Alternative Transportation/ Parking

- I am writing to support the suggestions of the NCNA, my primary concerns are preserving as much open space as possible and reducing traffic. The most obvious way to effectively eliminate the traffic problem is by closing Tucker at Stanford (and improving the intersection of Tucker and University for better flow that direction). The traffic circle installed on Yale is a big improvement. Something could be done to make Tucker and University work well for automobile traffic. Also, Tucker at Stanford could be closed to cars, but open as a bicycle and pedestrian access route. That would be fantastic and make the streets much quieter and safer. We live almost directly at that intersection and in the mornings and afternoons there is a constant stream of traffic down Tucker in the morning and up Tucker in the afternoon. Without that access, nobody would drive through the neighborhood unless it was to get to the law school (not a lot of folks), or to their homes. That would be so wonderful! –Cammie Nicholas, North Campus Neighborhood Resident; 8/21/2009

- The plan continues an auto-oriented campus. Where "activity" nodes are mentioned, read "traffic" (congested) nodes. There could be scant pedestrian "activity" in these areas since there is no reason for ped activity. This is disingenuous, putting a positive spin on increased traffic. The plan does not seem to support or foster a campus vision that, if given a clear choice of alternatives, would be the choice of most. It's too easy to imagine something better. There are better university models - in practice - from which to draw. The increased traffic seems to place the burden of traffic analysis and mitigation upon the City. Adjacent neighborhoods will suffer this will be an ongoing conflict for UNM. – Richard Borkovetz, Neighborhood Resident; 8/25/2009

- I would like to see a plan that encourages more walking, biking and use of mass transit. I would like to see more pedestrian areas in open green spaces that link the campuses and academic building together. I would also encourage you to remove the existing traffic circles and cancel all future plans for any new traffic circles. Less cars - More Pedestrians. I am not a fan of the traffic circles you have in this plan. I frequently utilize the traffic circle on the North Campus no - using my scooter or bike. I feel very unsafe using this traffic circle. I see that the new plan calls for more. Once again it appears that this plan caters to automobile traffic and to top things off it puts in confusing traffic circles that in my experience people do not know how to use. – Jim MacFarlane, UNM Staff/Alumni; 8/28/2009

- One significant stakeholder is missing from those represented in the plan: the City of Albuquerque. How does this plan tie in to the city's comprehensive plan? The city's centers and corridors plan would suggest an attempt at infill, mass transit, mixed use development, etc. Along those lines, it is common knowledge that the city is attempted to introduce a streetcar system to the University and Yale corridors. Would it not be complementary to use student housing in the south campus as a catalyst to support the goals of both the city and University? The current plans shows student housing in the far southwest corner where students will be isolated. Placing those buildings along Yale Blvd on the east side of the south campus would boost business along Yale and activate the corridor with a larger pedestrian presence, enhancing the opportunity for the city to create a successful streetcar system that may help to improve the area through redevelopment. This plan would also tie in the CNM campus, creating a strong pedestrian/ alternative transit path along Yale. – Tim Trujillo, Community Member; 8/28/2009
As written, the Master Plan update does not address the means by which the University will bring about greater use of alternative modes of transportation by students, staff, faculty and administration. My recommendations include but are not limited to collaborating with the City to improve bus service, reduction of single occupant vehicles, incentivizing use of alternative transportation modes and effective education for all those coming to the University regarding the need for reducing the number of vehicles coming to the area. – T’Brin E. Back/ Mardon Gardella, Neighborhood Resident; 9/3/2009

The long-term plan proposes to decrease parking on central campus and "encourage" faculty and staff to make fewer car trips and use alternative transportation. Making it more difficult for faculty to park on campus at a reasonable price will be disastrous for students. If faculty are forced to waste time by parking far away or taking public transport, they will inevitably spend fewer days on campus, working from home, except on the days that they must come in to teach. This may be beneficial from the perspective of reducing traffic on campus. It is not good for education, as students already complain that faculty can be inaccessible. It is critical for students, whose schedules are often constrained by off-campus work schedule, that faculty be on campus and available throughout the week. Parking policies should facilitate this contact, not actively discourage it. – Martin N. Muller, UNM Faculty; 9/4/2009

