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 September 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
Dominic Loya (MPO staff)

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

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:02 p.m.)

Sorg: Mr. Murphy do we have a quorum?

Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair, we do.

Sorg: Then I call the meeting to order.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Sorg: First item on the agenda is the Conflict of Interest. Is there any Member of the Committee or staff that has a known conflict of interest of an item on the agenda? Hearing none.

ALL NONE.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: We'll go straight to Public Comment. Is there any member of the public that wants to speak to the Policy Committee? Seeing none.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 August 10, 2016

Sorg: We'll move on to approved minutes, oops, Approval of Minutes.

Hancock: Motion to approve.

Eakman: Second.

Murphy: Mr. Chair. We, we do have two, two separate meeting minutes on the, on the agenda for approval.

Sorg: Okay. So we'll need an, a, a motion to approve each one.

Hancock: Mr. Chair. My motion is on August the 10th 2016.

Eakman: My second also.

Sorg: Okay. Moved by Commissioner Hancock and a second by Councilor Eakman. Is there any corrections or additions or comments about the minutes? Seeing none, Mr. Murphy would you take a poll.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And the Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

4.2 August 24, 2016 Special Meeting

Sorg: Then there's the minutes of the meeting of August 24th.

Hancock: Motion to approve.

Eakman: Second.

Sorg: Moved again by Commissioner Hancock and second by Commissioner Hand, Garret, no, excuse me, Councilor Eakman. Is there any changes in that minutes, those minutes or comments? Seeing none we can take a vote.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And the Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Resolution 16-11: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a Memorandum of Understanding between the MPO and the Camino Real Consortium

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle, do you have the microphone figured out yet? Okay. Very good. I see you struggling there. Okay. The next is the Action Item 5.1, Resolution 16-11: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a Memorandum of Understanding between the MPO and the real, Camino Real Consortium.

Hancock: Mr. Chair. Motion to approve.

Sorg: Is there a second?

Flores: I'll second it.

Sorg: Okay. Moved by Commissioner Hancock again and, and a second Trustee Flores. Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Mr. Chair. This is a Memorandum of Understanding between us and the, and the group that's known as the Camino Real Consortium which brought us the, the Viva Dona Ana Project and the Camino Real Corridor study, several other, the Unified Development Code. What this MOU does for the MPO, it commits us to participating in this, in this group where the, where many regional agencies gather, share information about, about their projects and, and you know generally coordinate to better involve the public in, you know in the planning process. Several, several of you have sat at that table although Commissioner Garrett and Trustee Flores have been the main drivers through this and so I'd you know like to defer to them if they would like to add anything to this, just with the last caveat that this, this is just a Memorandum of Understanding. It does not take any of the MPO's decision-making authority away from it. It just, it just, we just agree to, to communicate with others in the region. And with that I will stand ...

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Murphy. Is there a Member of the Committee would like to speak to this MOU? Trustee Flores.

Flores: No, I, I just, yeah I ditto that and say that it's nice, it's another way to help get community input. So that's the way I see it.

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you and, and I appreciate the Policy Committee considering continuation of the involvement with the, the Camino Real. The, one thing that, that might be worth taking a look at it if you haven't had a chance to do it at some point is the program goals and long-term desired outcomes which are begun on page 55. I think it's important to recognize that for about three and a half years or so we have been engaged largely in doing planning and so the next phase is getting into implementation. That may very well require some additional studies and plans, but it also could result in actual construction of, of things and development of, of regulatory tools and, and this is something that can help all of the entities that work within the region that we're concerned with, and that's Dona Ana County.

A major part of the, of the concern of the, of the Consortium that are expressed in, in our livability principles have to do with transportation choices and with supporting good transportation development and the good relationships between transportation and other functions. So I think that it, that this is a, a very important venue for sharing ideas and information and, and, and actually getting people to understand more about what different organizations and entities are concerned with, but because we have finished the, this, the Comprehensive Plan and, and we've had this grant through the Sustainable Communities Program we're actually in a good position now to support other grant applications by partners of the Consortium. So for example this is potentially something that could be used to support other transportation-related initiatives and we don't, the reason this is an MOU is that there are, there're no conditions here that have to do with money or, or contributions of in-kind time on projects because we don't have any projects as such. Those kinds of agreements will be made and they'll in effect be smaller contract agreements underneath the, the umbrella of the MOU. So I think it's important. We're, all we're really doing is reaching out, tying in at a regional level and, and then being able to move forward from there. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Garrett, or Commissioner Garrett. So is there any other comments on this resolution, questions? Seeing none, oh.

Benavidez: I have a question.

Sorg: Yes Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Okay. It says on E, "more access to funding and investment opportunities from public and private sources that recognize the value of coordinated approaches to the regional challenges." Is, so are we saying that the El Camino Consortium will assist us in that or how does that work?

Garrett: I'd be happy, I'd be happy to answer that. Where is that, what page number?

Benavidez: It's on page 51 E right after "Benefits to Members."

Garrett: Okay, good. The Consortium can work with either entities internal to the, to the Consortium or with members, or entities outside. Right now the, the County for example is looking for projects that would help support and implement parts of the, the Viva Dona Ana initiative. The COG also has capacity to look for grants. There're a number of different entities that have capacity to look for grants so I think it's, it's more, this is simply a recognition that we're not looking just within our own entity, that by signing on, if we see something that benefits what we're trying to do with this overall initiative, we just flag it and let other people know about it. There, there's no staff other than there's County staff and you know the, we've got facilities there at the County. So the, this is sort of being nested in and supported by the County but it's not just a County program. This is a Consortium effort.

