MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held August 16, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
Ashleigh Curry (Mesilla Citizen Rep)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Jamie Lakey proxy for Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
James Nunez (City of Las Cruces Rep)
Gabriel Rochelle (Bicycle Com. Rep.)
Jorge Castillo proxy for Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County)
David Shearer (NMSU - Environmental Safety) (arrived 5:08)
Lance Shepan (Mesilla Marshall's Department)
Andrew Bencomo (Ped. Community Rep)

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
Aaron Sussman - Bohannan Huston
Hillary Brinegar - Marron & Associates
Rusty Payne - Smith Engineering
Sam Johnson - Smith Engineering
Brian Byrd - CLC
Marcia Davis
Armando Morales - CLC
Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

1. CALL TO ORDER (5:00 p.m.)

Pearson: Okay. So it's 5:00 so I'll call the, I'll talk slowly so our last Member can come up. Call the Mesilla Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to order. It's right about 5:00. Let's go down the row and introduce everybody and if you're showing up for somebody else say who you're proxying for.

Billings: *(inaudible)*

Pearson: Yeah, we'll start with that end.

Billings: *(inaudible).*

Baum: You're not on your microphone.

Billings: Okay. Maggie Billings, Bicycle Community Representative.

Lakey: Jamie Lakey, I'm proxying for Mark.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Shepan: Lance Shepan, Town of Mesilla.

Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Town of Mesilla Citizens' Representative.

Rochelle: Gabriel Rochelle, Bicycle Community Representative.

Castillo: Jorge Castillo, proxy for Samuel Paz.

Nunez: James Nunez, Representative for City of Las Cruces.

Bencomo: Andrew Bencomo, Pedestrian Community Representative.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Pearson: Okay. Our next order of business is Approval of the Agenda. I see we have a presentation, we've, shall we move the presentation up in front of the trail discussion?

McAdams: It's up to you Mr. Chairman.

Pearson: I think that would be nice for our visitors if that's a …

McAdams: Okay.

Pearson: Is, is approval of the Committee? I'll hear a motion to …

Rochelle: So moved.

Bencomo: Second.

Pearson: Okay. So our next item is Approval of the, well I guess we have to vote on that.

McAdams: We do.

Pearson: All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? None. So that's approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 July 19, 2016

Pearson: Next is Approval of the Minutes. Do we have any discussion for the minutes of July 19th?

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. The minutes show that I was absent and also late so can't be both. I was absent last meeting.

Pearson: You're very …

Bencomo: That's how absent I was. I was late too.

Pearson: Yeah, so probably could reflect that, move him up to attending but arriving at 5:06 I think, was that the, was.

McAdams: Okay.

Pearson: Rather than as an absent member.

McAdams: Okay.

Curry: He wasn't, he was an absent member.

Pearson: Okay.

Curry: Is what he's saying and he was not late, he was just simply absent. Am I understanding …

Bencomo: That is correct.

McAdams: Okay.

Pearson: Okay. That's …

Bencomo: I was absent.

Pearson: All right then. Okay.

Bencomo: I was not late.

McAdams: Okay.

Pearson: Yeah.

Bencomo: Maybe I was really late, I don't know.

Pearson: Any other comments on the minutes? So I'll hear a motion to approve the minutes …

Rochelle: So moved.

Pearson: And a second?

Herrera: Second.

Pearson: All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? So the minutes pass.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Next we have an opportunity for public comment. Any member from the public wish to address us with any concerns or? Seeing none.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.2 U.S. 70 Shoulder Widening over San Augustin Pass (LC00240)

Pearson: We'll move on to the US-70 Shoulder Widening over San Augustin Pass.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I guess I'm up. It's NMDOT staff so …

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: This item we asked to be placed on this agenda just to give you all an update. We did have a stakeholder meeting oh I don't remember the date. It was a few weeks ago and George was in attendance on behalf of the BPAC, as we've had him as sort of the spokesperson for the BPAC in the past so. At that meeting we talked about several different options but one that we were sort of moving forward with for the design of the project was to have basically two concrete wall barriers in the section that goes up over San Augustin Pass so the section where there's six lanes, there's the passing lane on both sides. So at the meeting we talked about having two wall barriers there and sort of giving the cyclists their own little path in between the two concrete wall barriers. Mr. Widmer at the stakeholder

