MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held June 8, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Carlos Arzabal (Town of Mesilla)
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrived 1:10)
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC) (departed 2:24)
Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
Zach Taraschi (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:04 p.m.)

Sorg: Okay I'm calling the meeting to the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Sorg: First item on the agenda is Conflict of Interest inquiry. Is there any Member of the Committee or staff that has a conflict of in, interest on any of the items in the agenda?

Pedroza: No.

Doolittle: No.

Benavidez: No.

Barraza: No.

Garrett: No.

Eakman: No.

Flores: No.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: Okay. Is there, the next item is Public Comment. Is there any member of the public who would like to speak to the Committee? Seeing none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Sorg: We'll go straight to the Consent Agenda. Is there a motion?

Eakman: So moved.

Pedroza: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman and second by Councilor Pedroza to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Murphy take a vote.

Murphy: Okay. Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Arzabal.

Arzabal: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 * May 11, 2016

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Resolution 16-06: A Resolution Adopting the Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Sorg: Okay the first item is an action item, Resolution 16-06: Resolution Adopting the Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program. And I believe we all have copies here. Would Mr. Murphy like to explain?

Murphy: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. Staff passed out updated copies that should be in, in front of you. This is for adoption of the Unified Planning Work Program for Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and Federal Fiscal Year 2018. We've had this here several times as a discussion item. To some, we've made some minor typographical changes that were found in the document. We had *(inaudible)* references to MAP-21, changed those to the FAST Act. Substantively a change we made, and I guess direct you to page 20, 25 of the new handout, we in discussions with, with Ms. Herrera at the NMDOT we're advancing the A, A Mountain Study Area from Federal Fiscal Year 2018 to Federal Fiscal Year 2017 so those were the other changes that were made in the document since you last saw it. Staff is asking for you to approve the Resolution adopting this so that we may submit it to the DOT and the Federal agencies within their, within their adopted timeline.

Baum: You're not on the microphone sir.

Sorg: Sorry. Comments or questions by the Committee? Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Last month the Department did have a few comments and as, as Mr. Murphy mentioned we did review it and I just wanted to, to share my appreciation for addressing those comments. I think everything that we had as a department has been addressed.

Sorg: Thank you. Any others? Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Mr. Chair. Thank you very much. One of the things that we have talked a, a good deal about has to do with coordination with the El Paso MPO. Is that in here?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Yes it is. It comes under, let me find the, find the page and I can't remember if we specifically call them out but there is a work item for State and Federal Coordination that's on page 13: Staff will promote coordination among the Mesilla Valley MPO, other state MPOs, the state and federal transportation agencies. And this, this is the, the subarea which we report you know the, the spending that we have to do to go attend their meetings, to go attend the quarterly coordination meetings with the other MPOs. So El Paso is within that. We, you know as you know we have the Memorandum of Understanding with them that, that we, we maintain on the website and Mr. Medina and I periodically discuss issues by telephone and sometimes in person.

Garrett: Okay. And that would also include the RPO, right?

Murphy: Yes. Not as much with the RPO but RPOs would be covered under this item. We do, we do have pretty consistent communication with Mr. Armijo and Ms. Real.

Garrett: Thank you. I just, I'd like to just underscore that from the perspective of the County we need to be looking at the county as a whole. In order to do that it makes sense that you're our logical extension in terms of some degree of coordination on some of those issues. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, Mr. Murphy take a vote.

Murphy: Okay. Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Arzabal.

Arzabal: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Baum: You don't have a motion and a second.

Murphy: Oh.

Sorg: Did we?

Eakman: I would, I would move that we approve.

Doolittle: I'll second.

Sorg: Okay. Moved and approved by Commissioner Eakman and Mr. Doolittle. Moved and second, I mean.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Arzabal.

Arzabal: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

6.2 Resolution 16-07: A Resolution Amending the 2015 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Transport 2040)

Sorg: Okay. Next item on the agenda is Resolution 16-07: A Resolution Amending the 2015 Metropolitan Planning, Transportation Plan. Is there a motion to approve?

Arzabal: So moved.

Flores: Second.

Sorg: Moved and approved. Is there a discussion?

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. I do have a presentation on this item. As the Committee is aware, this year MPO staff has been working, engaged in extended process working on trying to complete the multi-use loop trail around effectively the, the urbanized area of the City of Las Cruces. Just to give a little bit of brief background since we do have a, a couple new members on the Committee since this process started. Currently the trail is three-fourths complete with the La Llorona Trail, the Outfall Channel, and the Triviz Trail comprising three, three of the legs. The La Llorona Trail has recently been completed. There is a TIP project already in the TIP that NMDOT is going to reconfigure the University interchange to put Triviz underneath it and as part of that the Triviz trail is going to be extended down south into, closer to the body of NMSU. As a result of this MPO staff and the BPAC thought the time was right that needed to move forward with trying to designate that southern loop, or excuse me southern leg of the loop. That particular leg has historically been a, a little bit difficult because there's really no obvious alignment to utilize. Each one of the alignments available have their problems. So we have been engaged in an intensive stakeholder process throughout the first half of this year. We've had a lot of good meetings with, with all of the relevant jurisdictions. We've gotten a lot of really good feedback, a lot of good conversations. And as a result we have four options to present to you this afternoon.

Staff will be asking the Committee to pick one of those as the southern leg of the trail. I do want to state at this time that this does not in any way preclude at any point in the future any further work happening on any of the other potential routes or, or alignments that are in the area.

This particular process is specifically to designate what will be the official southern leg of the multi-use loop trail. This will be an amendment to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. We'll be amending the Trail Plan which is one of the maps within the MTP and so this does constitute as an amendment.

This particular map shows all four of the options on one slide. This is just kind of a, a general overview. I won't go into detail about the specifics of each route on this slide. I'll do that in the, the, the discussion about each individual route but I do just want to highlight here that we do have two options, one of them utilizing NM-28 and one of them utilizing the Mesilla lateral. The original understanding of MPO staff was that we were not going to be able to utilize the Mesilla lateral because that requires a, an agreement between the Town of Mesilla and EBID. We subsequently were given to understand that that agreement is still on the table so we added those two, those two options back. I do want to make a caveat though that at the time that we presented this to the BPAC and to the Technical Advisory Committees we were operating under the previous understanding that the laterals were not on the table. So what the BPAC and the TAC reviewed is going to be what I'm going to be referring to as Options A and Options B.

Moving on specifically to the options, Option A is primarily going to follow University Avenue utilizing NM-28. Option B will primarily utilize Union Avenue utilizing NM-28. Option C is University Avenue utilizing the Mesilla lateral and Option D is following Union and utilizing the Mesilla lateral. In a little bit of a, a, a sidebar here the map that you see before you, and I don't want to steal Mr. Taraschi's thunder too much because he's going to be giving a more in-depth presentation about this data later on but just as a little bit of an overview right now what you're, the map that you're looking at here is from an organization called Strava which is a pedestrian and bicycling app that pedestrians and cyclists utilize to track their, to track their activities. And what this, what is represented here I want to say is activities. This is not necessarily individual, individual actions. This is activities by an individual or a group of individuals. What this map represents is right now through the years that the data was collected, I'll go into a little bit more detail on subsequent slides but University was utilized a, a bit less than Union Avenue as the, the, the network out there is currently configured. I do want to throw out the caveat right now that utilize, utilization of Strava data is not universally accepted in the planning community right now. There are definite shortfalls with the nature of the data but the use of it for, for informational purposes I'd, I'd state with a fair degree of confidence is something that's, that's gaining wider acceptance out in the field.

Moving into, does Councilor Pedroza wish to, have a question at this time or ...

Sorg: If it's okay ...

Wray: Certainly.

Sorg: You Mr. Wray.

Wray: Certainly.

Sorg: Commissioner Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you. What's the problem with the plan, is it inaccurate or is it just new or, or ...

Wray: It, it's, Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It's self-selecting data. Basically people have to download and, and sign up for the app in order to be able to use it. So it would be inaccurate to say that it captures the entire universe of potential users. It's, it's a self-selected pool of ...

Pedroza: I see.

Wray: Of participants and that is its biggest drawback. It, and it, from some perspectives it is, it is a significant drawback but staff feels that it is at least informative and, and worth taking the, the data that we have into consideration especially considering the fact that, that bicycle and pedestrian counts are very difficult to obtain. The, there, there's still systemic challenges in doing so, so we're, we're trying to encompass as much data in our work as possible.

Pedroza: Do we have any alternative count?

Wray: Not along these particular facilities.

Pedroza: No. Okay.

Wray: We, did we do any counts along Union? Have we done any bike and ped counts along Union?

Pedroza: No.

Wray: We do not have ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Wray: Any alternative ...

Pedroza: All right.

Wray: Data at this time.

Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Wray: Anyway, Mr. Chair. Returning back to the discussion of Option A, all of the alignments we'll follow, that we have proposed begin at the end of the La Llorona Trail at this point and connect along to, along Calle del Norte. Option A proceeds down along NM-28 and then along University Avenue, across the, the Main Street, I-10, inter, or overpass, and then crosses along NMSU along this particular alignment. I'll, I'll pause and state at this point that staff has been in talks with NMSU and it's our belief that NMSU is going to be submitting a TAP proposal this year for the portion that is on the NMSU campus and this is the alignment that they have stated that they prefer. So this particular alignment will be the same across all four of the options. Just some, some basic facts and figures regarding University Avenue. You can see the, the vehicular traffic from 2015 when it was counted. The Strava data again I've kind of gone over that data but the, the data was specifically taken from November of 2015 to March of this year is the, the numbers that you see in front of you there.