As I look at the Master Plan I find many forward-looking ideas (e.g. concentrating medical buildings on the Lands West Property). However, the proposals dealing with traffic and parking strike me as 20th century solutions to 21st century problems. Emphasis seems to continue on facilitating access to the main campus by individual automobiles. This conflicts with stated university objectives of encouraging more mass transit and alternative transportation. It would seem appropriate to encourage more parking in areas peripheral to the main and north campuses, and then providing shuttle service from these locations to campus facilities. The proposed transportation center at Yale and Camino de Salud makes some sense. However, access from parking locations east of University Blvd to the Lands West facilities should be accomplished by grade separations instead of stoplights at the intersections. This will facilitate the flow of traffic along University Blvd. Shuttles or moving sidewalks could enhance pedestrian movement from parking facilities to the various facilities on the North and Main Campuses. Likewise, traffic directed to South Campus can more easily access that area via Cesar Chavez, Gibson, Lead and Coal, than from Central, with shuttles to move people from that area to Main Campus (or even North Campus). – Karl Schwerin, Community Member; 9/8/2009

There is a need to address student housing parking by acquiring the structure north of Hokona Hall also the land currently known as CIRT could provide for expansion of the current parking structure. – Walt Miller, UNM Staff; 9/8/2009

There is currently no coordination between the UNM PATS shuttles and UNMH shuttles. This non-coordination caused the University to suffer in the following ways: 1) UNMH Shuttle drivers refuse to drive people from their medical centers (such as orthopedics, sports medicine, the cancer center) to the Duck Pond. By not driving to the duck pond, patients and main campus personnel cannot enjoy the benefits of using the Zimmerman Library or using the Student Union. 2) Both UNMH shuttle drivers and UNM main campus shuttles will not stop at Lomas and Yale Blvds. This makes it impossible for UNM student, staff and faculty to network with the city bus system. The city bus system, incidentally, goes out of its way to accommodate UNM. It is
unfortunate that the arrangement is not reciprocal. These two halves of "PATS" are accommodating their own needs and not that of the University, which desperately needs them to change their modus operandi. In short, PATS is no longer just about parking, it's about moving UNM students, staff and faculty around the University through the use of their shuttle buses. – Chuck Reuben, UNM Staff; 9/10/2009

- I have reviewed the master plan and although I do not have any major criticisms or comments about the overall project design, actually, the proposed changes seem very exciting to me, I do have one major question: What is meant by "remote" parking for faculty and staff? As members of the faculty, most of us are on central campus each day, preparing for classes, teaching, meeting with students, participating in committee work, researching and writing. Parking has always been an issue as it is but now I am a bit bothered by the idea of having to park, let’s say, at South Lot and then having to wait for shuttles like students have been doing. How much time will this consume? Will we have to pay for this parking? And will administrators be required to do the same? It seems very inconvenient for those of us who not only have spent many years training and working for our doctorates but now do a very large share of running (and building the reputation of) this university. – Ray Hernandez-Duran, UNM Faculty; 9/10/2009

- I am writing regarding an issue with campus planning - motorcycle parking. A large motorcycle parking lot just north of the Centennial Library was demolished for a new building. I would estimate that lot could hold nearly 200 motorcycles, and I often saw 80-100 cycles parked there. That lot was replaced with a meager 10 spaces on the south side of the Centennial Engineering Center. I put off purchasing a motorcycle permit for the first time since 2006. This semester I have spent time walking around campus and only today for the first time did I seen an open motorcycle space and that was at noon! Fortunately I did not spent $70 on a useless permit. Nor do I believe it is reasonable for me to have to arrive before 8am to get a cycle parking space when my class is at 11am. I find it interesting that individuals purchasing a South Lot permit are virtually guaranteed a space while those of us who are using a fraction of the gasoline and a fraction of the parking area are NOT guaranteed a space. It might appear that there is a lack of commitment to students, faculty and staff who are attempting to commute to conserve resources. Many of us live far enough away that taking city buses is not an option. Motorcycling was a great option - until now. Motorcycle spaces take up such little area. Surely there are accessible areas on campus that for a small investment could be paved for motorcycles? As an example, there is a small unused triangular grassy patch just east of the Centennial Library. Many other spots exist on campus. Isn’t it in our best interests to promote conservation of the environment and natural resources? Removing much of the campus' motorcycle parking is sending the wrong message. – Cecil Compeau Jr., UNM Student; 9/10/2009