Benavidez: Thank you very much. I really appreciate that exploration. Thank you.

Sorg: Good. If there's no further discussion then we'll take a vote Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Murphy: And Chair.

Sorg: Yes. I would like to point out there was, or it was pointed out to me I should say that we didn't take a roll call today, but I asked if there was a quorum and you said there was and so if it's okay with the Committee we'll bypass that. We all signed in the sheet anyway.

Murphy: We do, and, and from the recorded votes we do have ...

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: A member from each, each entity.

Sorg: Right.

Murphy: And, and five minimum.

Sorg: Very good.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Missouri Study Corridor

Sorg: So the next item on the agenda is Discussion Items, 6.1: Missouri Study Corridor. Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. As, as you are aware we have been under contract with Bohannan Huston to, to study the Missouri corridor inclusive of Roadrunner Parkway to, to the vicinity of Centennial High School. We're getting ready for our final public meeting that we're going to have on September 29th at the Farm and Ranch Museum. MPO staff and the consultant have been working diligently with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee as well as the Technical Advisory Committee on, on aspects of this study and refining the results, and the consultant's ready to present to the public one last time and we wanted to present, present their update to you at this time.

So we undertook the, we undertook this study because of a perceived need for connectivity and additional transportation options to the Centennial High School site which at the time we started, we started down this road was a, was a newly-constructed high school for the Las Cruces Public School District.

We are doing this under the auspices of the NMDOT Location Study Process. Since we're using PL funds on this we are strictly limited to Phase A activities. We cannot do any, any sort of advanced engineering on this study. We're looking at what kind of roadway

alternatives would potentially extend to the area of Centennial and Sonoma Ranch. We're looking at the number of travel lanes, provision of bicycle lanes, perhaps a multi-use path or in lieu of that solely a motor, a non-motorized trail, or of course we're always required to entertain the no-build scenario where we do not proceed any further.

So under this, the Alternative 1 is the no-build. The proposed roadways would remain on the major, on the Future Roadway Map and at such time in the future that it, that the need may become more pronounced we can revisit it at that time.

Alternative 2 is looking at an extension of Missouri Avenue as just a collector build, presumably two or three lanes from its end in the city, at the city limits to a connection with Sonoma Ranch just north of the high school site.

Alternative 3 would be, it would be instead a extension of Roadrunner Parkway south of Lohman Avenue where the, the Walgreens is located on that corner and that would extend southward and eventually east to connect to that previous future Missouri alignment and connect with Sonoma Ranch again.

The fourth alternative would be the, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan full build-out where both, both of those facilities would be constructed. Would note that back to the previous slide but on this slide as well Roadrunner would be constructed as a minor arterial which could be three or four lanes, a higher-speed, less-access facility.

Alternative 5 would be to move the connection to Sonoma Ranch slightly north. The advantages of this one would've been fewer, fewer drainage facilities constructed within the roadways, fewer arroyos to, to cross, potentially lower-pay, or lower-cost projects.

Alternative 6 that the consultant looked at would be to just at this time develop a pedestrian/bicycle connection, give non-motorized access to the high school. Also it would blend into a, there's a, Farm and Ranch is working with a group that is, not sure exactly how to describe it but it, it's called AdobeHenge and it's, it, it's essentially an open space recreational use within that land to the south of our proposed alignment and this would create better access to that as well.

We've had the consultant do a, a preliminary drainage analysis, we've conducted bicycle level of service, and we've ran our, our travel demand model on, on the options. They're going to present the short list of recommendations on September 28th and then with, considering the comment coming back from that we'll, we'll be coming back to this group on October 12th, give you a briefing and then hopefully have, have the document finalized for your November meeting. We developed an evaluation matrix which I left on my desk. I, each of the, each of the alternatives have criteria that we, that was evaluated for, for further, further study.

What we're looking, and barring any surprises at the last public hearing we expect that the consultant's going to come back with the

recommendations for further study would be a non-motorized path which is Alternative 6 or simply the Missouri extension for Alternative, Alternative 2 and then the, these three alternatives are being removed from consideration for the, for any future Phase B that may be, may be conducted.

We kind of touched on these throughout the, throughout the presentation so I, at this I will hope to answer any of your questions.

Sorg: Any questions by the Committee? Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes. It would be helpful for me to look over the matrix again that you had. It would explain many things to me. I, I don't think we need to do it now but I'd appreciate a copy of that matrix that I could study.

Murphy: I, I will, I did print it out. I just failed to bring it into this room. While, I'll, I'll pass it out while the next, while the next presentation is going on. But we're not voting on anything today. We don't anticipate you voting until November so I'll pass it out, you'll have, you'll have sufficient time to, to look at it and ask any questions.

Sorg: Could you e-mail the digital copy?

Murphy: Yes.

Sorg: Okay. That would be nice. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. How does Choice 6 fit with the broader bicycle plan and pedestrian plans for the entire area?

Murphy: We have, we do, on the, on the Trails Plan and on, on the Bicycle Priorities Plan. I, we do show a, a, a bicycle connection to the high school area. This would, you know this would forward that making that connection with the, with the thought being that you know the high school students that travel there would be a, a population that could take advantage of non-motorized transportation.

Hancock: And does that also fit with the, the plans that run along, going up north? Isn't there a path that runs to the north for bicycling and then back down?