The advantages to selection of Option A is the, the MPO recently completed a study corridor that's, would support the use, the multi-use trail along this particular corridor. It, the corridor is close to the core of the Town of Mesilla and would directly connect Town of Mesilla to NMSU. There are substantial economic development benefits to the selection of Option A with access between the Town of Mesilla, Convention Center, and greater potential student connections between Town of Mesilla and the NMSU campus. This selection would also improve non-motorized access to Zia Middle School and just one, one final note there was one bicycle-related crash along the, the specific section of University Avenue that's under consideration between 2012 and 2014. We are aware that there was another bicycle crash that was further, further east on University but that was not a part, that did, that crash did not take place along the portion of University under consideration.

The disadvantages to selection of Option A, crossing Main Street/I-10 is the most substantial challenge to the implementation of Option A. Extensive traffic, traffic calming and restriping would be required. It is a, a rather lengthy stretch of ground that would need to be covered to get from one side of that particular intersection to the other. The City and NMSU continuing the, the existing trail along the northern portion of the campus, the City of Las Cruces and NMSU have significantly reduced the existing corridor and plan to continue doing so. That multi-use path is, is basically been decided by the powers that be that it's, it's, does not serve any purpose along that corridor and is going to be repurposed for other activities. University Avenue under I-10 was also recently repaved, making it somewhat unlikely that the jurisdictions involved are going to be willing to consider implementing any changes along that particular stretch

in the near term. And lastly considering the entire length of the University Avenue corridor under consideration, there are substantial right-of-way and ownership issues that are significant impediments to the implementation of multi-use trail along this particular corridor. And this is a couple of pictures that we took, staff went out and took these pictures of the lead-in to the Main Street/University Avenue intersection and this is the east side if that intersection. I have a couple of figures here. The, the eastbound left lane here, this lane is ten feet wide. This lane, the right lane is 12 feet wide and then the bike lane here is ten feet wide. The pylon for the overpass as you can see is essentially adjacent to the curb of the roadway. There is substantial space along the median for potentially shifting facilities closer, closer to the median but there are substantial challenges to the implementation of a trail particularly through this portion of the corridor.

Moving on to Option B, this option is similar to Option A as in it, it follows Calle del Norte down to NM-28. The difference with Option B is instead of stopping at University it continues on down to Union, goes across Union and then picks up the existing portion of the Union Trail at this point, crosses Main Street, and then intersects with the NMSU preferred alignment at this point. Again some facts and figures: There is on the east portion of Union substantially higher automobile traffic on that, on that portion of Union as opposed to the, the comparable portion of University. However west of Main Street there's substantially lower vehicular traffic as compared to the relevant portion of University. Also as I mentioned earlier there, at this current time there is a, a, a substantially higher number of pedestrian and bicycling activities that are going on along the, the Union corridor according to the data that we received from Strava.

The advantages to utilizing Option B, as I said there already exists a significant portion of a multi-use path along Union that connects from the Main Street intersection to points west. It is a much shorter distance to cross Main Street and then I-10 with a much more direct access to the core of the NMSU campus. Taken as a whole there are fewer right-of-way issues along the entire length of this corridor as compared with the relevant portions of University Avenue. More cyclists are already utilizing this option as opposed to Option A and there are significantly lower motor vehicle traffic on, on this, on the west portion of Union.

The disadvantages to Option B is that Option B is further from the core of the Town of Mesilla. It does not have that direct connection. There will be greater coordination required between more jurisdictions for the implementation of Option B. There is substantially higher automobile traffic that exists along the corridor west, or east of Main Street. Even though overall the right-of-way issues are less extreme along Union there are several areas where the right-of-way narrows considerably so there will be right-of-way issues that will have to be taken into consideration for the implementation of Option B. There is an EBID facility adjacent to

Union Avenue that there will need to be some sort of agreement reached with EBID in order to utilize Option B. Also compared with Option A there's a much greater conflict with existing driveways along the Union corridor and there are four bicycle-related crashes east of Main Street between 2012 and 2014. And this is a, the, the Union and Main Street intersection. The trail starts just, just behind where this particular picture was taken and it resumes again just, there are a couple of buildings and then just on that side here. There is no existing multi-use facility through the intersection. There is however space along here for potentially some kind of facility to be constructed but obviously there are substantial physical difficulties with the implementation along this particular corridor as well.

Now Option C, as I said before at the time when we presented this to BPAC and TAC we were unaware that we could still consider the utilization of the Mesilla lateral so Option C substantially parallels Option A except for the use of the Mesilla lateral instead of NM-28. The, the benefits of Option C substantially parallel that of Option A as do the disadvantages. The, the most important point of consideration is that an agreement between the Town of Mesilla and EBID would be essential for the implementation of anything utilizing an EBID facility.

Then Option D again utilizing the Mesilla lateral but to connect down to Union, again this option is substantially similar to Option B. Again the main, the main point of difference being that an agreement between Town of Mesilla and EBID is necessary in order for, to implement.

This is again an MTP amendment that we are proposing. I, I'll pause at this point because I received a couple of questions during the week. In your packet we have all four of the options included in the map on pages, starting on page 58. The, the intention of staff is whichever option the Committee selects as the southern leg, that will then be appended to the Resolution as Exhibit A but if you have any further questions on that please, please let me know and I'll try to, try to clarify. If adopt, oh I did not update my PowerPoint and I apologize. But if adopted Option A, B, C, or D will be included onto the Trail Plan as Tier 1 Facilities. Other existing EBID facilities listed on the Trail Plan would then be listed as Tier 2 or Tier 3 due to the ongoing uncertainty that we have regarding their future viability. This is an example of what the, the Trail Plan would look like if we selected Option A, the University option. And just as an, the, these just are purely examples but this is what the, the Trail Plan would look like if Option B is selected. We have met the minimum require, the, the minimum 30-day public comment period for an MTP amendment. At their April meeting the BPAC did recommend Option B to the Committee for, for approval and at their May meeting the TAC recommended Option B to the, the Policy Committee for approval but that was without the inclusion of consideration of Option C or Options D. We are asking the Policy Committee to select one of the available options at this meeting and I will stand now for any questions.

Benavidez: Mr. Chair. I'm over here.

Sorg: Oh. Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Thank you. Did you show us Option D?

Wray: Yes, yes Commissioner. It is this option here connecting the, utilizing the Mesilla lateral down to Union and then across.

Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a couple of questions. Has EBID been consulted at all about whether or not they might be agreeable to whatever needs to be agreed to?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. Yes. Yes, we involved them very early in this process.

Pedroza: What was their response?

Wray: They're, they're very open to, to this use of their facilities but they, they're bound by law. They have to have the agreement before ...

Pedroza: I see.

Wray: This use can be done. So that, that's non-optional. But ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Wray: They're, they're certainly happy to enter into negotiations to create such an agreement.

Pedroza: Okay. Do you have any idea how long that would take?

Wray: I can't speak to that.

Pedroza: Okay. I think the other questions that I had you've already answered. It, let me just make sure. The BPAC chose Option B?

Wray: That's correct Councilor.

Pedroza: And the Technical Advisory Committee also chose Option B.

Wray: That's correct.

Pedroza: Do you have any information for us as to why they liked Option B?

Wray: The, the BPAC for the most part seemed to, to want to utilize the option that was currently being utilized by cyclists and pedestrians that, as, as things are right now. The, the, the Technical Advisory Committee seemed more persuaded by the, the, the lower technical hurdles of implementation of Option B. I don't know if Mr. Murphy wants to, to add anything if he had different impressions than I did or ...

Pedroza: Okay. Well I'll, I'll give my opinion. I, I also think that I don't like Option A because I just, without any real you know just from my own experience I think University's a little tiny bit more dangerous than, than Union. So I would think that Union would be much more suitable for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. And I think that's all. Thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Thank you Councilor.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Any others? I see the Mayor's hand up. Mayor ...

Barraza: Thank you. Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to make a few comments and concerns I have regarding the different options that are before us. I know that I have met on different occasions with Trustee Linda Flores and with the BPAC Representative from the Town of Mesilla, Ashleigh Curry who is in the audience this afternoon, and I've also had met with Debbi Lujan who is on the Technical Committee and I have talked to Gary Esslinger also from EBID regarding the options that have been presented and available to us. I, I just think that, I think the BPAC and I think in our conversation with Ashleigh, I'm not so sure and I'd like to hear her comments also that the BPAC did not recommend Option B. Can I ...

Wray: The B, the B ...

Barraza: Can, is it okay to ask her this Mr. Chair?

Sorg: Welcome Ashleigh.

