision plat, it is clearly stated that the use of the trail by the public is based on revocable permission. So when the property owners said No to the public to use the existing bike path, we can't do anything because it's a revocable permission. They have the right to do that. In 2016, when this lot line adjustment was done, it seems that the Land Use Dept. talked with the property owners to get public access to the path but the owners refused. Based on my meeting with the Dept. Director, it seems that he would not want to take this pathway via eminent domain because it's not possible politically especially there is an alternative route located just 100 ft away which is the Arroyo Chamisos. It is not also possible to fight this financially or legally. So Staff recommendation is to construct a trail next to Arroyo Chamisos – which will be Arroyo Chamisos Trail linking E & W Zia. BPAC passed a motion at the last meeting to do Location Study, Preliminary and Final Design funded through GRT. If Public Works Department Director chooses not to issue a bond for this project, there are other funding opportunities coming this May namely TAP & CMAQ. But it will take time to start a project if we will depend on these funding. It could take up to 3 years if we get funded through TAP. So, I will try to apply for Impact



# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

---

Fees. This is my update... I know it's not the news that BPAC members would like to hear but this is the result of my meeting.

Vice Chair: I have one question. It looks like on the aerial photo from the south is it even 100 ft of the diversion?

Staff Liaison: I didn't measure it exactly but that's what I remember you said from 2 meetings ago – that it is 100 ft away. But it's near enough the current bike path that Land Use don't wish to use eminent domain.

Vice Chair: It seems to me it's close enough that I rather build a diversion rather than fight with the property owner. I hope we get the money as soon as possible.

Member Gabriele: So thank you. I just want to make sure I understand this. So you would come down W Zia Rd and then travel down on Botolph Rd until you get to the new trail that runs parallel to the Arroyo Chamisos. Is that correct?

Staff Liaison: [At this point, Staff Liaison shared her screen showing the aerial photo and used the pointer to show what her thinking was.] So the bike path is here. We're thinking of constructing the trail here to connect with this trail.

Member Gabriele: Right. So when you get at the intersection of W Zia and Botolph Rd how do you get to the Arroyo Chamiso Trail. Do you travel down Botolph or will there be a trail going through that parcel somehow?

Staff Liaison: On ROW on Botolph Rd.

Member Gabriele: That makes sense.

Tim Rogers: Thank you for the report Romella. What exists today is really convenient because it connects one road to the other. So it's nice, it's convenient, it's direct. But sometimes, in these situations, the best thing to do about it is nothing. It's good to know that an alignment along the Arroyo Chamisos. This would be an extension of the Gail Ryba Trail. The Arroyo Chamisos Trail going E of St. Francis Dr. is the Gail Ryba Trail. It should be



City of Santa Fe

# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

realized that the upper left of the image there on the N side of the Arroyo Chamisos there is an 8-ft wide pedestrian easement in place that goes all the way to the existing Gail Ryba Trail at the bridge by former Capshaw School. So that exists. So if this would be pursued as trail project, you would want to pursue the entire thing. 8-ft is not enough but the City has something to build on to make a multiuse trail. Of course, I think Romella mentioned it but there's a sidepath along Botolph on the west side which would make the connection from Zia. Of course, you can use the road as well as a bicyclist. But one question is either way, you're talking about crossing private ROW. Do you anticipate that would be easier to obtain ROW from these private landowners along the Arroyo Chamisos because that would seem another hurdle still.

Staff Liaison: My understanding from the City Property Manager is it would be a lot easier to do because it's an arroyo.

Tim Rogers: Well certainly, the City has been able to do it in the past and it's a favorable alignment as a trail. As a standalone connection it is not as smooth to connect Zia to Zia but if we really pursue this trail, suddenly we are building Arroyo Chamisos this much further East – and again the Gail Ryba Trail but it's the Arroyo Chamisos trail. So that will be wonderful. To get to what is the Old Arroyo Chamisos the other road on the East side, you attain the goal on getting the street grade to the East which you can ride Zia to Museum Hill practically. It's an easy ride in that direction. It's really pulling other part of the City into our bikeway network. So it's really important. Thank you for focusing on it and following up.