- Traffic: The Summit Park NA and the North Campus NA are currently addressing traffic flow, pedestrian and bicycle routes that will have large impacts on access to the North Campus. The UNM Planning Dept. had full access to the design process. Now we are evaluating the implementation and modification phase and close cooperation with any UNM Master Plan is essential for the UNM Planners to be able to interconnect the North Campus with appropriate links to city streets, bike, parking and pedestrian facilities. Request: UNM Planning Dept. cooperative development with local city development process, the SPNA and NCNA. – Keith Rasmussen, Summit Park Neighborhood Association Resident; 9/11/2009
Whether we like it or not, UNM is a commuter school where most of our students drive from home or work to attend classes. We are concerned the plan of having only a few parking structures on campus will create a significant bottlenecks at these structures in terms of finding parking places and getting in and out. We will see more and more students late to classes, as they drive around looking for a parking spot. I cannot believe that you can replace most of the B parking available near and around the ECE building with just a single structure. This simply does not make sense and will lead to frustration for the faculty, staff and students. Furthermore, in our department (ECE) we have adjunct lecturers that just drive in to give a lecture and then leave. By making most of the campus impassable to cars, these lecturers will have to park far away and walk to their classes, adding an additional 10 mins each way to their commute. This will cause a drop in people who are willing to be adjuncts for courses, which will jeopardize courses and teaching at UNM. Finally the fact that we have convenient parking near the buildings makes UNM an ideal location to hold meetings with researchers from Sandia and other organizations around Albuquerque. By getting rid of nearby parking, it will be less convenient for visiting researcher to stop by UNM as part of their daily schedule. Although trying to have a sustainable plan for parking sounds like a great idea, there needs to be a lot more input from the departments and the faculty that will be on the receiving end of the decisions made. I only received an email YESTERDAY that requested that we reply by TODAY if we had any concerns regarding the proposed parking policy. We do have concerns regarding this plan and strongly discourage this from moving forward without more direct input from the faculty, staff, and students of this university.

– Pradeep Sen, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009

As an employee of the UNM Health Sciences Center (HSC) and as a public health professional promoting healthy and active lifestyles, please consider my below recommendations that applaud the current inclusion of a variety of public health promoting strategies and considerations; and also request a few additional public health concerns be considered. 1) Regarding the section that will "Develop better pedestrian, bike, and transit connections to the Central and North Campuses:" safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between Central Campus and North Campus is essential to promoting active/healthy lifestyles among staff and students and I thank you for including this language in the plan. This more specific language under "Healthy Communities" Section on p.14 "Goal Increase the capacity of the University of New Mexico Hospital to serve the community. Strategy: Improve at-grade crossings on Lomas Blvd. to connect North and Central Campuses. Explore option of grade separated crossings." is also essential to safely connecting the two campuses. Specifically, as a cyclist (and pedestrian) crossing from the HSC to Central Campus at the Lomas/Girard intersection, I and my colleagues, have regular challenges and unsafe situations with little existing infrastructure to calm traffic and promote safe and efficient crossing. A common strategy that pedestrians and cyclists take to cross Lomas is to do so at Vassar to then utilize Redondo Drive. If pedestrians and cyclists are prompted to utilize such mid-block crossing wishing to use the safe connecting street of Redondo drive, considering traffic calming, signage and additional infrastructure to provide safe crossing here would drastically increase the safety of crossers.

– Emily Piltch, UNM Staff; 9/11/2009

I am a junior faculty in ECE department. It seems that your plan will remove the parking spots outside of ECE building for both reserve spots and B permit. As a young faculty, I work very late
hours and sometimes leave my office after midnight. As a female faculty, I definitely do not want to walk on the University Ave. to the new planned lot late at night. I think we should be able to keep the option of reserved spots outside our department while improving other issues with parking. – Yasamin Mostofi, UNM Faculty; 9/11/2009

- Biker Friendly Campus: a lot of people know the issues of parking and transportation and getting to school, and I have seen an increase of bike usage in the 5 years that I have been at UNM. I applaud the efforts of including this in the Master Plan and I really like the map of bike trails laid out in the plan. – Monika Irene Roberts, UNM Student; 9/11/2009

- Transportation. Firstly, the lack of adequate access for students and staff to the freeway, especially outbound, seems like a major stumbling point. At Louisiana and I-40 there is a park-and-ride that is nearly full usually. That seems like a good template of a workable future. It would be nice if the DOT and UNM could work out a dedicated parking structure at the freeway nearby so cars could be dumped immediately. The conversion of the campus to a pedestrian and transit campus could then proceed apace. The major investment required to make a reality on this scale is a commitment I do not feel in the document, despite the repeated statements about making campus more friendly to pedestrians, bikers, and transit. Making it easy, fast, and cheap to get out of your car early would make campus better and make the surrounding neighborhoods contiguous without a morass of too many cars.