Curry: Thank you very much, thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Members of the Committee. Thank you Mayor Barraza. Yes it's true. When we were at the April meeting we were informed that it, there was an impasse between the Town of Mesilla and EBID as well as an impasse between the County

and EBID and we wouldn't, and the laterals were not an option. So we were not given that option. After that meeting I met with you and Trustee Flores and we realized that that was a misunderstanding and that at that point we talked about, we went to the May meeting, there was a May meeting of the BPAC and we talked about it at the May meeting and we requested that we do use laterals at any opportunity. So we were never given a vote on the option of using laterals. So I would like to say that as the BPAC Vice-Chair that is not represented at this meeting right now, that we were not given that option even though in our May meeting we did discuss it. The meeting minutes were not available before this meeting so we don't have any of that out yet. But it is not the, the BPAC's first choice. We were asked to actually just even table it I believe to not have recommendation B. So we're really going, in fact it's not even D that we would, we would, if we were given a vote right now I would speak on behalf of the BPAC that we would've voted for D but I actually would even like to say that we discussed using, and I believe it's called the Laguna lateral, the one that goes kind of through Mesilla Park ending at The Bean.

So the Mesilla lateral, I think that the BPAC again if, if all options were presented we would've chosen another option that would've been using the Laguna lateral through Mesilla Park so the Union Avenue, cutting off before you get to McDowell, and the Laguna lateral, the Laguna lateral all the way up to Calle del Norte. I strongly feel and I, and again I speak for members of the BPAC on behalf of them as well that it is not an option to use Highway 28. This isn't, this is a multi-use trail. You've got to put the four-year-olds out there, you've got to, you know this is, this is for pedestrians, it's for bicycles and everything. If you're a bicyclist and you want to ride on Highway 28 you know that's fine if you're a *(inaudible)*. But you can't, the whole point of a multi-use trail is to be community-minded and really beyond just the cyclists. We've got to think of the parents and strollers or where do you go with your kids to learn how to ride a bike? A lateral, it, the laterals are a great opportunity where you're really free of traffic. Here, ride ahead to that next intersection and stop there. That's, that's what the rest of the multi-use trail is. I ride the multi-use trail, the other part of it on almost a weekly basis and it's great to see families out there using it for what it's intended. If we were to use Highway 28 I feel that that would be a great flaw in, in the connection of the, the multi-use trail and I don't feel that it would complete it. I know the MPO did say that you know just for the sake of getting it completed now it doesn't mean that it's an end-all-be-all, that we could come back and revisit. But I think the realities of coming back and revisiting this after we've called this complete are slim to none. So that's, that's my recommendation Mayor Barraza. I think, I, I hope that answered your question in ...

Barraza: Yes it did.

Curry: Rather a lengthy way.

Barraza: Yeah it did.

Curry: Thank you.

Barraza: Okay. Thank you. I, Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Barraza: And I know that I, I really would like to sit at the table more with EBID and get a better clarification from them or a commitment from them saying that they are in support of this prior to make, taking a vote on this and to hear more from the BPAC regarding this resolution. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair. May, may I interject to make a couple of points?

Sorg: Sure.

Wray: Two things that, that we need to keep in mind, MPO staff did not bring this back to the BPAC after, after the, the new information came to light because the BPAC does not meet again until July and we are staring down the barrel of a September TIP, or September TAP deadline and one of the reasons why we have been moving so quickly on this is to be able to get a, an alignment designated so that it can be, so that this, this map, this plan can be utilized in support of TAP applications. Given the time constraints that we're facing we didn't feel like we had the opportunity to take it back to the BPAC for any further recommendation as we're already, this is June. We only have a couple more months to assemble relevant TAC packets, or excuse me TAC packets to get them submitted in to NMDOT. So for that reason we did not bring it back to the BPAC.

Point two is with relation to the Laguna lateral. The Laguna lateral would cross through Dona Ana County jurisdiction so it would require an agreement between Dona Ana County and EBID in order for that, for Laguna to, to be considered. It was always the opinion of Dona Ana County staff every time that we asked from the, that section agreement was not going to be forthcoming. We did consider Laguna for an extended period during this process but due to the, the recommendation of Dona Ana County staff we ultimately discarded it as being unfeasible.

Sorg: Could you do me a favor and with your pointer on the, thank, where is that Laguna lateral?

Wray: Laguna, it, it begins alongside the Union Trail up, I'm, I'm not going to be particularly exact. I apologize.

Sorg: That's okay.

Wray: But somewhere in, in this particular neighborhood and then proceeds across Dona Ana County jurisdiction and then up to, to pass by right around in there and then off to points north.

Sorg: It does, does it cross Highway 28 ...

Wray: No.

Sorg: At Avenida de Mesilla?

Wray: No. It does not.

Sorg: At The Bean there is a crossing there of a, a lateral isn't there?

Wray: The, there is. The, the issue is, is one that would be faced by an NM-28 option as well as there is no room for anything along this stretch of Calle del Norte. That, that stretch is what it is and there will not be any changes implemented there.

Sorg: *(inaudible.*

Wray: But the, the, the decisive reason ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Wray: Why we discarded the Laguna lateral was because of the recommendation of Dona Ana County staff.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? Yes Trustee Flores.

Flores: I would just like to say we asked at the last meeting because of the misunderstanding for a copy of what the City has with EBID and I know a, a copy was forwarded to the Mayor. I read over it and I told Cynthia and I might've cc'ed it to the Mayor as well saying that I didn't see any problems with at least what EBID had the City, their, what, I don't know if it's an MOU or ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Flores: What you, we, but it, I didn't see any problems with it. So I don't foresee any problems with having a lateral now. I know that I was told by officials from the County so I can see how Laguna's off the, off the table. But definitely I don't see the other two options being off the table and again

with Union I will admit I think it's probably safer for children to go through Union because you do have less traffic. Here's my dilemma is I know young kids, middle schoolers, high schoolers are going to be using University to get to Whataburger or to get, to cross that area anyway. So where would I rather have a young child be directed? Union and these laterals and I think cyclists would rather use the laterals because it's just nicer not to have cars around, not to be breathing car exhaust fumes. But I just, I worry that if we go through Union that University is going to be forgotten and I know Viva Dona Ana, we have plans for University. I'm just concerned about the teens and possible accidents there but I see that you had four accidents on Union. You know it's just what are your, what are your concerns and then there's the additional concern of maintenance. I absolutely want Union be, University because of my fear of an accident with teenagers who I think are more likely to take chances and then if we also have something going on with Union because you, I've been told in the past, "Well you can still have the University corridor. We're not cutting that off." Well number one, I just think if you take care of Union then there's not going to be much of an impetus to then take care of University and if we end up doing University and Union that's a lot for Mesilla to handle as far as costs are concerned. So, but I'm not going to fight Union as much as I had, after talking to Bencomo and Ashleigh and then bringing up the children issue because I just think of it as an adult, well yeah you know I can, I would like something safer for University but thinking about young children, I know how easily they run off. So that's all I have to say.

Sorg: Trustee Flores if I could just ask you a little clarification. When you're talking about University are you mainly talking about the crossing at Main Street and Valley Drive or is it the rest of University?

Flores: I'm talking University, actually it doesn't cross through Valley Drive. Valley Drive, you can get there through a back road that's a, that goes off to Wal-Mart, it's a little further down Main Street. But University basically crosses with I-10. You know there's like a hit, where it hits Main Street and I-10 under the overpass, it's really dangerous and I know, I have a neighbor who's in I think the seventh grade now, he may be a sixth grader, seventh grader. I've seen him on his skateboard crossing, and I know where he's going. He's going to Whataburger. And I know there's no way I can talk to him and tell him, "That's very dangerous." He's not, he's going to keep doing it and so are other kids his age and so that, and then kids riding bikes could, you know going to practice to Zia for soccer or baseball, late at night, you know I just had those concerns for them as well as the kids that are going to Zia Middle School. But really it's the ...

Sorg: Okay.

Flores: After-hours, late at night or just kids when they're together ...

Sorg: Understand.

Flores: Risk-takers.

Sorg: I'll, let's let Councilor Pedroza say something first and then Commissioner Garrett and then the Mayor again.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to remind people that it, there's already a plan to build a hotel across the street from the IHOP which will bring even more congestion and traffic to University. So I think it may, you know understandably if there have been more accidents on Union than on University well maybe that needs to be taken into consideration but I think that University is a high-speed street and with more traffic because of the hotel, etc. and, and so on. I, I think that that would be very, very dangerous. Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to work through a couple of issues, I think the, the point that was made earlier about the purpose of the loop trail as a multipurpose is really important for us to keep in mind. This is not I think the same thing as sort of local, "How do you get to your school?" which is important in its own right and we need to be able to identify projects to support safety in terms of kids being able to bike to school and bike around and, and that kind of thing. Similarly, I, I think there's going to be bicycle traffic on University that has to do with students at the university and, and we, that's part of their responsibility along with the City to, to make that a, a safe place. I would hope that regardless of, let's just say if we pick a Union alignment that that wouldn't preclude the idea of doing whatever we can do reasonably within the confines of the existing right-of-way and structures to make that as safe as, as we can for, for cyclists, because there is going to be some cycling going through there. And, but I don't think that that should wag the tail of the entire trail on the southern end.

I was really convinced when we had the, the presentation the last time we, we talked about this about the, the inherent problems of Valley and Main and University. It's just, and the railroad tracks, it's just a mess in terms of, of getting across there. It's much less of a mess crossing at Union and I think it's, it's important to recognize that the extension of the, the trail from on the southern side of the university ties in nicely. So partly the, what they're doing it seems to me is, is moving the trail not through the center of the university but the southern part of the university in order to allow for traffic if you will to come off of that into the university. That

makes sense to me. So I really strongly support the idea of a Union alignment.