Staff Liaison: If Public Works Department Director will not issue a bond for this project, there trails impact fees we can use. We have to ask Parks if we can use some of the money for Preliminary design so we can start the project immediately and apply for construction funding via TAP. I can pursue this if this is BPAC's priority.

Vice Chair: So do we need a motion to vote on this? Or can we move forward because this has been our priority?

Staff Liaison: I think we can move forward because you passed a motion at the last meeting.



# MINUTES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

---

Vice Chair: I think we have given our guidance.

- d. Public Works Department Temporary Street Closure Permitting Process (Sky Tallman, BPAC Planning and Funding Subcommittee Chair)

**MOTION:** Member Tallman moved, seconded by Member Eisenstein, to make fee closure of a street with the change in traffic patterns or closure of part of the street a petition process rather than a permit process with the City then taking action to close all or part of the street.

**VOTE:** The motion was on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Member Serrano, Member Spencer, Member Tallman, Member Gabriele, Member Eisenstein, Member Finger, Member Morlino

**Against:** None

**Abstain:** None

Member Tallman: We brought this up last year so I don't think it needs to be labored too much. But I would like to propose a motion for the City Council to make that a petition process rather than a permit process so if the same sort of qualifications of that 75% affected business owners or residents petition the City will close the street rather than the City issuing permit to individual permit applicant to then take on the liability doing that. We saw in the past that there was a lot of interest and it had a broad public support for the closure of certain street; and it didn't happen because of the large fees that are associated with the liability. So I think to facilitate this it depends on whether the pandemic will be over. Spring time is here and even if the pandemic is over, I think we would like to close streets sometimes. To change the traffic pattern, to close a street, a lane or a parking space, that should be a petition; not a permit. That's my contention.



# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

---

Vice Chair Spencer: Would the rest of the rules still apply that is currently on the permitting process as far as the use of the street?

Member Tallman: I don't have issues for the rest of the rules. I think it's up to the City Council to debate that but I think the starting place they do a lot of groundwork to establish what would be good criteria. So I'd say I think keep the criteria that they have come up with unless they decide to come up with other criteria. Maybe I rather not comment on the criteria but I think the process should take the form of a petition rather than permit application.

Vice Chair: Would you like to put that in a form of a formal motion and see if we can get a second?

Member Tallman: To make fee closure of a street with the change in traffic patterns or closure of part of the street a petition process rather than a permit process with the City then taking action to close all or part of the street.

Second: Member Finger

## DISCUSSION

Member Eisenstein: I just want to understand the petition process. I certainly agree with Sky that what they did last year certainly was not very efficient or favorable. But how does a petition process work? If we make a motion that it should be a petition process as a standard process, the City Council would know exactly what to do to set it up? So that's my question. How does it actually works.

Member Tallman: I'm not sure to the answer to that. Maybe Ms. Glorioso-Moss can answer that better. But I think the fundamental principle is that maybe they don't know exactly what it means. So maybe they need to define it or figure it out as part of the process but the principle at hand is the City should be responsible for closing of a lane or changing of a traffic pattern. It's the City's duty to do that anyway. For example, if the traffic light goes out then the City redirects the traffic. Or if utilities need repair, we close the street and make a detour.



City of Santa Fe

# MINUTES

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

---

Member Eisenstein: Maybe we should make it a little bit broader in terms of a motion. The petition process or another process which the City is responsible for the closure. I support the petition but I'm wondering if we need to broaden it to give the City a leeway as long as we make sure the City is responsible.

Member Tallman: Ms. Glorioso-Moss, do you have any suggestion on the language of the motion?