meeting did raise some concerns on, I guess based on the fact that once you make it to the top and you start coming down you do go quite fast and it would be pretty difficult to sort of keep maybe control in between the two concrete wall barriers. So we did listen to that. There was also some discussion revolving around snow removal because believe it or not there is actually a lot of snow and ice that accumulates up there on the pass and Trent Doolittle, the District 1 Engineer did mention that that is one place in his entire district that they plow the most and so snow removal became a, sort of an issue thinking if the tractors came and pushed the snow off it would probably land in between the two concrete wall barriers and then it would be basically impassable for a, a cyclist so after all of that conversation District 1 staff decided to go ahead and move forward with a design that's, only includes one concrete wall barrier. So it'll look similar to how it looks now but the shoulder will be wider. We will still have the white, the three lanes, the white stripe, the rumble strips which take up 18 inches from the stripe, and then you'll have, there's some portions that kind of squeeze down a little bit but at minimum you'll have seven feet of rideable space outside of the rumble strip. So that's the design that we were looking to move forward with and hoping to just get some feedback from this Committee on whether you think that that's okay.

Pearson: So the concrete wall barrier is next to traffic, that one's staying or that one's ...

Herrera: No. So the concrete wall barrier will be sort of similar to how it is now so you'll have the lanes, the white stripe, the rumble strip, the shoulder, and then the concrete wall barrier.

Pearson: Okay. So the concrete wall barrier's protection from the rock fall.

Herrera: Basically, yeah. And we did discuss removing the rumble strips but the District 1 engineers didn't feel like that was a good idea just because they wanted to give some sort of, you know if a, if a car is drifting they don't want them to hit somebody so there's some kind of warning at least with the rumble stripe that they're going off the road before they get to the shoulder.

Pearson: You don't have a typical cross section available to show us do you?

Herrera: I think we do actually. We have the consulting team here, Smith Engineering. They're designing it and then ...

Brinegar: Where does it go?

Herrera: Hillary.

Herrera: So the portion over the pass is where it's going to be the narrowest, like I said seven feet of rideable space but the sections that are beyond where there's the three lanes you will have ten feet of rideable shoulder space so that's outside of the rumble strip, between the rumble strip and the, the guard rail there will be ten feet.

Pearson: And currently the shoulder's closer to five feet isn't it?

Herrera: Yeah. In some places it squeezes down pretty narrow. At the narrowest point in the whole section, so this project goes basically from the end of Organ to the beginning of the White Sands turnoff, so that's the project limit. The narrowest section in there of rideable space will be seven feet.

Curry: Jolene, is this the one that has the two concrete barriers, this one …

Johnson: This is the one …

Curry: That's on the screen?

Johnson: That has the two concrete barriers.

Herrera: Right. So this one has two. This is what we presented at the stakeholder meeting, just so …

Curry: And so …

Herrera: You're all aware.

Curry: You would take the first, the concrete barrier that's next to the cars, basically replace that with a rumble strip.

Herrera: Yes.

Johnson: This one will be the rumble strip right here where it's labeled "existing at this time" and it'll be removed and we'll have a rumble strip there and then there, there will be the rideable surface for the bike riders.

Baum: Will you state your name for the record please.

Johnson: Sam Johnson, Smith Engineering.

Murphy: Microphone.

Johnson: Sam Johnson, Smith Engineering.

Baum: Thank you very much.

Herrera: Yeah. So this is perfect because this shows you what we presented at the meeting but then like I said after the discussion we decided that that's maybe not the best option so yeah. That inner wall barrier would be removed.

Pearson: So currently there are some guard rails. Those wouldn't, those would be taken out?

Herrera: No. The guard rail would remain but we are widening the shoulder so it would be pushed back with the shoulder.

Pearson: So it'd be on the outside, it'd be next to the end of the roadway.

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: So the bike lane, you'd have seven to eight foot of bike lane, guard rail ...

Herrera: Yes. Taper.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: All that kind of stuff.

Pearson: Right.

Herrera: When I say rideable surface I mean there's no guard rail in the way, you're not riding on the rumble strip. I mean it's the shoulder that you would have to ride on.

Pearson: Yeah. Currently the area where there's a guard rail there's also that rumble strip which leaves you about three feet of rideable space and if there's any kind of debris in the way it's going to have a crash because it's on the downhill portion so this is much, much better.

Herrera: Yeah. We thought it was also safer for the pull-off that's up there. Sometimes people tend to walk and so having the two concrete wall barriers, there were some concerns raised about people possibly walking in there and then if a cyclist was trying to ride and then there was a person walking and so just having the one concrete wall barrier I think helps alleviate that just because people typically don't tend to walk on a high-speed facility.

Pearson: Gonna look like a highway rather than look like a ...

Herrera: Exactly.

Pearson: Path or trail.

Herrera: Exactly. So are there any comments from the Committee Members?