I think the question that how, that, that we're faced with has to do with whether at this point to use the, the Mesilla lateral then others basically to take Union to the Mesilla lateral and, and run that up or to go with an alignment that we don't have mapped out here which would be either using the Laguna lateral off of Union all the way up to The Bean, I'm just going to say The Bean, or to go Union to McDowell, up McDowell which doesn't seem to have a huge amount of traffic on it and it looks like a nice place to bike, and connect then from, at that point you hit Zia and that's I believe a connecting point for the Laguna lateral as well. There're going to be problems of addressing how you take the trail to the lateral at both ends through this alignment. But I see that as being that's why you have projects. This is a, this is a schematic that we're generally approving as a, as an alignment.

And let me just say in terms of, of the County, I have a deep disagreement with our overly conservative legal force. I think that they are being totally unreasonable about multijurisdictional sharing of public space. They want to be completely indemnified for anything that might happen on there and that's, it, it's all about liability. The City has found a way to deal with that. I think other responsible entities can deal with that, and quite frankly if there's an accident whether you've got a clause in it or not they're going to try to sue you. So I think that the point here is, is just to say I understand staff is marching to certain orders, that has never come to the Commission as a policy issue for us to act on. And I would personally aggressively support this kind of thing in terms of working with EBID, working with the public and the MPO and the Town of Mesilla. It just makes so much more sense to do this as a quality thing and the rest of people are just going to have to swallow hard and keep going. But, and maybe they'll be able to get legislation at the legislature. That's what they're looking for. I, I just don't, I don't think that as a policy board we should, we should basically kind of stand for that. And I'm willing to take a lead in terms of the, of the County Commissioner saying, "That's not right for Dona Ana County to hold up this project." We need to sit down, work with EBID, hear their concern, have our concerns, and then find a way to make it happen. So I strongly would actually support Option E which would be Union to McDowell to the Laguna lateral and connecting at that point with Calle del Norte. Let me just, I'm not sure that, is, do we, I mean we've got options here but as a policy board we can also introduce amendments, correct?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Yes, the Policy Committee can designate whatever ...

Garrett: Okay.

Wray: You wish.

Garrett: So I, I just want to put out that that seems to me to be a really high-quality experience that's really in the spirit of, of the loop trail and you know the whole point of getting it on the map is so we can actually get money to work through the issues and to get the money to solve the problems. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Garrett.

Pedroza: May I ask ...

Sorg: I would, I would need to know where you're talking about. I don't know, I'm not that familiar with this part of the world.

Wray: If, if I may attempt to, to retrial what Commissioner Garrett ...

Sorg: Okay, please.

Wray: Stated, if I'm remembering entirely correctly, the Commissioner's proposal would be to pick up approximately at the, the end of the Union, of the existing Union Trail, move north and I, where, did you want it to connect to one of the, the, the other roads here or just follow the trail all the way up to approximately The Bean?

Garrett: Well it's easier to go from The Bean where you've got your ...

Wray: Okay.

Garrett: Pointer and to follow that down to Zia which is right at the ...

Wray: Right about ...

Garrett: Intersection of McDowell. And ...

Wray: Approximately there.

Garrett: And then the question really has to do with the quality of experience whether you come down McDowell or whether you stay on the lateral all the way down to Union which I think would be the best option. In other words we just pick up the lateral where it comes close to, which is probably, it's really close to Mesilla Elementary, isn't it?

Curry: It's Mesilla Park Elementary.

Garrett: Mesilla Park Elementary, yeah. That's right.

Curry: Thank you Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. I appreciate that. It, the lateral does intersect Union Avenue and it's right at Mesilla Park Elementary so I, my personal recommendation in favor of staying off roads as much as possible is just to stay off McDowell and just keep, be on the lateral the whole way from Union Avenue all the way to The Bean. The traffic gets, as the Town of Mesilla knows well the, the traffic gets pretty awful on McDowell during Zia's pick-up and drop-off times. I would be in favor of bypassing that, that McDowell option entirely and just doing the lateral from Union all the way to The Bean. Thank you.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Garrett: Could I just get a point of clarification on that?

Sorg: Yeah. Please do.

Garrett: The, the crossing of the lateral on University is east of ...

Curry: Thank you ...

Garrett: It's, it's east, east of, of Zia, right?

Curry: No. It's ...

Sorg: West.

Curry: It's actually west of Zia.

Garrett: It's west, okay.

Curry: There's a little subdivision, there's a little subdivision ...

Garrett: Okay.

Curry: About, what's, is it, what's it called, the Bold ...

Flores: Mesilla Farms.

Curry: Mesilla Farms. Mesilla Farms subdivision ...

Garrett: I know where that's at.

Curry: And it's just past that.

Garrett: Got it. Okay.

Curry: Yeah.

Garrett: It actually forms the boundary I think for, for that. Okay.

Curry: Yes. It's an, it, there's, is a lateral behind Zia but it's not the Laguna lateral.

Garrett: The same one, okay.

Curry: Yeah. Thank you.

Garrett: Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Who else has a comment? Commissioner, no, Councilor ...

Wray: It's hard isn't it?

Sorg: Councilor Eakman first, or the Mayor was next, excuse me. And then Councilor ...

Barraza: Oh, no. That's okay. I just want to clarify something also is that we were basing a lot of our, our decisions I guess on University. The reason we talk about University so much is we're in the process, we just had a study done to, we call it the University study corridor where we will be hopefully getting some funding to implement the multi-use paths on there which are for pedestrian and for bicyclists. And so we thought we could incorporate everything onto University based on the study that Bohannan Huston had done and there would, hopefully, we would not need additional funding for the multi-use trail if we were able to go through with it, this University project. And since they were already there it was just so much easier to incorporate it into that.

Sorg: Understand.

Barraza: Okay. Thanks.

Sorg: Councilor Eakman now.

Eakman: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd like to speak to the tourist experience that I'd like to see come out of completing this trail, as I started to talk about last month. And when we were talking about it I immediately went to Option D because it would be nice if the visitors could have some relief as they're

going along. If they're on University they could hardly take their eyes off of where they're headed at that time. They couldn't enjoy what surroundings, whereas if they're on Union they can actually look around and absorb the environment, and if they can take a lateral somewhere along that's even more relief to just enjoy the trip. When tourists come to town to do something like this, it's not to see how fast they can do it. It's about the experience itself and getting off their bicycles and maybe doing a little shopping and maybe getting a beverage or getting some ice cream. It is something that can bring people to our community. They can spend a day easily, more if they'd like taking this multi-use trail and so myself, I'm absolutely behind D or E either one for the idea the tourists and even the people who maybe don't bicycle every day to see how fast they can get down to La Mesa but actually just want to enjoy time with their family or their spouse or something of that nature so that would be my opinion. Thank you.

Sorg: Any others?

Benavidez: One question.

Sorg: Yes Commissioner.

Benavidez: Thank you Mr. Chair. I was looking at the, I was looking at the Option E that Commissioner Garrett wanted to do with the lateral but I notice that at one point they're going to pass University, correct?

Wray: Yes. Yes.

Benavidez: Okay.

Wray: They'll be crossing it.

Benavidez: And how is that going to work, is, the people have to stop and cross over or are they going to build a bridge to go over, or how is that gonna work?

Wray: Mr. Chair, excuse me, Commissioner Benavidez. I can't answer that at this point. The, that's getting into a design-level question that we're not prepared to consider really ...

Benavidez: Okay.

Wray: At, at this moment in time. I, I and, and Mr. Taraschi went out into the field and looked over, physically went through all of the available options. I don't particularly recall right off the top of my head right now what the nature of the crossing of the, the Laguna lateral and University was but I,

I'm confident that it could be, could be done safely and effectively. I, I will say that.

Benavidez: Okay. I believe she has a comment.

Sorg: Ashleigh.

Benavidez: Ashleigh.

Curry: Ashleigh. Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Councilor Benavidez. I'd like to just reference the other points in the multi-use trail. There are numerous places in the trail where the trail crosses Roadrunner, you know on the northern parts of the Outfall Channel and what traditionally happens is the cyclist comes and treats that as an, as a normal intersection. The traffic on University Avenue at that end is very mild and it, you just treat it, you come to an edge of a trail just like people who walk that lateral do right now, they stop. I don't think any engineering treatment needs to be placed there.

Benavidez: Okay.

Curry: It's just that when you come to an intersection you stop, when the road is clear you go. I don't think it's an issue at all because it's the top end of University Avenue where there's very little traffic for the most part and again, like it is with the rest of the multi-use trail as the City has done you just get there and you know there, maybe there's a, maybe there's a crosswalk or something like that. You can look at Valley as an example. That's a much busier street and the multi-use trail crosses Valley.

Benavidez: Yes.

Curry: So I don't think a bridge needs to be built or anything like that. A, possibly a crosswalk and signage but beyond that I think it's a fairly easy cross.

Benavidez: Great. Thank you so much.

Curry: Thank you.

Benavidez: I, I really appreciate that explanation.

Curry: Sure.