Murphy: I, along Roadrunner Parkway?

Hancock: I believe it goes up off of, let's see what the name of the road is, where University Avenue goes on for, Baylor Canyon, Dripping Springs Road, there it is. Dripping Springs Road. Isn't there, isn't there a plan for bicycle lanes along Drip, Dripping Springs?

Murphy: We have, we have called out for bicycle lanes on Dripping Springs ...

Hancock: Yeah.

Murphy: On our long-range plan.

Hancock: Right.

Murphy: I know as projects are, are developed in those areas I, I do believe you know the County is, is working on extending, extending the bike lane through that area.

Hancock: Okay. So it, it would be possible then to connect, this would then connect over to Sonoma Ranch would then, would then connect into Dripping Springs and ...

Murphy: That's, that's correct.

Hancock: Tie in overall.

Murphy: And, and we also, our plan also calls for Sonoma Ranch to have bicycle lanes on it as well so we're, we do, we do look at the overall connectivity for, for bicycles ...

Hancock: Good.

Murphy: In our planning.

Hancock: Good. I know that's very popular. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Staff has just passed out the alternatives evaluation matrix draft so I think we can cancel that, unless somebody wants a digital copy anyway.

Eakman: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Commissioner Eakman.

Eakman: Could we get a smaller font please?

Sorg: Thank you.

Eakman: We're, we're ...

Sorg: Councilor.

Eakman: Wasting paper here.

Sorg: Yes. We are. Okay. New glasses are in order. So anyway that's that. Commission, Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. And I appreciate the, it's been a while since we've talked about this, at least as my, my recollection in terms of the, the Committee. Could you basically recap why the proposed alternatives that were dropped were dropped?

Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. And the, the matrix passed out will also help answer that. Essentially the short answer on the Roadrunner extension, it was going to be a more, it was going to be a higher-cost facility to, to build. The travel demand model shows that it did not take as much traffic to the, to the high school as, as was stated out in the purpose and need. Most of the traffic, no most of the demand we saw traveling on that was essentially using you know, it was, it was going to the north and the east and was essentially just moving traffic over from existing Sonoma Ranch over to, over to Roadrunner, so it didn't really provide any new connectivity in that regard. The northern alignments were, were dropped because, because of the associated costs with, I, the, the, it, it didn't, it didn't get it you know closer to the, close to the high school and the cost differences with the, with the difference in drainage facilities did not make, did not make sense to the, to the team and to the project team analyzing it. And then the MTP scenario didn't, essentially that was a cost one and it, and it really did not provide that much added benefit building both of them at this time.

Garrett: Could, could you go to Alternative 4? And, and 5 is simply, yeah it's, it, it, it just runs a little bit higher up. I think part of what I'm, I'm interested in is number one, there's, the extension of Roadrunner would not take any pressure off of the intersection of Telshor and Lohman? I mean the ...

Murphy: Yes.

Garrett: One of the things that's interesting about this whole thing is that you know there's going to be continued development out to the east and I'm a lot less concerned with what's happening right now than I am with what this might look like in ten years and the idea of sort of cul-de-sac-ing Roadrunner and so you can't go any further south and you terminate Missouri which is, I mean we keep talking about how there, the problems with north-south transportation on the east side of the, of the city. And this is, it's going to put more traffic if, if we don't do this kind of thing it's going to put more traffic on Dripping Springs and more traffic on Lohman. So I mean if you just, and you know and, and you know we've got AdobeHenge but if you go to Option 4 again you know what's going to happen in sort of the, the area north of the, I don't know fuchsia line above the high school?

There's a pretty big area there. Is that going to be a park? Is that going to be undeveloped or is that likely to be developed?

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Those are great observations and just to actually, and to, to point out by going with the, if Alternative 2 were to be the one advanced, Roadrunner Parkway would not come off the Future Roadway Map. The, we looked at the travel demand model with the year 2040 projected socioeconomics and although it was outside the scope of our consultant's contract to look at Telshor/Missouri it did have a, it did have a small effect on that intersection at that time, probably not enough to justify advancing it at this, at this time. We're, we're putting it first in line for, for the next build. But I think we just need to, just to remain cognizant that we are not saying that Roadrunner will never be built. It just does not need to be built first on, you know based, you know based on the projected 2040 numbers that we used. As we update our Transportation Plan every five years and if we start experiencing a different level of growth where the traffic is projected to, to increase significantly over what we're, what we're projecting today, we can always readjust our priorities at this point. But based on, based on our current understanding you know that it does not rise to the immediate, the immediate need.

Garrett: So do right-of-ways exist for these alignments yet or would one of the things, would this process nail down some alignments and, and, and right-of-ways on those alignments?

Murphy: If we were to, if we're, say proceed with Alternative 2 we would, or depending on who builds it, the City or the County would then work with BLM, the land owner to you know, to secure the right-of-ways for that. The existence of these corridors on the MPO's Future Roadway Map so if the, ensures that if, if the land is turned over to a private entity and it is, get developed we get the, or the, the government gets the right-of-way at the time of subdivisions because it is placed on the MPO's map. Although not, not constructed and this, Roadrunner from Lohman down to this, if you guys see the, see the mouse ...

Garrett: Right.

Murphy: At the corner of the city limits that land on either side has been subdivided and the right-of-way has been acquired for that portion. It just has not been constructed at this time so, so the right-of-way preservation will, will be ensured through continuance of the corridors on the MPO's maps.