Rochelle: Yeah. I, am I to understand then that the only warning motorists have that they're moving into the bike path would be the rumble strip that you're proposing if you take out that first concrete barrier?

Herrera: Yes. There would also be signs and ...

Pearson: Lane striping.

Herrera: Lane striping, yeah.

Curry: I like it. I think it takes into consideration, I think it is easier to clean. I think cleaning would be an issue with debris if you had the two concrete barriers in there, hard to get something in there to clean it. And I appreciate it so I think with signage and markings and that kind of thing I, I say thank you.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Bencomo: So I had a question. When you say "rumble strips" are you talking the ones that are cut into the asphalt?

Herrera: Yes.

Johnson: Yes.

Bencomo: Okay. Cause the, those are, I know they're typically used but they, there's also the type you can lay down as a road stripe and then they have a rumble strip on them. I don't know if that would be less invasive to biking or not but seven feet sounds like a lot. I, I actually, I like this. I like the, the width on it, the idea that there's going to be striping to warn people if there's bikers along there. I know people ride all the way to the monument and back. It's a long ride. I would never do that. But this is a great idea if we can have signage and things, and then also if we can just kind of advertise this. I think a lot of people don't know about a lot of the facilities we have around here so this looks really good. Thank you.

Herrera: And Mr. Chair. Just to, to address your comment about the rumble stripe versus the rumble strip, we did talk about that. District 1 engineers basically felt that since there is room to still have you know a pretty wide

rideable space that they wanted to go ahead and put the, the rumble strips in there. They're, they feel that they're a lot safer. They give people more time to react. Also it's better for plowing. Any other comments, questions? No?

Curry: Ms. Herrera, Mr. Chair. If I may ask a question on behalf a community member and it's, it's sort of related to this area but further down. They wanted to know if along Main Street, so I believe it's still Highway 70 all the way from Three Crosses to I-25, will there be bike lanes marked at some point? Is that ever in the consideration to mark those as bike lanes?

Herrera: We actually are under contract right now with Smith Engineering, the same firm, looking at, we're doing basically a capacity and safety study for that area. So from the Three Crosses intersection to the I-25/US-70 interchange we're still in the study phase. That study has not been produced yet and we don't have any construction funding set aside in the STIP right now. So we're sort of waiting to see what the study says before we move forward with any kind of programming. That's definitely something that they're looking at though. We're multimodal so we wouldn't leave bikes and peds out of the study like that.

Curry: Thank you very much.

Pearson: Any other comments? Okay. Well thank you for this information. I think it was well-received and very important for us to, to have at this Committee.

5.1 MTP Trails Plan Discussion

Pearson: So our next item is 5.1: MTP Trail Plan Discussion.

MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Shepan: Could you, excuse me. Sorry. It's difficult to *(inaudible)* I'm opposite the, could you zoom in?

McAdams: Let me see, I ...

Shepan: Or do something ...

McAdams: Yeah, I can and y'all ...

Shepan: Cause we can't see that ...

McAdams: Can zoom in.

Shepan: And we can't ...

McAdams: Yeah, let me ...

Shepan: Zoom in on these monitors.

McAdams: Let me, let me zoom in real quickly. Okay. Hold on. You can also zoom in as, well let's see.

Pearson: Click and drag.

MICHAEL MCADAMS CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: Can you trace that with the cursor when you ...

MICHAEL MCADAMS CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.

Curry: Mr. Chair, Mr. McAdams. May I just ask you, I'm familiar with that small pinched section and like the pinched section that was of concern near Andele's and The Bean, it's a very narrow roadway on Calle del Sur right there. What's the consideration there? Is that going to be an in-road facility?

McAdams: I'm, I'm not really sure at this point you know. I guess this will be up to the Committee and if it's, if it's late, later on some work done I guess that can be a side. I'm not really, I don't really know.

Curry: Okay. Thank you.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I do have the same concerns as Ashleigh. From Highway 28 to Mesilla lateral, that little tiny piece of University, there's no right-of-way there, just like on Calle Norte off of I, off of 28. It's the same issue. From 28 east to Laguna Lateral there's right-of-way there I believe, space there. That's one of the reasons why we continued north on Laguna Lateral to The Bean and then some kind of connection to the Mesilla Lateral up there. I'm not sure if anybody was at the Policy Committee meeting. Is, is there some reason they're going kind of back to in-road facilities again, it looks like?

McAdams: Tom, Tom can ...