Sorg: Okay. Mr. Trent first. Then Mr. Garrett.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a couple of comments and then I'll have one question for, for Andrew. My first comment is I agree with Mayor

completely, is we're, the Department still supports regardless of which option we choose doing something with University in front of Zia. For clarification though I believe that that study goes from 28 to 478. I don't think it's addressing anything crossing of University, crossing of Main, crossing of Valley, and tying in. So it's specifically dealing with just a, a portion of the, of the corridor that's relayed in these options. So we are committed to moving forward with the study as, but as I've reiterated before we currently have no construction funding tied to that corridor. The study will give us some options but that construction money has not been obligated or even reviewed at any point.

Sorg: University you mean.

Doolittle: Correct. University.

Sorg: Yeah.

Doolittle: So I agree with the Mayor that we are a supporter of continuing to improve that corridor specifically. The other comment that I have that I think goes along with what Commissioner Benavidez was, was sharing is I have difficulty supporting an Option E only because it has not been evaluated by the Technical Advisory Committee so ultimately we don't know what, what true safety issues are, are in place, what they would need to be implemented to, to follow that trail. I'm not saying it's a bad one but my concern is implementing something now that hasn't been fully evaluated by the two supporting Committees I have some concern with. And then ultimately the question I, that I have for Andrew is I understand the timeline's tied to the TAP applications and ultimately the need to, to incorporate these amendments. But what is the intent of including a map that may or may not be realistic or all the options haven't been presented to the two Committees. What's the intent of attaching a map and then how are we moving forward with the TAP applications?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Doolittle. We're not just attaching a map. We're amending the entire MTP and so at that point the MTP as a whole becomes a supporting document to the TAP application which in our estimation, not being the, the ultimate evaluators of the application but due to every, everything that we have heard greatly strengthens the quality of the application so that it is much more likely to, to, to gain funding is the purpose behind this.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

Doolittle: Just one clarification question Andrew. What, what exactly are we hoping to apply for through the TAP application? Are we looking for study money, are we looking for construction money?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Doolittle. That depends upon the decisions of the jurisdiction in question. The MPO cannot apply for TAP funding ourselves. Our, our member, our member jurisdictions are the ones who have to do that. So I believe I said early in the presentation I, MPO staff has met with NMSU staff within the past couple of weeks as a matter of fact and I was not personally able to attend that meeting but it was my understanding that NMSU was very strongly intending to submit a TAP application for this portion of the proposed trail that crosses their campus along this alignment. As far as any other jurisdiction intending to do anything for this particular TAP cycle, we have met very, very preliminarily with Town of Mesilla staff back in February I believe it was. Correct me if I'm wrong. It, it was early in the year, very early in this process where there was some converse, come back here, where there was some conversation about options along, TAP applications along the Calle del Norte corridor. As far as I know those are the only two projects that are sort of percolating right now that I am aware of. I don't know if Mr. Murphy wishes to elaborate any further. Doesn't look like it. But those are the two projects that I am aware of right now.

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, if I may I just have one more quick question and I, I'll be finished. So ultimately if we agree on or approve one of the options today and then for instance we get commitment from the County to pursue agreements with EBID and then either through the County or through the Town of Mesilla they ultimately determine that Option E is a better one that could then be their ...

Wray: That ...

Doolittle: Option for a TAP application.

Wray: The, this Committee can amend the, the MTP ...

Doolittle: Okay.

Wray: Whenever it sees fit.

Doolittle: Very good.

Wray: It can direct staff to begin a process to do that.

Doolittle: All right. Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Andrew.

Sorg: Yes Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I thank everybody for their comments. It was certainly very enlightening. I think that at this point my choice and I'll just say it so that we can possibly begin to, to get some sort of consensus would be Option D. The main reason that I withhold, or, or question going to Option E is because it seems as if that will be delayed, it will delay it because we will have to get more agreement from the County and so forth and it seems as if D is off the, off the main trafficky areas. It can be used fairly easily and so that would be my choice. Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. Would you just clarify, the loop trail has a number of other kinds of trails that connect off of it, correct?

Wray: Yes. Yes Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett, yes.

Garrett: Okay. I, I, I point that out because again if we look at the loop trail as a particular kind of concept I don't think that that's a conflict with the work on University or in any way, I've never looked at this as backing off of the work on University and I think that needs to continue. I, I will say that, that I, the, the idea of the, the Laguna lateral as a connection between Union and Calle del Norte to me is very, very attractive. And I want to tie into something that Councilor Eakman said about tourism. Let's just suppose that you are able to get people who are just riding the trail because it's a nice place to visit and you know having the flow of the loop on the east side of Mesilla seems to me to be a, an easier way for somebody who's riding along that, that loop and wants to go get an ice cream cone on the plaza to get off on Boutz. Boutz is 25 miles an hour and, and in order to connect in it's, it's friendlier I think in terms of connecting in with the commercial center of the, of the town than is the Mesilla lateral which takes you all the way on the other side. Now you could always spin off if you wanted to I guess on Union and find your way up but that's not an, in other words I'm just saying that it's not a bad experience and there's a logical connection that can be made in terms of, of doing that. I, I hear Mr. Doolittle's concern about the, the other two committees reviewing. Did I understand that the other two committees did not look at C and D?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Yes, that is correct. We were operating under an erroneous assumption at that time.

Garrett: So I, I would just suggest that if, if we follow the logic that we shouldn't vote for something that hasn't been seen by the other technical

committees that precludes anything except A and B which to me in terms of policy doesn't make sense. So what I'd like to ask is if we were to conditionally approve an option that used the Laguna lateral as a connector, as a, as a principle, as a concept, in order to keep moving with your deadline could we then have you meet with the other two advisory committees, come back to us so, you've got everything ready okay to, to move this thing forward but what we would like to do is to get their input on any technical considerations before we say yes and we could do that in August.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. We could do that. We, we could, we could do a provisional adoption today and then that should probably satisfy the requirements of having the, the supporting document and then bring it through the advisory committees and then back to this Committee in, in August, yes.

Garrett: It, it's a bit convoluted Mr. Chair but I believe that it's the right way to do the, the process and it also is right to me in terms of considering options that have been, been brought up. And I, I just want to say one, one last thing. I, I think that the Committee in terms of the Policy Committee, our indication that this is the kind of experience that we're supporting for a multi, you know for this loop trail is part of what's needed in order to move forward through the issues that the County's having with EBID and of making, you know sort of clearing the way for other things. If we give other options that people don't have to face hard decisions they're going to go somewhere else. So if this is the best way to provide this kind of experience in terms of cycling then I think we need to accept that as a challenge and do as much as we can to see that it, it, it's properly vetted and that we get the support we need to move forward. Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Just one question. Do you feel the County is confident in getting an okay on the County's portion of this canal?

Garrett: I've made a commitment that I will push ...

Sorg: Okay.

Garrett: As hard as I can.

Sorg: Okay.

Garrett: The other thing, let me just, one, one thing too just in terms of timing and money, the big piece that is not developed in terms of, of Option E if we go with a lateral is the lateral. And actually getting moving on that because people are already riding on Union and I know they're already riding on, on Avenida, or, or Calle del Norte. So being able to, to say that's a piece that

we really want to focus on and get work done on, you don't have to do the entire thing all at one time so you could phase it, okay and depending on what kinds of monies were available and all that I, I just think it's probably going to be a three-phase project and there are issues in their own right when you get to Calle del Norte. So I ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Garrett: We did, we've really not spent a whole lot of time on the issue of Union and Calle del Norte. So the issue to me is really that, that ...

Sorg: Yes.

Garrett: That connection between the, those two ...

Sorg: Yes, I was going to make a comment similar to that. The, good question on, on these laterals, is there any kind of construction, maintenance, reconstruction, or any kind of things you want, need to do on a lateral to make it part of the loop? Or is it, can be part of the loop as is?

Wray: Mr. Chair. The, the vision that staff has had consistently throughout this and I don't know if it's been consistently expressed to any of the committees or the jurisdictional officials but we have always envisioned it being a paved, a, a paved facility. It is our belief that this can be done. There, even on the laterals I, I will point out at the, I'll take this opportunity to point out even along the laterals there will be portions where there will be some right-of-way pinches and issues like that. We're not going to get away from that no matter which option we select. But our, our, our vision was always that it was going to be a paved facility all the way around ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Wray: All, all the way around all four legs. Not being an engineer I don't know how much that might cost, how much, how much, how much ...

Sorg: I'm not asking.

Wray: Labor that would be but ...

Sorg: I'm not asking, yeah.

Wray: That was the vision and, and we believe that it is an, a, a, an obtainable vision. If I may interject at this time Ms. Curry from the BPAC wishes to, to speak to you again if that, if that's possible.

Sorg: Well if I let her.

Wray: Yes, yes. If you let her.

Sorg: Yes Ms. Curry. You could go ahead and speak.

Curry: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again I apologize for taking up so much time but I just want to point out Commissioner Benavidez mentioned crossing over University Avenue. It is a concern to me if you choose Option D you'd be crossing over Highway 28 and at the point that Highway 28 intersects Union Avenue it's 45 miles an hour. So I think that that, if you were using that as a multi-use trail that's a bigger consideration to me than crossing over, I believe the speed limit and correct me if I'm wrong is about 25 miles an hour on University if you were using the laterals. So I think a bigger consideration when you're looking at studies and talking about what engineering studies have been done I think that that's a, a much bigger consideration, Option D crossing at 45 miles an hour a, a much wider road.