Garrett: Very good. And just to, to make sure that I'm, I'm clear about this the Roadrunner Parkway extension south from Wal-Mart *(Walgreens)* to the corner there that you are showing where the, what, the far, yeah and I'm

sorry, the, the pharmacy that's, that's at the intersection of Lohman and, right, from that south to the limits, the city limit right there, there's sufficient easement already in place to, to put the, the road in?

Murphy: I, I've seen the subdivision plats where there's 100 feet of right-of-way dedicated.

Garrett: That's all I need. Okay. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett and Mr. Murphy. Is there any others? Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Okay. Alternative Number 2 as we see right now and Alternative 6 the, the bicycle pathway, does that go around the, the, the same path?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Benavidez. I do believe in these illustrations they do though they don't necessarily have to depending upon what we learn going down the road.

Benavidez: Okay. And the bicycle path, does it go further south towards the high school or is there a path there on Sonoma?

Murphy: I can't recall it, if there are currently bike lanes on Sonoma but, I, I'm getting acknowledgement that yes, there are bike lanes on Sonoma and any widening of Sonoma would, would continue those bike lanes per the MPO's Bicycle Facilities Plan.

Benavidez: Great. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Sorg: Any others? If not I, I, I have to ask a question. On Alternative 2, the Missouri build-out, would the bike path and walking path be equivalent to Alternative 6 or size-wise, the path be as big or has that been determined yet?

Murphy: Mr. Chair. It's not been determined.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: But through discussions with the, the consultant their, their vision of it is, is some, is something that they could be combined, done together or one could, you know or, or the path could go ahead of the roadway.

Sorg: First and then the road second.

Murphy: Yes.

Sorg: At ...

Murphy: But, but not ...

Sorg: A later date.

Murphy: But keep it so that one does not preclude the other.

Sorg: Yeah. Okay. Well I wasn't going to say very much tonight, today but I can't help it. I spent a little time in the Netherlands and Germany here late, recently and I, I was amazed at their bike paths and their sidewalks, huge. And the number of people using them are huge numbers. They have enough cars too but they have a lot of bike paths and they're well-used and I'll never forget my son's comment in Amsterdam. Without me prodding he said, "I'm amazed how, how fit people look here." Everybody that was running around or walking around or biking around, whatever, very fit. There wasn't much obesity we saw over there. And of course we know that having public transportation as well as bike paths and more walking paths contribute to that and we've been saying that in the City Council too. So I, I, I hope we can have on the Missouri extension if that's the choice we have, we have a significant bike path and, and a, a walking path for those students going to the high school there and, and, and others. Yes. That's it. If there's no other questions or comments.

6.2 Committee Training

Sorg: We'll go on to the next item on the agenda, another Discussion Item 6.2, more training. Mr. Wray.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Staff is going to use the opportunity today to, to begin a conversation that this Committee is going to have multiple times over the next several months and, and in the years to follow. MPO staff began this project which is a, a, a crash, a crash analysis project some months ago and we're presenting some preliminary results to this Committee today.

The purpose of the project was to analyze areas within the Las Cruces urbanized area, areas that have a recurrent pattern of crashes. Specifically this particular analysis focused on a, signalized intersection was, was kind of the, the, the unit of measurement that was utilized. We're, we're hoping to be able to, to use this analysis to, to move forward to perhaps isolate some areas where there is a significant pattern of crashes where there, we might be able to identify infrastructure problems that could be remediated through various means. Also, this year the Federal Highway Administration released their, their guidelines for performance measures for safety. In fact they did that just within the past

couple of weeks. And that is a project that this Committee is going to have to take on in the very near future, to be determining the performance measures that will be adopted by this MPO but I will go into a little bit more detail as to what is going to be required by that process as the presentation goes on. This particular analysis that I'm, that I'm going to discuss today is specific to the years 2012, 2013, and 2014. There are 121 signalized intersections that were examined as part of this analysis. Staff did combine the results with AADT volumes to calculate the intersection crash rate and I'll go over that in more detail in just a minute, but just overall the crash rate is a very useful tool to, to determine the relative safety of an intersection as opposed to just the raw crash total and I'll go into some specifics about why that's so just a little bit later on.

Just a little bit of terminology that I want to cover: AADT and everyone's probably familiar with it but it stands for Annual Average Daily Traffic. It's the average traffic that flowing over a particular road segment, that's the, the data that our, that the MPO Traffic Count Program, it collects and submits up to NMDOT. The Intersection Crash Rate measures the, the number of crashes controlled for the number of vehicles present on the road. It's calculated as follows on the screen. I'm not going to recite the formula cause you can read it faster than I can, than I can read it off for you. But that is the formula that was utilized to determine the crash rate. Some other terminology: Property damage only crashes are crashes that involve damage only to vehicles involved. Injury crashes, excuse me, injury crashes are crashes that involve personal injury to the parties involved and fatal crashes are crashes that result in the death of at least one party involved.

Now this is the, the overall map and I, I realize that it has a lot of information on it and we, we will delve into more detail about it. The red portion of the map on the left side, that is the, the, the total number of crashes and the blue is the crash rate and what I, what I want to highlight on this particular map is that it, it does, the crashes do follow predictable corridors. We have Valley here, University, Lohman, some along Madrid, and then Main Street and very similar, very similar patterns of occurrence along the crash rate. But as we'll see in just a moment, rate does not necessarily correlate strictly with total crashes.