Bencomo: Cause that's what we're gonna end up with, with that small area. That's gonna be an in-road facility unless we get somebody's property. So just a question.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. That is the option that the, the, the Policy Committee decided upon at their, last week and we did point out those,

those factors. I think, I think they were, I think really they're of the opinion that that's going to be something that's happening far enough down the road that we'll have time to, to address it. And also I meanwhile would point out that all the other facilities that we did, did consider are still going to be on the Trail Plan but as Tier 2 or Tier 3 facilities which make, means they're still eligible for project development. So it'd be my estimation that as projects develop and what become, what is feasible gets, gets advanced we may be updating this map as well. But this is the, this is the option that the Policy Committee wished to identify as their preferred route, routing.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: Can I follow that up with why, did they say why exactly they wanted this route?

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I, without, without know, each, each member voting did not express their, you know their motivations for doing it but based on the conversation I would, I would pass on to you that the ability to you know get, get kind of close to the heart of the, the town center and then also utilizing the more expansive Laguna route, lateral on the south and then I, it was, it was actually, the option was actually developed by one of the Commissioners and I, you know I think it's a way for the, for the County to participate in the development of, of the loop here so that's the only motivation I can share with you, or that I'm aware of.

Herrera: Thank you.

Curry: Mr. Chair, if I may. Mr. Murphy I just wanted to clarify with you what you said earlier, so what I'm understanding is that this is an approved map for now but you envision that as construction comes closer it may still be amended in details, maybe sorted out but it may not be an in road or some other option may present itself as more viable in the meantime and it may change? This isn't a set-in-stone map in other words. This is just something to move forward from.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. This is a, a, a planning map for a, a long-range transportation plan and if a, you know related to the, to the roadway maps that most people are familiar with. They represent you know really kind of a, a, a desire but what actually gets constructed may differ you know given what constraints arise at the time that construction happens. And once this facility is constructed and we do know where, where it is we will amend the, amend the map to show exactly where it is. So at this point I don't believe that any of the jurisdictions have, have the financial capacity

to construct that southern loop portion all in one fell swoop. I believe that it'll, it'll be put together piece by piece and then as we move on we may find needs to amend this.

Curry: Thank you, thank you. And if I may, I have one more question. Have you received application yet from the Town of Mesilla to do the portion along Calle del Norte?

Murphy: It has not been submitted but the, but the, but Mayor Barraza did indicate that it is being worked on.

Curry: Thank you.

Pearson: So what part did, can you clarify?

Curry: Yes. Mayor Barraza and I had talked, probably April/May time frame about possibly submitting TAP application, a TAP application for the piece that goes from the river to ...

Pearson: Okay.

Curry: To the Laguna, or to the Mesilla Lateral cause that was the most undisputed piece and so as Mr. Murphy said, breaking it into chunks for funding purposes, having that one chunk as sort of undisputed, everybody sort of agreed on that piece. She was planning on putting forward an application.

Pearson: Right. Because that kind of goes to one of the reasons I wanted to talk some more about the Trail Plan, is that there are some different, other parts of the Plan that have projects just kind of begging to be identified. One that springs to mind is a connection from Motel Boulevard to the outfall channel. The Scorpion Bike Club from Picacho Middle School uses that and they're probably trespassing on private land in order to get to the trail. So being able to identify as a project for, it's probably the City of Las Cruces, that might be something the City could look at RTP, Recreational Trail funds as opposed to TAP funds. It's just a possibility. I have no idea. But other projects would be to bring, I think it's the Armijo Lateral which was discussed as part of the Proximo Amador project, connect from the outfall channel all the way through.

McAdams: I guess Mr. Chairman you'll move on to discuss revision of the, our plans for the, plans for the plans I guess.

Pearson: Right. Do we have, have those, do we have specific pieces like that that need to be further identified? Do the entities use this as a planning tool, I guess is the other question. You know is it, are we doing good work here

in having this identified? Should we call out, maybe have a priority? We, we see five projects for each entity that we would suggest as priorities to look at while you're doing all your other capital improvement projects.

McAdams: I think that it would be a good idea if the Committee could look at short-range priorities, you know what, if we have a limited amount of funds what would be good priorities to, or project to recommend to the different entities, the City, the County, the Town, I've, and perhaps DOT as well. So to be more realistic perhaps, I mean look at both, look at the continuity of the system and things we knew, in the, the far future but also look at things we can do in the near future that'll help with connectivity, realistic project. I think that would be our recommendation you know, or you could look, look at both too as well.

Pearson: So this map has been updated. Does it also have other multi-use trails that have been added?

McAdams: It, it should be updated Mr. Chairman.

Pearson: Okay.

McAdams: As of present.

Pearson: Because the, the Dam Trail System I see is still dots but that's imminently to be done I believe. I don't, we'll find out during our updates maybe.