Sorg: Well and also you can add to that, other crossings of some of our arterials in the City here actually use a crosswalk with flashing yellow lights that you turn on and off as a pedestrian or bicyclist.

Curry: Right.

Sorg: If you want to get real fancy we could put one of those on University.

Curry: Right. Well and ...

Sorg: Or any other crossing.

Curry: At, at The Bean if you were to use The Bean one there's already a signal light there.

Sorg: Yes.

Curry: So that you'd already have a crossing and wouldn't have to put anything fancy in. To me 45 miles an hour is, you know again you've got kids in tow, that's quite a big, a big piece of road to, to cross over at a high speed with kids. And that would in my opinion support going down to using a lower speed limit and, and a signaled intersection.

Sorg: Very good.

Curry: Okay. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Ashleigh.

Curry: I think that's it for me.

Sorg: That was great.

Curry: Thank you.

Sorg: You bet. I, I, I was going to continue on, you touched upon that short segment of path, Calle, Calle del Norte where on D Option it turns to the lateral and between there and Highway 28 as being a problem. We, could you, was that going to be too much of a problem to extend that path there to Highway 28?

Wray: Mr. Chair. Throughout this process staff has, has always tried to keep in mind the, the reality that there may have to be some compromises in the implementation of the trail. The, the, the southern leg as I said has historically always been the most challenging portion of this to complete which is the reason why there's never been a completely designated portion of this loop from end to end. It, essentially a sign would be the only thing that would be possible to, to, to put in along that portion just saying that "This is the connecting point between X and Y along the multi-use loop trail." There, there's no, the buildings literally abut the edge of the roadway there.

Sorg: That's right.

Wray: There wouldn't be possibility of doing anything more than that but in, in the interests of completing the trail staff feels that that, if, if that is the, the selected alternative or, or an alternative that includes that, staff believes that that's an acceptable compromise to make given the, the relatively short span ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Wray: That that would cover.

Sorg: Okay. I couldn't help but notice this, the Laguna lateral we're talking about here does shorten up the, the route ...

Wray: It does, yes.

Sorg: For a bit. It does take away the added path that would have to be on Union using the existing one that's in the city there. I'm proud to say that the City has its part of the trail done. And ...

Wray: Well Mr. Chair, not across Union, not across Main.

Sorg: Main?

Wray: On, on Union. It doesn't ...

Sorg: Oh yeah.

Wray: Doesn't continue.

Sorg: And that's, that's my next point. If we do use Union crossing Main, it would be much easier to put a overpass there for pedestrian and, than it would be on University.

Wray: It would.

Sorg: Yes. So there's a little plus there. I, the final thing is what I'm concerned about is what Mr. Doolittle said. Can we do this in a reasonable amount of time so we don't miss out on proper planning and funding and so forth?

Wray: Mr. Chair. Following along Commissioner Garrett's suggestion I think that if, if, if the, the Policy Committee adopts or, or firms up an adoption of a document in August that will still be before, that'll still be before the September deadline so technically we only need to have the document on the shelf ready to go by then, but I think that it, it would behoove us for the confidence of potentially applying jurisdictions to have some sort of statement of intent at the very least from this Committee about which alignment this Committee would intend to support.

Sorg: Not, not necessarily an amendment to the resolution?

Wray: I, I mean the, the resolution all, all we're citing is Exhibit A so right now we don't know what Exhibit A is if, if ...

Sorg: Oh, okay.

Wray: Just speaking hypothetically ...

Sorg: Okay.

Wray: If, if the Committee selects Option, an Option E staff will go back, we'll, we'll put together a map just like this, we'll, we'll circulate it around the, the Committee Members for their review and just to make sure that it is in fact reflective of the Committee's will.

Sorg: Okay. Mr. Murphy you have some more to add?

Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair. In the interest of keeping the process, or this process clean and less confusing I, I may also suggest consider continuing this discussion item till the August, give staff you know direction to proceed based on the discussion here and that way we retain the, we, we keep the public comment period for the MTP amendment open, that we don't start a new MTP process and then we can go ahead and vote on the matter in August.

Sorg: So are you suggesting we table this until August?

Murphy: I think the, I, I think the word we want to use is "continuance" but ...

Sorg: A continuance, okay.

Murphy: But I, I, I think there's a lot of discussion. I think there's a lot, lot of ideas that we can take back to the other committees to get some more, more robust discussion on and then, and then bring back, bring back the matter with new evidence.

Sorg: Okay. Do I hear a motion to have a continuance?

Benavidez: So moved.

Garrett: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Commissioner Benavidez and seconded by Commissioner Eakman. One more round of discussion before we vote?

Wray: Mr., Mr. Chair. We actually have an active motion already on the floor ...

Pedroza: Oops.

Wray: From the beginning of this discussion before I gave my presentation. I guess we'll need, and I did ...

Sorg: We'll need a vote on that?

Wray: I think we would just need to have whoever made the motion withdraw it, and I actually regret I didn't write it down so I'm not sure who, who made the motion.

Sorg: I think that we ...

Eakman: I did, and I will, I will withdraw.

Sorg: Okay.

Wray: Okay.

Sorg: Good.

Wray: Then we're clear now.

Sorg: Okay. Do, so the, has there been a motion for a continuance?

Pedroza: Yes.

Sorg: Okay. And second? Okay. So final words?

Pedroza: Question.

Sorg: Yes.

Pedroza: Something.

Sorg: Commission, Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you. What would be very very helpful to me would be if, if the map could be revised to show what kinds of communications there are from the Laguna lateral up to The Bean so that I would know, maybe there are already paths that people use and, and love. But I don't know that and it's not shown on the, on the map at all. So ...

Sorg: Make sure.

Pedroza: Yeah. Yeah so that would help quite a bit. Thank you.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mayor.

Barraza: And one last.

Sorg: Barraza.

Barraza: It, I'd like to hear from EBID, if you have a conversation with EBID in support of the laterals, that it's okay and they're working with us to utilize the laterals. I, and I think that'll clarify some of the misgivings or concerns some of the Members have.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: We will endeavor to invite EBID staff to attend the August Policy Committee meeting when this discussion will resume so that they can, can hopefully give that, give that affirmation. The EBID is a member of the Technical Advisory Committee so by implication, by recommending an option they have stated their consent but we will invite them to the August meeting to, to have them say that in person.

Sorg: Okay. Any other, yes, Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: I want to emphasize one more time the economic generator this can be. Somebody is going to put together a map of the entire trail loop showing all the shopping opportunities on it, showing pictures of things, photo ops along the way, also mentioning where the bike shop is. I see somebody's going to put a bike shop right on the trail advertising new tires, air, food and beverage opportunities, refreshments, a place to park in the shade with a picnic lunch available, clothing souvenirs. All of these things will be done and it's going to really add to an economic base. I think what this could do for the community of Mesilla is outstanding and so I think people should be putting their thinking caps on and we should get some energy. Thank you.

Sorg: Couldn't agree with you more. This is actually what was talked about early days of, of this loop trail. Okay. One more time? Okay. Are we ready to vote then? Go ahead and call the roll.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Arzabal.

Arzabal: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Commissioner ...

Garrett: Garrett.

Sorg: Garrett.

Garrett: I regret that I have another conflict I have to get to.

Sorg: Okay.

Garrett: So we're done with the voting business.

Sorg: Yes.

Garrett: All right. Thanks.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Committee Training

Sorg: The next item is a discussion item and I'll turn the meeting over to our MPO staff.

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair under our Committee Training we have two, two training items for you. First one are, we had our scheduled Federal Aid that Mr.

McAdams is going to do but also given the, the last discussion and also since he'll be leaving us shortly and he's done a lot of work on that Mr. Taraschi's going to give a presentation on the, the, the Strava data that Andrew had in his presentation after Mr. McAdams does the Federal Aid training.

Sorg: Okay. Very good. So you're leaving us soon?

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Sorg: Oh.

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Sorg: Okay.

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Sorg: Okay.

McAdams: Mr. Chairman, Committee Members. I'd like to talk about the Federal Aid Highway Program and it's a real, this is a very complicated program so I'll go over it very brief, briefly. Basically, and this is from the, *(inaudible)* Federal Highway Program. The Highway Aid funds are authorized by Congress to assist the states to provide construction, reconstruction, and movement for bridges and highway. And through the local, it's also funding local lands program like BLM, forest, national parks, and any land that, other public lands. And the, the start, the statutes are: Establish the highway program that are, were found in Title 23 of U.S. code and also in regulatory in there so if you would like to see there's also a link and it goes to look at the introduction to highway aid program.