These, these are the highest spots within the, the, the areas of analysis. We have this, Lohman and Walton which is the highest, highest total crashes but there are some differences as to what the highest crash rates are. And we will go into a little more detail on the next couple of slides. And I want to ask the Committee's indulgence as we're going to be going back and forth across these next couple of slides a bit, and certainly stop me at any time if you have any questions or want some clarification about it, but I do want to, to highlight Lohman and Walton. We will see that particular intersection a number of times throughout this analysis. It has the highest total crashes within the area that we analyzed for this process. It had 112 total crashes during the total time of the analysis.

Lohman and Telshor had the second highest with 105. But if we go to crash rate there is a, a vast drop-off between the two highest which is not the, does not correlate directly with some of the, the highest total crashes. But again Lohman and Walton is the third highest, has the third highest crash rate but we see Lohman and Telshor has a relatively low crash rate which we attribute to the safety improvements that the City of Las Cruces did within the past several years but before the period of analysis that this particular study covered. Now I'd, I do want to spend a little bit of time talking about the, the Bataan Memorial West and Del Rey, and Bataan Memorial East and Mesa Grande because there is a, a very distinct drop-off between these two highest and the rest and while staff does not have the information present at this time really to make any sort of recommendations regarding this, we do strongly encourage that further study is done on these two particular intersections because the crash rate is so very high.

These are the property damage only crashes. Again Lohman and Walton is very high on that list. Lohman and Telshor does have the highest property damage crashes but that's to be expected as that does have a relatively high absolute number of crashes when, when looked at. Also you see here, if my cursor will come back, Elks, Main, and Triviz also appears very high on the property damage only crashes which it also was the third highest of the total crashes.

Total injury crashes, again Lohman and Walton. This one is at the very top of the injury crashes. Again this, while, while Lohman and Walton is not at the top of every single metric there it, it is in the top three of all of them. That intersection is one that, that very obviously is going to need some, some further study and analysis and hopefully some, some remediation will be possible to improve the situation there. Again Lohman and Walnut is another very high injury crashes, and then here we have Bataan Memorial West and Del Rey as having the third highest rate of injury crashes during the period of study.

And we did have one fatal crash. The location of that was actually a little bit of an outlier. It, it was at the intersection of Triviz and University which did not rate that high on either crash rate or, or total crashes but that was the location of the fatal accident that we had during this particular period of study.

Moving on to, to, to some bicycle and pedestrian issues, you see before you on the chart the list of the top bicycle-involved crashes. I do want to, to kind of pause at this time and say that there are some issues that we have regarding the collection of bicycle crash data. The, the methodology in our estimation is a bit flawed but for the years that we, that we have the data, this is the data that we have. Just want to, to highlight Alameda and El Paseo and Main as one of the three highest which we, we know from previous conversations that that is a little bit of a problematic area for cycling in the area.

And here's the pedestrian-involved crashes. You see Locust and University, a lot of student traffic. That one is, was the highest for the area and then Hadley and Valley which was a, a little bit unexpected for staff was the second highest. We were, we, we did not think that that one would be the one that would be the second highest of incidents. And again pedestrian-involved crashes have the, have a, a similar collection and reporting problem as bicycle crashes. We're ...

Eakman: May I, may, may I mention something right now?

Wray: Certainly.

Eakman: I see Valley Drive mentioned often there ...

Wray: There, yes.

Eakman: And we're going to have improvements to Valley Drive next year. I was wondering if we're mitigating some of those issues that we're seeing here with pedestrian safety or if, if they can be a part of that study.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. We're not really at a position to, to say as, as a part of this study. We didn't delve down into the data as deeply as that to analyze all the specific causes. I will say that we certainly hope that it will be remediated but we will be, we will definitely be looking, looking for or looking ahead and do, and looking at some of that exact analysis as we go forward, as we will need to do so for the FHWA performance, performance measures.

Eakman: But there is no manner for a pedestrian to cross Valley.

Wray: That is, that is correct sir. Yes.

Sorg: Excuse me, there is no what across Valley?

Eakman: There is no signals at all for a, a pedestrian to cross Valley.

Sorg: Really? Oh. I was going to ask if Mr. Trent from DOT would have any comments or not? Maybe not.

Doolittle: So I kind of agree with Andrew that it's a little premature to say whether we are or aren't going to address that. We're currently in the design phase, very early on. I know that we are doing some intersection improvements through that corridor. I can't remember if Hadley is specifically one that we're adding signals to. But of course pedestrian, as part of the design they have to look at accident history.

Sorg: Okay. Thank ...

Doolittle: So I would say that we're going to address it one way or the other. I just don't know the specifics.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Trent. You can proceed then ...

Garrett: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Oh. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Be, before, before we leave that, I think that I'm correct in saying that the walk to school program for, yeah Safe Routes to School for MacArthur begins at the grocery store on the west side of Valley and then it's, it, basically you go right through the Valley and, and Hadley intersection in order to walk to the school. And when I saw that it, it caused me to think, "What's the area that is being served by that school and how many of them are, of the kids are on the west side of Valley and have to cross?" So I, I, I just would say if, if they're, cause there's some residential areas in that area and I think it might be worthwhile just double-checking that location just, just to follow-up on the point that Councilor Eakman was making.

Sorg: Thank you Mr., Commissioner Garrett. Yeah. Of course we want all new projects to emphasize pedestrian safety.