McAdams: But our policy would be only to put in facilities that are complete or, for, so the lateral, the, will be completed fairly soon and when that is we'll update the map.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Bencomo: So with some comments on that, we've talked about this previously, I mentioned it, some kind of maybe work session with the entire Committee so that we can come with, I mean whatever the Policy Committee comes up with I, the, obviously they get to have the say if we give our suggestions here they can vote and vote something differently. But I think we still need to push what we think is best and if we could sit down and maybe prioritize some kind of map system that maybe prioritizes color-coded or whatever, green, yellow, blue that this is our first priority, this is our second priority, this is our third and just kind of put something in place for down the road because someday as we're working on this trail system 20 years from now some of us, like myself may be dead already but hopefully not. And, and so it's, it's not about just the people at the dais

right now, it's about continuing this plan for long-term, setting it in place. There's also some future things to take into consideration like connection with the Rio Grande Trail which is another biggie, to bring people through there and into the communities of Las Cruces and Mesilla and Dona Ana, Tortugas. There's also the, the trails that are non-multi-use like single-track trails that have some connectivity, especially now that like places like Dripping Springs Road are completed and people can ride up that road and take Sierra Vista, go all the way up and around, up to Baylor Canyon, different places. We have some crazy single-track hundred-mile trail runners here in the room with us right now, cycle people but so a lot of those things to be able to take into account and put those other pieces in because the, the plan we have right now is, is really based on paved multi-use in the city only. And now we can start looking at even, now we're moving into Mesilla, we're looking at laterals, we're, we're getting the ball rolling. So if we could do some kind of prioritized map or something like that it would be great.

The other comment or question I have also, I was reading the minutes from the last meeting which I have of course missed the meeting. There was a discussion about the multi-use on the, the, the irrigation ditches and it having to be ten feet wide. So is that a requirement, I'll, I'll plead ignorance here, a requirement for it to be ten feet wide? Because for example University, we talked about that widening and in some places we may have to modify and not have certain facilities that we could have in another part of it, and we were okay with that. So do we have that ability to say, "You know what, based on this lateral or this area we want to use which we think is the best route, we're not going to get ten feet but we can get eight feet out if it or we can get seven feet out of it and that's," do we have the ability to, to do that or does it have to meet these certain design standards, I guess is the question I have.

Pearson: I guess maybe we can ask our NMDOT representative to expand a little bit but ...

McAdams: Right.

Pearson: I think that, put you on the spot, that we, the, well go ahead. I lost whatever I was going to say.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess the short answer is no, that's not a requirement. But it is an AASHTO guideline and so they are just that; they're guidelines. We try to do our best to meet the ten-foot minimum standard for a true multi-use trail but there is also the understanding that that situation doesn't work everywhere and trying to retrofit things in isn't exactly the easiest thing to do so I guess I would say that we always strive for ten feet but if there's small areas that, where we can't get that ...

Bencomo: Okay.

Herrera: I guess we'd have to, to look at it and the entity who's proposing the project and is going to be the sponsor is really, they're going to have to make the case I guess for that.

Bencomo: Okay. And that makes sense. I, I, I get that. There's, there's best practices which would be that ten foot but then there's the reality of what we are trying to do here locally. So as long as we can keep that in mind I, that's great. I'm glad, I like that answer actually. So thank you.

Pearson: So the map gives us Tier 1, 2, and 3 priorities but we don't have any real feeling for what projects in those priorities. So I wonder if that's maybe what we should as a Committee have a project list of, maybe three to five projects for each of the entities.

McAdams: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: And that could be a recommendation that is adjacent maybe to the plan.

McAdams: I think that's exactly what we're talking about. As staff we'd like to see like if *(inaudible)* recommendations for the upcoming fiscal year for projects for the City, for the Town, and the County and perhaps the, the DOT if applicable and what we think would be a reasonable recommendations for the next fiscal year. And it's, well the, for this, CI, CIP, all right. Instead of looking at priorities per se let's look at a list of projects that we think are doable and would aid to connectivity etc. are and it's piecemeal but I think this is where reality, we're going to put at, you know little pieces here and there to create a system. So I would say for our, our, the staff point of view I think that would be our recommendation for going ahead. And then at the same time perhaps look at the overall plan but I think we would like to see that as an emphasis. Yeah.

Pearson: So moving forwards do we ask staff for the lists or do, should we come up with the lists, have a meeting next, maybe at our next meeting?

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

McAdams: The, the, I think Mr. Chair we would recommend the second one looking at the Committee, coming up with their priorities and of course we could assist with this.