The first time basically we've been involved in the, as a, as a country and road building for quite a while but the, really the modern part of the USBR roads and later the FHWA was initiated to get the *(inaudible)* out of the road, out of the mud really to initiate farmer market routes first you know cause people started *(inaudible)* cars and they couldn't get their goods to market, or their cars to market you know to do stuff to. Later on other things were added. The, do, I won't go through all this but basically it's a whole litany of different laws, started in 1916 to bring what, the FHW's what it is today which is a very robust agency, a very, a, a lot of people involved and of course that's why we're here too as well. If you look at it started out with basically a form, or not a formula but looking at the state and the federal-state role meaning how the monies are transferred, what's the roles of federal and state in handing out transportation monies. And of course the big milestone was in 1944 which was establishment of the high, of the initiate sigh, highway system and

defense system too, and highway and defense. And then in 1956 was the established Highway Trust Fund and want to discuss that later. We know right now that a lot of discussion with the Highway Trust Fund cause there's not a lot of money and so I, we're going to, I think that, that FAST Act's make it robust but we still have to look at more money too. But of course in 1962 we created the Three Street Planning Process which we operate under and going down to '66 when the USC was formed and then another milestone was the NEPA which is National Environmental Protection Act and then going down to '73 where it's categorical funding, and continued on a lot of activities in '90s with ISTEA, ISTEA-21 SAFETEA-LU, and we discontinued the ISTEA format and looking at MAP-21, and the last one was the FAST Act which we're under right now which broadens to get more funding. We'll have to change some of the operating of Federal Aid Program.

If you look at core programs, Federal Aid Program is really, it's not one law, one act. It's really several programs, projects working in concert with, not concert but some, a unit. It's very loose unit to a certain degree. And this is just a listing of the many many programs of all, the National Highway Program, the Service Transportation Program, CMAQ and Congestion Mitigation, Highway Safety Improvement Program, Railroad Crossings, Metropolitan Planning, Transportation Alternatives, and this reef, relief program and discretionary program. And there are the, there's also other program for the federal lands and federal lease access program, national parks, and travel/transportation program. There are billions of dollars involved in this too so it's very, and all the, all the monies based, we get come from the highways from the federal aid.

The motivate, the source of revenues is the biggest thing is the motor fuel taxes which are special and special fuel taxes, truck *(inaudible)* and the general fund and the LUST fund that's related to underground tanks. If you look at the federal gasoline tax breakdown one goes to the Leaky Underground Storage Tank fund which we still, it's becoming a little bit *(inaudible)* but it's still going on and to getting, getting rid of those, the tanks that are, that are polluting ground water, and then the 18.4%, four cents are going to, 18.3 are going to Highway Trust Fund, of what, of 14, 15, what 44 for the Highway County, and 2.80, 86 cents for the Mass Transit Act by county.

Let's see, go on. You look at the average highway account income it's where is, where is the money coming from? From special fuels and diesel, tire, truck sales, truck and the great bulk of it are good 19.6 in gasoline tax, right. I give you that's approximately $30 to $35 billion per year, or fiscal year. One thing we discussed and at previous discussion we discussed the highway trust fund is having some troubles. If we don't, we're going to eventually have to up the highway gas tax or look at other, some other revenue to get the, yes. Yeah.

Sorg: Are those numbers in the pie chart dollars?

McAdams: They're cents. Bill, billions excuse me, billions of dollars.

Sorg: Billions of dollars. Thank you.

McAdams: Right. So yeah. So the great bulk comes from gasoline you know. And we know that right now that people are driving less, for whatever reason we don't know but we need to increase the tax, probably to the general fund or increase the gas tax or find I think another way of funding this source.

If you look at what we're doing right now is the transportation planning. One of the, the most important thing is the statewide Transportation Improvement Program because all the things for the state, TIPs and the RTPOs and also the MPOs TIP, MAP-21 which is really the FAST Act, I should've put in the FAST Act sort of precedes that, or, or a amends that and a lot of the things still true but I think the, the FAST Act is really related to more performance analysis. We have several products we do and we already discussed, discussed that last time; UWP, participation, citizen participation, long-range transportation plans, the TIP, and the one thing we *(inaudible)* is that we, all federal funds in transportation have to go, have, must be in and oh crap, and the STIP. But, but not oh crap, but I, that's really, STIP is wrong.

What is, what is one of the most, the corner pieces of environmental control and environmental regulations was NEPA which is the National Environmental Protection Act and that's really a umbrella for many many things and you look at the environmental justice, clean air *(inaudible)*, the safe, safe, safe water drinking act, *(inaudible)* protection *(inaudible)* protection, economic/social environmental effects. It's where our, on and on and more. So this a very important act which is amended as well. And we've built highways you have to be aware of get, being in conformance with NEPA.

If you look at one of the first and we, we off you, this, sort of background of really why, how this operates between the federal aid program, the federal aid programs are really, they give you the specification, the state mainly but also gives it our *(inaudible)* as well, what we have to do. So you look at from the very beginning we have to conform to state and federal regulations, pretty, federal regulations and looking at, really if you look at most project, majority of projects are through the state DOT and they have the oversight and the stewards of all the aspects of construction from beginning to end, from planning all the way to the end and maintenance as well operations. So when you look at engineering and pre-engineers to a *(inaudible)* artery, what's the environmental consideration, NEPA very you know. It may be nothing but you, if you have you know waterways, arroyos, etc. it could be very important. Context sensitive means that maintaining safety and mobility, we're looking at alternative solutions. If you look at some of the, the

product at Missouri and with University we look at no-build and that's also required, are different solutions too. So it, this I think is very important. And also what was really been at this, more than anything with since I been in transportation is public involvement. More and more of get what do the public think and then trying to work with the public as much as possible.

Adherence to federal standards, guidelines so it's the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials which really gives guideline for how roads to be done, bike ways, etc. with agreement to update it. DOTs are *(inaudible)* responsible of contracts to federal, for federal contract provisions *(inaudible)* you need that things like bid, fair bidding, you know how you aware the bids, how the standards are done, you know how the, the up, things like emergency or emergency vehicle or provisions of, of transportation through the, the sites and ensure integrity of the entire construction process, incentives or warranties, and also work safety, work safety and new construction technologies and procedures.

State DOTs are responsible for right-of-way acquisition as guaranteed by the, the fifth amendment you think the fifth amendment's something else but actually it, it talks about what is generally called "taking" which means no person can be deprived of, of life, liberty, or property without due process of law which mean they have to go through a court process or through a regulation process and if, nor shall private property be taken, called a "taking" in planning terms without just compensation. It goes on more beyond that, you know open process and not forced to, to give your land away and it's very important. So one of the thing is, one of the most difficult thing is to do is right-of-way acquisition because it's really it could be a very costly thing and a lot of time you see a lot of your *(inaudible)* right-of-way acquisition cause a very lengthy process as well sometimes.

If you operate, building, FHWA is not only involved with just building roads. It's also involved in operations you know. To build, maintain, and operate a transportation system that is safe, reliable, and secure and really looking at how does the FH, the DOT is kind of responsible implementing agencies. They, we, they process funds, they look in, at what, give suggestions but really the FHWA give the national leadership, conformity, they sort of regulate it, and also technology and standards as well. What, what a, what also operation means is trying to keep, create a community or connection between local, state, and federal transportation professional and elected officials, transportation planners, safety, public safe commute, university, and private industries. So what our role as the MPO is sort of get to, get everybody gathered so we can talk about these things and come to a, like we did today consensus or in cooperation instead of in, in, instead of being conflict, right. If you look at operations also looks at federal highway program, allow for funding for traffic management, for traffic monitoring. A lot of what we do is monitoring the light, looking at trucks, we're looking at all vehicle counts, bicycle counts

that we'll talk a bit later, traffic control, ITS capital improvements was in, Intelligent Transportation System. CMAQ which we don't have to worry about because we're not, we're attainment and also funding *(inaudible)* programs and ITS research funding.

If you have any quick questions you see us all here and we'd be glad to answer any, any question you have cause this is very complex rules and regulation. Even sometime we don't know them all. And also there's, if you go on the FHWA site you always find some essentials and we have a, if you look more you can read more about this. But we're always available. You can actually online there's plenty of FHWA site as well. Are there any questions by the Committee?

Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: I guess I'm a little surprised by the relatively small amount of money available for the national highway system.

McAdams: Mr. Eakman, Chairman. Yes. It's not, it's, as we know that we have a many problem with bridges and roads and the, the money needs, there's need to be more, more money. I think that's one of the big, about a couple of months I addressed this too about the, the highway TAC, the highway transit fund and we knew it's having problems so I think that we're looking at, I think it's congressional, a federal issue and that we're looking at, "How do we deal with this," with the highway trust fund and really have other general funds being coming from is that, I think also that, I think the federal government is used to some of the federal aids is looking for alternatives. One thing they're encouraging is toll roads. We can't do it in New Mexico, you see that. Or other sort of innovative financing to sort of make up the gap, you know. But I agree with you come, completely that, that we don't have enough money in the highway trust fund and that we should urge our, our congressmen and our state representatives to do, to try to urge some kind of a deal that can be done about this. But I agree, it's not enough, you know. We have, we have bridges that are collapsing and ...

Sorg: Yes, Councilor Eakman.

McAdams: Yeah.

Sorg: I actually have talked to our, our senators and they are in favor of adding more to it. But now isn't there an additional a, a gas tax that the state in, adds to that or is that 19.4 cents the total amount of tax?

McAdams: I think there's a ...

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair. That's, that's correct. The, this, this presentation was just centered on the federal gas ...

Sorg: Federal.

Murphy: The federal funds. The State of New Mexico as most, nearly or ...

Sorg: Every state.

Murphy: All other states have their own, own gas tax and ...