Hancock: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. It strikes me, when on the previous slides there was, seemed to be some common factors and is there a way to look at the characteristics of those intersections to see if there's a common factor? It struck me that there are double turn lanes at all of those intersections and, and some of them have turn lanes to the right and turn lanes, double turn lanes to the left or double turn lanes to the right and double, and a single turn lane to the left but I'm just, it just jumped off at me and I'm wondering if that is a factor that, that could be considered.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. That, that, that is one, that's a good idea of how we could look at. I think our initial thoughts on this, we would be identifying the problem intersections, the ones that have the ultra-high occurrence and then we would use, use that as, you know as a vehicle for, to look at each of those intersections more in-depth, perhaps you know request road safety audits and then each, each intersection find solutions for those. But that, you know that would be an excellent idea for us to look

for commonality among types and, and perhaps adjust our, our design standards on how we build those intersections so I, I thank you for that idea.

Wray: Moving on then Mr. Chair. As I mentioned earlier in the presentation the, the FHWA has now sent out their, their guidelines for the performance measures. The, the, the five measures are on the screen: The number of fatalities, rate of fatalities, number of serious injuries, rate of serious injuries, and number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries. These are the items that FHWA expects the performance measures adopted by the states and the MPOs to deal with. We're not necessarily limited to those but as you see before you on the chart there, we have two options to, to, to potentially pursue and we're in the very early stages of information gathering, but effectively the MPO can choose to agree to support the State, the State performance measures as you can see on the chart what that would require, or the MPO can establish its own HSIP which is Highway Safety Improvement Program performance measures. We're, we're nowhere near a point at, at, at this moment in time where we can make a determination as to whether we want to support the State standards or whether we, we want to, to develop our own because the State has not yet really begun the process to my knowledge of developing what their own standards are going to be so until they do so it's a bit difficult for us to, to, to state with any certainty what, what we should or should not do. However leading up to this staff is certainly going to be engaged in process of continuing to do this analysis so that we are prepared for the time when, comes when we do know what those measurements are going to be. Specifically things that we know that we need to address is that we are going to have to expand the scope of our analysis beyond just look, tying crashes to signalized intersections. We're going to have look beyond that analysis and then apply the VMT considerations to that. Again we're also going to have to determine whether or not, and this is more of a broad, this Committee is going to have to determine whether or not the MPO is going to support the NMDOT HSIP targets or whether this MPO is going to have its own HSIP targets. And I'll stand now for any questions and I'm certainly happy to go back to any slides that the Committee wishes to, to look at and I, I want to state at this moment that this presentation is going to be posted on our website at the Calendar Item for this meeting before the end of the day today so.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Wray. Is there any questions or comments? I see Commissioner Hancock's light is on.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Is there something to prevent us from having higher standards?

Wray: No. No. No.

Hancock: So whether the State initiates or not, we can set the standards at a, a, a value level for the health and safety and welfare of our constituents that we deem appropriate.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. Yes, we may, we may set our own measures at, at the level that we deem, where we want it. With, we do need to be, keep, keep in mind that the, you know through the legislation Congress has mandated that if you set a, you set a, you set a target that it's a target that you can make. There will be financial penalties associated with not hitting your targets so while we could set them to what we like, we better hit them.

Hancock: Is there also benefits? In other words if you, if you choose the higher standards and they have penalties, are there extra benefits for choosing higher standards?

Murphy: I, I do believe that there would, there would be some incentives to, to making, to making them, to, especially when, when those regions that don't make their goals lose out on the money it's got to go somewhere but again we need to be careful that we're realistic.

Sorg: Trustee Flores first and then ...

Flores: I just had a ...

Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

Flores: Concern seeing as there was one fatality, would some, with a number that's so low it just concerns me because you only need one idiot with more than one person in a car and I can see how that can be very destructive when we have such a low number so I just, I don't know how you deal with that. I mean you can only take, you can only try and improve a design so much but in the end you only need one idiot.

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Trustee Flores. And that, you know in our area we're, we're fortunate enough to you know, we have the one, we, we only had the one. That, that might speak you know that it, we contribute to this, you know be part of the State's targets because we are very you know subject to shocks a lot in those numbers. Also I'd, I do think that FHWA is cognizant of that type of situation and we're continuing to get guidance you know day, you know day by day as, as they release stuff. It, it'll be turned out to be a, a five-year rolling average to help, to help minimize any kind of you know shock effect based on that but you know your, your point is absolutely right on. You know one, one incident can drastically change those numbers.

Eakman: Thank you Mr. Chair. My experience had, has been in health care administration and this is a classic epidemiological study that you're having right here, absolutely classic. It reminds me of the incidence and prevalence rates of about a 500-bed hospital and my experience is you can drill down so far that everything is meaningless and I think you have some great basic information here. I'm looking forward to, it looks like there are so many opportunities for accidents that maybe we should be congratulating ourselves for the few number of accidents we have rather than looking at these in a truly negative way, but we don't know because we haven't discovered enough at this time. My only advice as you continue is to drill down and if you need help from an epidemiologist I'd really suggest it because then we would really have good information. Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Councilor Eakman. May I ask you or anyone here: Do you mean comparing us to other places in, as an epidemiologist, as a, the epidemiology study, would we be comparing ourselves to other cities, other places and so forth?

Eakman: Only if you're looking for self-improvement and perhaps that is our goal ...

Sorg: Okay.