Herrera: That's kind of what I was going to say, is I would recommend that the Committee come up with the project list. I mean I think we've already done sort of the long-term planning. That's what the map is for, is more of a long-term picture of where we want to go. A list of projects would be

helpful for entities, especially when we have project calls like TAP and RecTrails that we have right now. So we're a little behind the ball on this cycle but maybe for the next cycle, excuse me, having a list of projects that we could just hand to the City Councilors or whoever it is might be more impactful than a map that's sort of too big-picture I think sometimes.

Pearson: So maybe bring this forward on our next meeting and ask Committee Members have in mind a list of projects, three separate lists, one for each City of Las Cruces, Town of Mesilla, County of Dona Ana and then we can discuss from there and may or may not come up with a recommendation.

McAdams: Well I ...

Pearson: At least we can make the list.

McAdams: Exactly. Yeah.

Pearson: And whether it's priority, if it's nothing more than just a list and we can work with priorities at a future ...

Curry: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: BPAC meeting.

Curry: Are you suggesting that each individually we come up with what we think and then we discuss it at our next BPAC meeting?

Pearson: I think that's ...

Curry: Or are we going for what Mr. Bencomo suggested of just having a, a kind of a work session where we all sit down together with the map and figure it out together?

Pearson: I guess it depends on how easy it is to come up with a list, if we need the work session type approach or if we can just bring up our lists and say, "This is my ideas," and I don't know how ...

Curry: I, I would be willing to coordinate a work session with those who are interested and available to, to meet together before our next meeting and if anybody's interested or available to come to do that. I would prefer to do it collaboratively because I think we'd get a lot of ideas off, you know off each other, "This works, this doesn't work." Whereas if we come together with lists it's going to take an enormous amount of time to coordinate it, that at a BPAC meeting as opposed to sort of offering up proposals. That's my opinion.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I agree with that. I think us doing it collaboratively, I realize everybody has schedules and things to do and, and I'm willing to, to work with Ashleigh and if we can coordinate a meeting, if people can come they can come and if they can't or they don't want to that's fine and they, they can do their own lists. But that opportunity to do that, but and I would also maybe go a step further, I would also like to be able to invite people to that meeting that have a, there's stakeholders just, besides people that are at this. I, I realize I'm the Pedestrian Representative but if we could get stakeholders outside of this group also that we know that could give some input, they may have some ideas that we're not thinking of. They may have some valuable feedback. I'm sure they do. So, but I, I think meeting collaboratively would be best in my opinion.

Rochelle: Mr. Chairman. I agree with that as well. I think that it, we're better off doing, meeting outside this framework because otherwise we're just going to come in here with laundry lists and then have to prolong the meeting, this meeting in order to come up with some sense of agreement. It's better to come in here with some agreements in advance. Thank you.

Pearson: So our next, September is usually an off month for us so maybe we have a work session in September? Go ahead Tom, what's ...

Murphy: Mr. Chair. I, I, I guess we could look at, at the possibility of, of having a formal work session during your off month. If, if the Committee was to meet outside of this, or, I'm, let me back up. If Members of this Committee were to meet outside of this venue under the guise, under the auspices of it I think we would have to ask you to limit the meeting to four Committee Members or fewer to avoid ...

Pearson: Quorum.

Murphy: Quorum issues and violations of Open Meetings Act. So if, if there are five or more of you that are interested in doing this let us know, we'll work at, at getting a, a meeting space and, and advertise an agenda so that we're in conformance with the Open Meetings Act. If it's four or fewer of you, you could meet as a subcommittee of, of this, of this Body and then we, we don't have those concerns.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: Tom, what, is there an issue with having sort of an open to the public work session where we do have more than four members of this Committee, it's posted as a work session, there's no decisions, I mean we're not voting on anything but still have it posted to the public?

Murphy: If we have, if we have it posted to the public that, that is fine and all 11 of you can be here and, and everyone else in the, in the world. It's just a matter of five of you getting together at somebody's office and then, and then making a, discussing policy aims and, and things of that nature. So if, if we break that magic number of five we would like to know about it so we're able to advertise it.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. That, I, that is absolutely correct that if we show up together like that. I hadn't thought about that until he just mentioned that. I forgot about my City days. Yeah you, you, we would have to advertise it to the public. It'd have to be a, an actual meeting. So if it's, if you can get meeting space for us, if the Committee agrees I think that's great because then we can have feedback from the public there if we so wish. If we can ...

Pearson: So could we have the September meeting at this location ...

Murphy: I don't think ...

Pearson: As a work session?

Murphy: We, we, we'll check the availability of spaces.

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: And then ...

Pearson: Then maybe we should just plan on it's either here or someplace at City Hall that, that ...