The Transportation Strategic Plan may be the source of this apparent disconnect. It mentions the free city bus passes as well as the park-and-rides, and even proposes changing of University Boulevard profile. However, in apparent haste to support the Lot C structure as a solution, the Plan seems to overlook the obvious point that the closer a structure is to the freeway, the easier everything else would be to solve. The plan as written clearly shoehorns and exacerbates the existing problems on the MLK freeway entrance by staking out a continued reliance on the Lot C Structure as some kind of sustainable plan. So, under the heading “Stakeholder in NMDOT South I-25 Corridor Study,” I believe the search for a park-and-ride (for transit to campus) should be a priority. It seems obvious to me that this solution would solve most of the thorniest issues in the master plan regarding campus quality for pedestrian enhancements.

Fundamentally cars are not a safe mix with bikes and pedestrians. I hardly know anyone who has not a friend who has been injured or killed by this mix. Further, drivers and congestion and density are not what they once were when the small neighborhoods surrounding the University were built. It appears from the “gateway” talk in the document, which I would say feels quite vague, there is hardly adequate attention to this simple consideration for pedestrians and bikes.

The point of separating the cars from pedestrians at the Cornell/Central entrance in the context of limiting the car traffic on Redondo is mentioned. I believe this spirit needs to spread around campus. The east-west corridor for non-vehicular traffic is mentioned but its location is not delineated in words. For all appearances, it is what would be the continuation of Roma. I believe Roma and University should be re-engineered to be a pedestrian crossing and as a major pedestrian entrance to campus (NOT A CAR ENTRANCE). Currently it is used extensively by pedestrians despite the six lane hurdle and the lack of curb ramps. Turning at that intersection is restricted and could be further restricted, I believe. The proposal in the Transportation Strategic Plan for University Boulevard to be narrowed to four lanes total (down from six) would facilitate this move.

The frequency of the appearance of the word pedestrian in the text of the draft Master Plan
Draft give me tremendous hope going forward as neighbors. –Whitney Durrell, Spruce Park Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009

- Transportation/ Traffic/ Parking/ Shuttle/ Bus/ Bicycle/ Light Rail: Bicycle Friendliness, We recommend the following to make UNM’s campus more bicycle-friendly: 1) Dismount zone at the center of campus for pedestrian safety, 2) Safe, secure, well lit, conveniently located bike racks, 3) Enforcement of traffic laws for bicycles, 4) Respect for bicycles/ bicycle-friendly paths, 5) A low-fee bike share program, 6) Egress and Ingress that promotes bicycle use and discourages Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) use. Better pedestrian, bike, and transit connections to the Central and North Campuses. Light rail from parking to South Campus to Main Campus to North Campus to Parking that connects with Route 66 bus line and the Rail Runner. Light Rail and the Duck Pond: We oppose the removal of the duck pond. It has great historic value and it plays a significant role in the identity of the campus. We want to invest in the light rail, but not at the expanse of the most significant green space remaining on main campus. –GPSA/ Andrew Marcum, UNM Students; 9/11/2009