Eakman: Is self-improvement. Rather than comparing ourselves to other folks I would at this point recommend we stay with self-improvement and improve the safety here in our local communities. No, I don't think other communities might be doing this type of study and I congratulate our staff for doing it.

Sorg: Are other communities doing the same studies?

Wray: I couldn't answer that.

Sorg: Okay. If they did, is it possible to obtain that information?

Wray: I'm, I'm sure we could.

Sorg: And compare crash rates and so forth.

Wray: I'm sure we could.

Sorg: Okay. I'm not saying we have to do it but it might be useful. Any other questions then? Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Thank you. The accident that happened on the corner of Triviz and Spruce, that falls into a different time period, correct? That's the, it was a fatal, fatal crash that happened there.

Wray: Oh, was that the one earlier this year?

Benavidez: Yes.

Wray: Yes. That was, that's outside of this study.

Benavidez: Okay. And what about the other fatal crashes that happened in, one of them in Highway, high, Highway 25 and the other one high, Highway night, 70 that was, I guess, and I don't know if it's in the city limits so would, that would fall, in ...

Wray: I, I believe, I believe that, that crash happened a year or two before the start of this study if I'm, if I'm thinking of the same, the same crash that you are. I believe that happened in, in 2010 or somewhere in ...

Benavidez: It, the one on Highway 70 but what about the one on Highway 25, the one that, right off of, right after the exit of Las Cruces?

Wray: I, I don't know which accident that one is but the only one that happened in the time period that we're looking at was the one at the intersection of University and Triviz.

Benavidez: Okay. There was another one on Highway 25 earlier this year where, remember that lady that abruptly stopped and another car crashed behind her and it burst into flames.

Wray: Okay. That, that was outside the time period of this study.

Benavidez: Okay. So that's out, okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Sorg: Commissioner I think that was a, a, a non-signal type of accident. It wasn't at a signaled intersection. It was right on the interstate.

Benavidez: Right. It was right on the interstate.

Sorg: Yeah. So it wouldn't been in the study then. This is only signaled intersections.

Benavidez: Okay. And I was just wondering because it was, I don't know if it was, had to do anything that was within the limits of Las Cruces or, but that, you said it would, it had to be a signal area right? Correct?

Wray: The, the accidents were tied to, to the signalized intersections for the purposes of the analysis. That's something that we're going to have to change as we go forward to do more analysis because that's not going to be as in-depth as is going to be required for, for, for the future work.

Benavidez: Okay.

Wray: Oh, and Tom just let me know that we were looking at county-wide data for the purposes of this.

Benavidez: Oh. Okay. Sounds good. Thank you.

Sorg: Mr. Trent and then Commissioner Garrett.

Doolittle: Actually Andrew just ask, answered my question. I was wondering, he, in one of his slides he specifically mentioned the Las Cruces urbanized area but Dona Ana County has signals outside of Las Cruces, Town of Mesilla has a few, so that answered my question. Thank you.

Garrett: Thank you. And, and in a sense this is to follow-up on Commissioner Eakman's question. What kinds of demographic information and I guess information about drivers are you going to be gathering in addition to the particulars about the condition of the crash?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Our data source from this is the crash statistics developed by the, the UNM Data Center. And what they do is they compile the law enforcement reports from around the state. They place them into a, a, a geographical information system or GIS file, and then they release them to agencies around the state to conduct this analysis. That's one of the primary reasons that we stopped looking, or, stopped looking that data at 2014 because essentially that's the latest data available. That being said, we're having, we, us and the Santa Fe Planning Office, other MPOs around the state are, are having continued conversations with how those, you know what, what those reports capture. But right now it's essentially the, you know the, the responding officer fills out their report and then they turn that in and, and then UNM codes that into a file. That's the information that we have available in regard to these incidents. So short, short answer to the, is that there's not demographic data associated with it.

Garrett: All right. I, it might be interesting and important to do a literary, literature search to find out whether anyone is looking at human factors that are related to crashes and then how that could change the way that designs and standards are put together. I was thinking in particular about people who might be visiting the area, let's say in the wintertime who used to driving in other kinds of places and come here and it's a different way of

driving. We all, anybody that has driven around the country knows that there's different driving styles in different parts of the country. I'd be curious about whether younger drivers, older drivers, you know drivers you know with kids in the car, whether those ended up being contributing factors in, in certain situations and how that might factor into thinking about the kinds of, of work that we could do and in, and sometimes I'm not so sure that it's necessarily about putting something in the roadway as much as it is driver education programs in particular locations where you're actually targeting the, the audience that you know has a higher risk of being involved in an accident right down the road because of the, of an intersection. So this might not be fitting exactly what your model is currently but I'm saying would it be possible to do a literature search to see if you know like in cooperation with public health agencies and, and other groups, there are some additional factors that are being looked at and, and programs being developed.

Murphy: I, I think those are, are great suggestions. I know that I, to have, my finger's slipping. We're going to have to have, the planners around the state are going to have that conversation with the law enforcement agencies, you know previous slides the, Andrew had mentioned or it was serious, one of the terminology was serious injuries versus just injury crashes so, and FHWA is developing a guideline of what constitutes that serious injury so we're going to have to ask them, you know law enforcement to revisit how those reports are developed. I think you know, in, you know in addition to the shortcomings that you pointed out we've also heard from some of our law enforcement community that something like bicycle crashes are under-reported because unless a motor vehicle is involved an incident is not going to get into that. We know about many crash, bicycle crashes through cyclists later going to the Emergency Room and through the medical reports but it, it does not get through the law enforcement data. So I, I, it's helpful to find out where all the shortcomings are and you know we, you know literature search I think is going to be something we need to do to try and improve this, this particular data set. You know that, that being said you know not all data is perfect but this one, it, this one is kind of, it has the advantage that it's, that it's universal, it's, it's compelled by law to be completed so it's useful in that regard. Would we like it to be more complete, would we like more information in it? Absolutely and, and we will have to work with other, other partners in order to achieve that but I think you've, you've given use some, some excellent suggestions of, of things to pursue as well.