Murphy: We could probably find some location at some point. So I guess if it sounds like it, you want a special work session set up so staff ...

Curry: Do we need to take a show of hands and just see that there, more than five people who are interested in doing it?

Pearson: Well we were talking about calling the public, making it a public thing ...

Curry: Yeah.

Pearson: Too so that's the opportunity, that's, that way we can get the advertising to be done if we call it as a, a work session. And if some Committee Members happen to have coffee together so long as there're no more than four they can have their discussion.

Wray: Mr. Chair. By saying that we're just going to have a September meeting, is that implying that it's going to be the third Tuesday that you would like for us to look at?

Pearson: I think so, yeah. Okay?

Wray: At the same time?

Pearson: Five o'clock sounds right.

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

6.1 MPO Staff Update

Pearson: Okay. So we're up to Committee and Staff Comments.

McAdams: We have additional presentation from Bohannan Huston and Aaron Sussman's here to discuss the Missouri Avenue extension.

AARON SUSSMAN GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Curry: Can I just ask a quick question? What's the period of time? Is that a day, a week, a month, 45

Sussman: Yes. I'm sorry. That is 4,500 trips per day.

Curry: Thank you.

AARON SUSSMAN CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: So how much impact will the Missouri neighborhood have with the Missouri build? Is that, that must be one of the prime considerations or not, or ...

Sussman: Well there's the reality that extending that facility does induce traffic through that neighborhood. And you, that can be taken both ways. The Missouri Avenue extension has been on the long-range roadway maps I think for more than 20 years. So that's not a secret that that roadway was envisioned as a, as a through corridor, through east-west corridor. But the reality of it is that it would have impacts for those communities. Now what we're saying at this time is that given that there would be impacts and given the cost associated with constructing a full roadway typical from the existing Missouri Avenue to Sonoma Ranch and given the fact that that doesn't fundamentally address the regional traffic challenges that we can observe, it's not something that we can definitively say we should

absolutely pursue construction of that facility today but something that does clearly warrant more analysis if we want to move in that direction.

Pearson: Okay.

Nunez: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Go ahead.

Nunez: A few things. The, you started off by saying that you are making the assumption that the BLM land's not going to change. I'm curious and I don't want to throw a wrench in the whole thing that you've done here but what, how could it change? In other words could it, could you have certain amount of development? Is it realistic that it will? That's one question. Let me go ahead and ask a couple more. Are state, I mean another statement is if you're just, looking at this and seeing the color code, yeah you can kind of see that there's less red in, in the options you suggested so that makes sense I guess, trusting all, that I agree with everything that you've written in here. But yeah, the, is there extension and then the bicycle/pedestrian connection. My two cents is develop the city. Open it up. I've lived here most of my life and actually my parents' roadway became pretty major thoroughfare so and, and it was kind of a surprise too. But you know it, like you mentioned 20 years and the people along Missouri may be not happy but yet there's, I, I see a benefit when you open up a city for many many different ways. That's just my two cents. But the, so I'm, I am kind of curious too, looking past what you have here, is it, I know pretty much just have the, the high school there and then you also have a route now for certain people live behind A Mountain or, or whichever direction they're heading. But I suppose the City will grow some in that direction at one time to the, to the, to the east.

Sussman: So let me respond to the BLM question first. BLM has been an active participant in this project. They have a representative on our project team. They've made it abundantly clear that there's no attention, intention to dispose of the land for urban development purposes at this time. That is the assumption that we need to work off of. It's consistent with the assumptions in the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan in terms of the socioeconomic forecasts. So we have no reason to deviate from that, from those set of projections. One thing that's important to note about the projections, and I think this goes to your last point is that I think when the study had been initially authorized the projected growth level for the Las Cruces Metro Area was quite a bit higher than the more recent set of projections. We don't anticipate through the MPO forecasts a large amount of development to the east of the study area. There's a fair amount to the north of the study area which would help explain that sort of east-west to north-south set of movements. But in terms of that east-west

connectivity to promote access to east Las Cruces, there's not a tremendous amount of development anticipated in those set of forecasts. Those are our baseline assumptions that we need to adhere to and respect as part of this study. That's one of the nice things though about one of the, the benefits and the burdens I suppose of planning at the MPO level is that those forecasts will be reevaluated as part of the next MTP and if those assumptions change and if there are changes in development patterns then those can be, then our set of assumptions can be updated and that may change the priority level of different roadway facilities. But at this time given our information, you know again there's not a lot of true east-west trips that are generated through the study area that Missouri Avenue facilitates except for an alternative path to sort of avoid, or is a, an, an alternative route for existing transportation challenges, traffic challenges within the core of Las Cruces.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Bencomo: So earlier you talked about a projection, I think it was 2040 if the number's right, 2040; 4,600 to 4,800 traffic count daily through there if you connected Roadrunner and Missouri, correct? Did I get all that right?