Staff (Glorioso-Moss): If it's a petition process maybe Legal will be involved or Land Use. I know this process was led by Public Works – Traffic Engineering but I am not a Traffic Engineer. Maybe what we can do is move with the motion; vote on the motion and I will do research on how the process works. If the motion won't work, maybe we can rescind the motion at the next meeting.

Member Tallman: We are an advisory committee so if we use the word "petition" and it turns out Council has a better idea that is not exactly synonym to that. I'm not sure that it would change the nature of our motion. We make a motion, and the intention is clear. Council may change the word or play with it a little bit.

Vice Chair Spencer: I think that's fair. We are just advising the Governing Body. If the Governing Body thinks this does not quite work let's come up with something else. It's still an advise coming from us. What I do recall at least with traffic calming in Los Alamos, the City did not require people to submit a permit. The rule was if a certain percentage of residents petition for a traffic calming study, the City conducts the study. So this is sort of consistent with that sort of idea.

Member Gabriele: I wonder the same thing that Yolanda brought up. Can the motion be worded in such a way that we don't have to be prescriptive with the procedure if we don't understand what the procedure is? The point is to not make it a burden on the shop owners or property owners and that it should be the responsibility of the City. Is there a way to word it that way so that however it works we don't have to go back and change the motion or whatever.



# MINUTES

Member Tallman: That's what we kind of tried to do last year and Councilor Garcia did not really know what to do because we did not really have a framework to work with and it didn't go anywhere. It was not presented to the Council and it died. So I think starting with a motion petition ... because petition is really a broad concept. It just means a bunch of citizens asking to do something. Petition is really broad but it's distinct from a permit.

Member Gabriele: So is that why we think it did not go forward because the wording was not appropriate or whether there are other barriers that maybe it didn't make it happen?

Member Tallman: Another barrier was just backlogged of not meeting for many months because of the pandemic. And he did not want to take it on after October because I guess we all thought no one would like to close the street after the pandemic ended which was supposed to be months ago.

Discussion ended here. Roll call vote on the motion was called.

- e. Engineering Staff Requests and Recommendations (Romella Glorioso-Moss, Staff Liaison)

Traffic Operations Manager requested help from BPAC in prioritizing sharrows need replaced in the City. We currently have 14 sharrows and Traffic Operations Manager ordered 20 more. A box of 2 sharrows costs \$480. So if there are more than 34 sharrows to replace "immediately" or within a year (meaning prior June 30, 2022) we need to find more funds in our Operational Budget. A form was included in the packet.

- f. Sidewalk Funding Policy (Sky Tallman, BPAC Planning & Funding Subcommittee Chair)

**MOTION:** Member Tallman moved, seconded by Member Eisenstein, to postpone agenda items 7.f through 7.i to next meeting.



# MINUTES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

**VOTE:** The motion was on the following Roll Call vote:

**For:** Member Serrano, Member Spencer, Member Tallman, Member Gabriele, Member Eisenstein, Member Finger, Member Morlino

**Against:** None

**Abstain:** None

- g. E-bikes (Khalil Spencer, BPAC Vice-Chair; and Yolanda Eisenstein, BPAC Law & Policy Subcommittee Chair)
- h. Bishop's Lodge Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Issues (Yolanda Eisenstein, BPAC Member)
- i. BPAC Recommendations for Potential Uses of Parks Stimulus Funds (Robert Morlino, BPAC Member)

8. **MATTERS FROM STAFF**

9. **MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE**

10. **MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR**

The Chair informed the Committee that Member Khal Spencer is stepping down as the Promotion, Education and Programming Subcommittee Chair and he is appoint Member Judith Gabriele as Chair.

He also informed the Committee that he is leaving before 6 pm to attend the Governing Body's Special Meeting and Vice Chair Khal Spencer will chair the meeting.



City of Santa Fe

# MINUTES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 08, 2021  
5:30 PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

11. **NEXT MEETING: Thursday, May 13, 2021**

12. **ADJOURN 7:48 pm**

*Romella Glorioso-Moss*

Liaison

*Michael Lian*

Chair

May 17, 2021