Garrett: Thank you. If I could just follow up because I know Michael was at the luncheon on the Health in All Policies rollout and the idea of one agency being able to work with another agency where we are actually able to put different databases together and coordinate different kinds of both perspectives and information is what that initiative is all about. So there

may be an opportunity through, through that effort to find some other partners who have a common, common goals and complementary information and approaches. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: One thing does come to mind but first congratulations for doing the study. We really appreciate it. That's why we have so many questions. At our, at our most high-intensity intersections in town, it just popped into my mind what would happen if we 24/7 videotaped some of them for a while and saw what was actually happening? We'd really get some information that way.

Sorg: Thank you. Not a, an interesting idea, very much so. Any other questions or comments on this discussion topic? If not.

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Sorg: We'll go on to other staff or Committee comments. Anyone have another comment? Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Yes. I'd like to introduce MPO's newest staff member, Dominic Loya who's our new Planning Technician and he's going to be working with the Co-Ops on the Traffic Count Program and was, you know which was instrumental in this last presentation and provides, provides us with a lot of data help.

Sorg: Thank you. And welcome Dominic. Any others? Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. I know staff was and is involved in the 5339 grant application that was just awarded of $1 million-something for more buses. Congratulations on bringing home the bacon. That's a pretty big deal. I don't remember whether it was 5339 or 5311 but they, the award was, 11?

Murphy: Eleven.

Hancock: Yeah. That, that's a, a, a nice achievement. I'm also wondering if it would be appropriate for an MOU from the South Central Regional Transportation District similar to the Regional Consortium, the Camino Real Consortium because transportation is such an, a, a key element. It would be appropriate I would think that the Transit District do an MOU also. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Very good. Any other comments? Trustee Flores.

Flores: I just want to invite everybody, we're having our 16 de Septiembre celebrations this weekend. They're free. We have a parade starting Saturday, September 17th at 11 a.m. along Avenida de Mesilla. We're going to be doing some type of commemoration for Juan Carreon who was a famous singer who just passed away in Los Angeles. He's from Mexico, I believe from Juarez. And we have an upcoming Pecan Festival on October 8th and 9th and I got a something on Facebook basically asking if I wanted to do some type of competition against County Commissioners. I don't know if, if City Councilors would also be included but I said I was in. So I think the, the, they were suggesting we do, what is it, corn hull toss and a, or a horseshoe toss or something like that. But anyway, so just letting you know, save the dates.

Sorg: Thank you. Councilor Eakman, did you have any more?

Eakman: That inspired me to mention the Plaza de Las Cruces dedication this Saturday. Welcome everybody to that. I think it is officially at two p.m. but we have festivities and activities all day long so feel free to come. We'd appreciate seeing you there.

Sorg: Thank you Councilor. Very good. Any other comments? Trustee Flores.

Flores: Also I'm, I'm sure everybody here is aware that they've been, there's a group that's been promoting getting people out to vote. I didn't know but you could basically register online so, because my husband's been saying that nurses have been complaining at work about, "Oh well you know I want to go vote, I want to go vote," but they haven't actually gotten around so I sent him some flyers and said, "You tell them they can register online." So, and anybody that has a group that would welcome them they're, they're willing to go out and basically let you know about voting and where to go and all that.

Sorg: Thank you Trustee Flores. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. As I mentioned at the last meeting on, the County is going to be having a work session for all of the Boards that Commissioners sit on. That is going to take place on December the 6th, December 6th, nine to 12. So if you're involved, any one of us are involved in different committees, please let your Chair of those committees know that we need to have a representative so that we can be sure that information is passed along to the newly-electeds so that they understand what these committees are about, what each committee does, and the, and how easy it is. We don't have to do anything, we just show up. You know we want to make sure that they, they, everybody just competes to get on the committees so.

Sorg: That, was December?

Hancock: December the 6th.

Sorg: Sixth. Okay.

Hancock: Thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Hancock. All right. Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to let everybody know I'm not blatantly not giving a report this month but we are practically finished with all projects in the Mesilla Valley MPO area for now. Don't, don't start clapping yet. We're going to disrupt your lives come spring. So what I'll do is probably next month as well, it'll be fairly quiet as we start getting closer to the Spitz/Three Crosses, the mill and inlay on US-70 from Aguirre Springs to the county line. As we get some updates on studies I'll give that as, as we have them but for now we, we are finished for the most part in this area. So that's good news for the traveling public but.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Trent. Okay.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: It, I see it, there's no one from the public so I don't expect any comments from the public then. We only have Jolene from the NMDOT so if there's, it ...

9. ADJOURNMENT (2:16 p.m.)

Sorg: There appears to be we're at the end of the meeting and so I'll call for a motion to adjourn.

Flores: So moved.

Hancock: Second.

Sorg: Moved and second. All in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: We are adjourned.

Bill M. Sorg

Chairperson