- University Heights Neighborhood Association (UHA) supports improved connectivity and agrees with the Plan’s statement that such connecting “requires a comprehensive transportation plan that links the three areas while minimizing the impact of automobiles on surrounding neighborhoods” (p. viii). However, the draft plan does not include some of the key elements that would fulfill that goal. The draft Plan discusses the need for improved bicycle and pedestrian connections within the campus and proposes a “people mover” between Central and Lomas (p. 41) and a pedestrian/ bicycle route between the South and Central campus (p. 15). Missing from the draft Plan discussion are connections across Central between Yale and Girard. For more than 30 years, the closing of the Stanford vehicle entrance to make it a better pedestrian and bicycle entrance has been requested by UHA. During the time the entrance was closed while Pearl Hall was built, there was much less vehicular traffic through the UHA area, resulting in improved conditions for pedestrians and residents, and minimal negative impact to UNM. In addition to connecting the Central and Couth campus, there would be many benefits to better connections with CNM (some of which are mentioned in the draft Plan) and with the UHA area (which are not explicitly mentioned). The Master Plan should explicitly discuss the fact that the large majority (more than 80%) of students will continue to live off campus and recognize the need to develop better connections with those people, especially in the surrounding neighborhoods. Recommendations: 1) Permanent closure of the Stanford vehicular entrance or the alternative of right turn only exit on Stanford and a new entrance east of Stanford and a new entrance east of Stanford as discussed at our July 7 meeting should be incorporated into the plan to minimize automobile impact on the UHA area. Such closure also is consistent with the goal to restrict automobile access to the Central campus (p. 41) and would provide for a dedicated pedestrian/ bicycle entrance to Johnson Center and Johnson Field, as well as new buildings that are proposed in the draft Plan. UHA also believes that the proposed closure of Redondo between Yale and Stanford (p. 41) would result in increased traffic into the Stanford entrance, with the undesirable associated increased traffic through the neighborhood. –Ben Roberts, University Heights Neighborhood Resident; 9/11/2009

- Transportation/ Traffic Issues: Numerous concerns arise with respect to assumptions and recommendations contained in the “Transportation Strategic Plan (June 2009)” (TSP). 1) The TSP contains the statement, “The Central/ Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Interchange provides access to
the south and west sides of the Central Campus. Central Ave. is a city arterial with 6 lanes and raised median islands. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. is a 2 land collector street owned by City of Albuquerque” (TSP, 9). As has previously been discussed at length with the university, MLK Blvd. should not be viewed or promoted as a primary access point to Central Campus. The redesign of the Big-I and the access from I-25 to MLK has had lasting, negative impacts on the Sycamore and Spruce Park neighborhoods. There was significant discussion during the facilitated meetings between UNM, the City, and the Spruce Park and Sycamore neighborhoods regarding the proposed Lot C parking structure about needing to work with NMDOT to have signage installed along and improvements made to I-25 to direct people to access Central Campus via Lomas rather than MLK. 2) With regard to the City of Albuquerque Transit System, the TSP states, “There is currently no formal coordination between ABQ Ride buses, and PATS or UNMH shuttle services” (TSP, 17). It is also noted in this section that the $65,000 that is provided by PATS and the legislature for student bus passes is “less than what would be generated through the fare box and individual pass sales” (TSP, 19). In order to expect cooperation, not to mention on-going subsidies, from the City of Albuquerque with respect to transit coordination and services, UNM should have engaged ABQ Ride management and planning staff at the onset of the Master Plan Update process and should do so in the future. 3) Under “Suggestions for Further Study” in the TSP, the first bullet reads, “Perform a transportation study of UNM to identify the existing conditions of the surrounding roadways, analyze the impact of the proposed campus growth on the local roadway network, and determine possible solutions... Analyze the impact of campus expansion on the surrounding neighborhoods” (TSP, 45). These analyses should take place prior to making decisions about where to locate and develop projects, such as parking structures, so as to help inform those decisions. RECOMMENDATIONS: Perform transportation studies, analyze impacts, and develop solutions on the front end, rather than the back end, of developing capital projects, BEFORE Finalizing plans and seeking funding. Work with neighborhood leaders and the City to understand the impacts that certain development proposals will have on existing street networks before finalizing plans. – Isaac Benton, et. al, City Councilor; 9/11/2009