Sorg: Do you know offhand how much it is?

Murphy: It is 19.4 if I'm correct. Yes.

Sorg: That's the federal.

Murphy: That's the state and then the, the federal is, no it's 19.6 for the state and 18.4 for the federal.

Sorg: Ooh.

Murphy: If ...

Sorg: That's right?

Murphy: Somewhere, somewhere in that neighborhood.

Sorg: They're very close together then.

Murphy: Right. And, and you know less, less than half of New Mexico Department of Transportation's budget is federal funds. They're, over half of it is, is state money coming from that other gas tax ...

Sorg: Good point.

Murphy: Other excise taxes and, and you know various fees. And then just to kind of round it out, each of your local jurisdictions provide for your transportation funding in different sources, property tax, sales tax ...

Sorg: Correct.

Murphy: You know etc. So this presentation just covered the federal funding.

Sorg: I understand.

Murphy: But ...

Sorg: Yeah. understand.

Murphy: Every, there's, we've, we spend a lot more on transportation ...

Sorg: I understand. In fact ...

Murphy: And we never ...

Sorg: I was at a, a ...

Murphy: We never have enough.

Sorg: A, a transportation infrastructure conference in Dallas, Texas or just outside of Dallas, Texas, Irving, about four years ago, maybe five years ago and several people got up and said, and one of the things I, I learned there is that our federal trust fund is supplemented by other taxes too, to some extent.

Pedroza: I have a question.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. McAdams did you say that New Mexico cannot have toll roads? Why is that?

McAdams: I, Chairman, Councilor Pedroza. Yes, that's correct. That's in state law that ...

Pedroza: State law.

McAdams: We cannot, we cannot have toll roads. So there has to be a state law, a state legislation change that.

Pedroza: Oh, we'll change that. Okay.

McAdams: And next door they do it, in Texas they do it. They can do toll roads.

Pedroza: All right. Thank you.

Sorg: Does that include both public and private roads?

McAdams: I don't know. Is that true, public and private roads? Public and ...

Sorg: So ...

McAdams: Public and private roads are tolls?

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

McAdams: Okay.

Sorg: So if some private company wanted to build a road from A to B and charge toll on it they could do it?

McAdams: I, excuse me Councilor, Chairman, and I can't ...

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle has ...

McAdams: I can't answer that.

Sorg: Some comment.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I believe it's both public and private.

Sorg: It is, okay.

Doolittle: And the reason I think that is one it's, it's state statute. Two, we've been approached as you all are familiar, we're working on the West Mesa corridor study. We were approached by the trucking industry ultimately that they were hoping to build that facility, toll it to recoup their costs, and then hand that over to the Department and the preliminary guidance to them is they cannot do that because of state statute.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you very much. That's nice to have that clear, clarity. Okay. Any other comments, questions for this presentation? Thank you very much.

McAdams: Thank you very much.

Sorg: It's very good. Next.

Taraschi: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Many of you may not know me. My name is Zach Taraschi. I'm the planning tech for the MPO. What I have for you today is a presentation over a project that I've been working on largely over Strava Metro. And let me quickly go to their website for you guys real quick, start that out. So what is Strava Metro? It's data that's collected by the company Strava and they basically anonymize it, aggregate it and then they distribute it to agencies or anybody that wants to purchase the data from them. The way that data comes in is through both streets, origin destination, and intersections. And they've had a lot of

success with a lot of DOTs in the U.S. but also internationally. I think it was in Queensland, is that, is it in New Zealand? Oh, yeah. Australia, awesome. I'm a geographer and I don't even know that, it's great. But so yeah, they've had a lot of success with that so far and so we kind of wanted to go forward with this and kind of see what we could get from it. So let me go back to my presentation here.

So how does Strava work? Strava is an app that's free on both the Apple app store and Google play. And once you download it you basically just hit "record," you go out onto your activity and then once you're finished you hit "stop recording" and then it pulls up basically a map of your activity showing basically how long you were out, the miles you did, and your actual route. And then any friends or anybody that you know that you also have on Strava you can compare your efforts to them as well. So it's almost like an athletic social media per se, but, it's data that, or it's an app that people are already using so we thought that it'd be a good idea to maybe try it out and see what we could get from it.

So who's the target audience of Strava? It's pedestrians, runners, cycling groups, both recreation/commuter cyclist and that, that's something we actually really liked is that you can delineate in there whether it's a commute by bike or whether it's just a regular activity. And we can actually do that with our own collection of the data, is that we could see if it's a commuter or if it's just somebody doing it recreationally. So we got data, our, our data was kind of split up into two basically collection times. Very recent, the first set of data was for six months starting in November until March of this year. Our next data acquisition is going to be in October and it's going to be from April until September. So we're having very recent data and it's, it's actually very nice to have it that close to, well it's in the year that we're in. So the demographics that we have of it are up here on the screen for you. This is the October to March data. As you can see the cyclists were about 1,100, kind of male-dominated but the way that it's kind of stratified between the age groups is very appealing to us, that even though this is an app and it's on smart phones it's a lot of age groups that are using it. When it comes to the pedestrians or runners there was a little bit less of usage but the female population actually kind of went up with that. And it's still very evenly stratified between the age groups of anywhere from being young adults to middle-aged adults.

So going forward, what did we get from the Strava data that we've purchased? Well first of all we were able to generate a heat map for the pedestrians or runners. As you can see it's kind of centered towards the city core here, a lot of NMSU, A Mountain here, and then the Triviz Trail and what-have-you.

Going forward we also got a cycling heat map which a lot of it is generated outside of the city core, you know on the periphery of the city, probably people going on longer journeys, stuff like that. So then we're also able to get intersection data and the intersection data came in and it was basically anywhere where two streets came together they gave us an

intersection point for. What I did is I pared it down to the signalized intersections all across our area. And this map shows the actual total time waited for that six months at each one of the intersections. So we can see there's a lot more time waited here towards NMSU, towards the city center, not so much on the periphery. So we thought we'd kind of pare it down to a little bit of a study area in the city core and then we aggregated it to just be median wait times. And so you can see a little bit more wait times in the city center here of the, and this is just median wait time, this isn't weighted on how many people, this is just you know the amount of people how, what was the average time they waited.

So then also from the intersection data it gives us commuters. Where are the commuters going? And these are the signalized intersections that commuters use the most which we actually found very interesting but you see down here kind of off of Hadley as it goes through Main Street and what-have-you, along the Triviz Trail here, and down on NMSU.

So then we can also take the heat map data which also is delineated by commuters and then see where the commuters are going. You can still see it's a lot of the Triviz Trail and it's a lot of these streets that are going to NMSU, from NMSU, stuff like that.

And then finally what we were able to derive is also origin/ destination. Now the polygons that are presented in this are created by Strava. They, and on the phone it was kind of confusing how they derived it. It's just kind of, they let the data derive the polygons itself. But what you can kind of tell is that a lot of people are going and coming back to the exact same place which wasn't as exciting for us but it was still very interesting to see.

So overall we're pretty happy with what we've gotten from the Strava data so far. We do understand that it does have its limitations. It is kind of a small sampling size but going forward it's something that we can hope that we can use basically maybe with our suitability map, other things like that. And then Strava is, as Andrew had pointed out becoming more accepted by DOTs across the U.S. and we're hoping that maybe as the app becomes a little bit more of a forefront for the community that we can get better results from it. So I guess that's it for me. I'll stand for any questions.

Sorg: Thank you. I guess we all better get Strava on our phones. Any questions from the Committee? Yes Trust, Trustee Flores.

Flores: I want to know, do we have anything on our website from the MPO saying that we're using it or requesting that people use this so that we can gather data, or is that a no-no because it's a private ...

Taraschi: I'll largely let Tom answer this but if, if I were to answer I think it, we're saying "no" at the moment because it is a private company and I don't, I don't know, Tom.

Murphy: We do not have it on the, on the website as, as of yet. It's something that we've been kind of discussing in, in, internally. I don't think that there'd be any kind of conflict with us promoting it since we are using it for the data and you know it, I mean we could put it out there as a way to encourage people to be able to, to influence our analysis well, so it's not on there but I envision it going up on there at some point.

Flores: I would just say that I, I would approve of putting it on because the more information that you have the better and it just seems to tie in with our commitment to community outreach.

Sorg: Anything else? Yes. Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you. When you use the word "heat map," does that mean the number of, of trips or is that really a temperature?

Taraschi: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yeah.

Taraschi: So it's, I can, in the data we can either delineate it by activity so if Tom and I go out together and we ride, that's one activity between the two of us. But we can also separate it between users. So each, from those demographics on there it's got, you know shows the 1,100 people and that's independent users. And from there what I, what I largely tried to do was look at users rather than activities, you know and yeah, okay.

Sorg: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: I just wanted to say I have to leave. I have a 3:00 appointment.

Sorg: Yeah.

Barraza: Okay.

Sorg: Well, okay. Any others?

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS - None

Sorg: Is there any last words from staff?

9. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:54 p.m.)

Sorg: Then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn, adjourn.

Eakman: So moved.

Flores: Seconded.

Sorg: Moved and second and all in favor, you want a roll call on this? Can we just say "aye?"

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: We're adjourned.

Gail M. Sorg

Chairperson