I have comments about UNM’s approach to parking for its employees (both faculty and staff) on the main campus (not south campus; not HSC). Our planners seem to be creating parking problems at a faster clip than they are solving them. I wonder if it’s easier, and the machinery better in place, to spend money on capital-improvement projects than it is to come up with a solution to what has so far been an intractable problem. Or maybe it’s only considered a problem by the 9,630 of us who need to find parking on campus near the building in which we work. As I listened to the master plan presentation at the August 11 meeting, it sometimes seemed as if the university’s planners were simply tossing a few clichéd "solutions" at this problem and then ignoring it in the hope that it would go away. It hasn't gone away, and the master plan holds no promise that it will go away any time in the near or even distant future. The fact that parking continues to be the most frequently expressed concern (as Mr. Dekker described it: “parking, parking, parking...”) should not bring our planners to shrug their shoulders with an "oh that again" attitude when these questions are brought up. They are brought up because they have not yet been resolved. The fact that parking continues to be harped upon should not deafen planners' ears to the problem out of some sort of resignation to the fact that the planners have not yet been able to, and perhaps are not able to, resolve this
problem in a proactive, win-win fashion (or, in the case of UNM’s many constituents, a win-win-win-win fashion). Whatever the reason for UNM's inability to find solutions to this problem, the result of its practices so far has been that faculty and staff are increasingly being tossed out into the proverbial street and left to fend for themselves when it comes to finding a way to get to their desk each day. It is a well-worn if not so funny joke that employees are up a creek whenever they have an appointment or UNM errand during the day that requires them to relinquish whatever spot they may have been able to commandeer by arriving on campus before anyone else was awake. I was aghast when I heard it suggested during the August 11 Regent’s meeting that UNM's solution to its parking problem should be to make parking more "scarce" and expensive for employees. In fact, UNM is already on this path, using an ever increasing percentage of its ever-diminishing number of parking spots for "reserved" parking, available only to those whose compensation is high enough that they can afford to pay the, yes, exorbitant permit price. This policy is reminiscent of the strategy behind 19th Century company stores, and it is unbecoming of a university that calls itself New Mexico's flagship university.

Regarding proposed solutions: One proposed solution is that more people will walk or ride a bicycle. However, I haven't heard a distinction made between commuting to and from campus versus getting around during the day once one is on campus. Nor have I heard a distinction made between getting around on campus during the day – which certainly lends itself to walking, bicycling, shuttles, etc. – and going into, and returning to UNM from, the Metro area during the day. The parking issue is related more to getting onto campus than to on-campus transportation, yet most of the discussion about solutions applied only to on-campus and intra-campus errands. The images used in slide presentations to illustrate this utopian view of bicycles, buses and pedestrians seem consistently to be photographs of UNM’s lovely early summer campus with its colorful flowers, blue skies and blossoming trees. The fact is that for a large percent of days each year, UNM’s walkways are slick with ice, drenched with rain, or so hot as to be unwalkable except for short distances. Nor do the photographs that are shown suggest solutions that would work every workday of the year for individuals who must bring with them large containers for books, papers, lunches and laptops. Another proposed solution is that more people will use mass transit to get to and from campus. It’s fine to say that someday Albuquerque and New Mexico will have adequate public transportation. However, that is not currently the case and it would be foolish to use it as one of the cornerstones of UNM’s parking solution. Regent Koch’s comment during the August 11 meeting was well taken: Workday transport must be fast. Very fast. This applies to campus shuttles, city buses, Rapid Ride and even RailRunner. My time before and after the eight hours that I work for UNM is my life. It is unjust for the university to require that I spend that time waiting around for transportation.

What would be the cost to UNM if its 11,189 full-time ABQ campus employees (reference UNM 08-09 Fact Book pg. 6) worked seven hours a day instead of eight hours because of time spent waiting for and using mass transportation? It would be unwise of the university to elect to spend my workday time in that way. (Needless to say, it would also be silly to then wonder why productivity on campus was less than it ought to be, and unjust to point the finger at employees as the cause.) RailRunner is one example. Even if its routes were more extensive, waits and travel times are unacceptable. I’m told that it is sometimes so overcrowded that one must wait even longer for a later train. Furthermore, trip times on RailRunner and on buses are significantly longer than making the same trip by car. Mass transit in the Metro area is beginning
to be a reality, but it has a long way to go. Regarding motorcycle parking: University planners would presumably prefer that UNM’s people at least convert to using scooters or motorcycles instead of automobiles. However, the number of motorcycle parking spots is in free fall, at least in the southwest corner of campus. Why would planners allow that to happen? Regarding bicycle parking: Have the planners considered the fact that bicycle theft on campus is rampant? I’ve seen no numbers reporting the theft rates; I know them because of friends and acquaintances who have tried the bicycle solution. I’ve been left to wonder why UNM media report on other crimes but always leave out the number of bicycle thefts. Please consider the inaction on the part of campus police in locating thieves and stolen bikes when weighing the wisdom of recommending bicycles as a commute solution to the people who are counting on you to deal with these issues. – Frances Strong, UNM Staff; 9/13/2009