Sussman: If, yes. So if you connected Missouri east-west it's about 4,500. It's about the same if you connect both.

Bencomo: What ...

Sussman: But then it becomes a question of at what point are, are vehicles looking to make that north-south connection? Is it Roadrunner or is it Sonoma Ranch?

Bencomo: Okay. Maybe I misunderstood then. So you're talking about the forty-whatever-hundred trips would be if you connected Missouri to Sonoma Ranch, not to Roadrunner Parkway.

Sussman: If you connect it, it's essentially the same number if you connected them both ...

Bencomo: Okay.

Sussman: Or if you connected just Missouri to Sonoma Ranch.

Bencomo: Okay. Do you have projections of what Missouri would be, like I said it might not change anything if you don't, if you just left it as is, what are the, the trips now or what would the projections be?

Sussman: Well because it …

Bencomo: Oh, it's not going to change.

Sussman: Right. Because Missouri Avenue dead-ends …

Bencomo: What, what are the trips now?

Sussman: At city limits. There's about 2,500 trips to the east of Telshor Boulevard. As you get closer to the edge of city limits that number …

Bencomo: Drops.

Sussman: Gradually drops to essentially the last driveway.

Bencomo: It probably, it probably drops around Curnutt cause that's where the school is.

Sussman: Yeah.

Bencomo: People turn off to the school there and they stop traveling.

Sussman: Right. I want to say it's only several hundred trips in sort of that …

Bencomo: Okay.

Sussman: Far easternmost segment.

Bencomo: Cause …

Sussman: So there clearly would be a, a number of, a decent number of additional trips that would be generated …

Bencomo: Okay.

Sussman: And pass through that neighborhood.

Pearson: So instead of …

Bencomo: And then I asked these questions because I, I'd, I don't know, I'm not a traffic engineer or anything but I'm thinking if there was a route from Roadrunner Parkway to Missouri, that allows people to avoid Telshor and Lohman which is a mess, it seems like that would be a great benefit but I don't know traffic engineering, so just curious.

Sussman: So if I can respond to that. I think you've correctly identified the rationale from a traffic flow perspective to construct both facilities. But an important question that we, that we try to weigh through the evaluation matrix and through the set of evaluation criteria as part of this study is whether that benefit from a traffic flow perspective is sufficient to justify the construction of both facilities, and in our estimation that given the negative impacts and sort of a varied, the additional costs and sort of a varied challenges associated with constructing both facilities, it's hard to say that those, that, that improved traffic flow supersedes all of those other considerations.

Bencomo: Okay. Thank you. I think the angry drivers alone on Telshor would argue with you but, I'm, I'm just kidding. I, I, I don't know traffic. But thank you.

Pearson: But for the impact to the neighborhood that last, that last house on Missouri at the end will be going from the cars driving into their driveway to having 4,500 people driving past their house after the build. So that goes directly from what's the benefit to the city versus what's the benefit to the neighborhood.

Sussman: That is correct, and that's something that has to be weighed. And so I, I, you know again I, I don't want to belabor this point too much but our, our sense is that because there are more sort of regional transportation and traffic challenges, extending any of these facilities alone or even both of them doesn't really get at the underlying challenges. So we would want to, if again we were to invest some pretty serious resources into roadway construction that'd be part of that comprehensive set investments.

Pearson: And then the bicycle option is better than the no-build just in that it gives bicyclists access and improves the multimodal.

Sussman: Yes. Actually we identified a number of benefits, not just in terms of the, the connection itself: The access from the neighborhood to the, the high school, you've got a multimodal east-west connectivity, it's consistent with the uses of a, of that, the land in the study area today but fairly low impact. It's something that's supported by the Farm and Ranch Museum because it might promote access to their site as well, and then obviously it extends the bicycle network. If I can sort of pivot onto the question of funding which is ultimately where a lot of this then leads to, this is the kind of project that if I understood Ms. Herrera's presentation on TAP projects a couple of months ago correctly, it does hit kind of all of the criteria because you're extending a network, you're creating additional options, additional connectivity, and you're also providing direct access to an educational institution, to a high school that's an improvement upon the existing infrastructure. So it would seem to meet a lot of the criteria that NMDOT have identified in terms of the types of projects that they fund from a non-motorized perspective.

Curry: Mr. Chair. Mr. Sussman do you, speaking of that, that's along the lines of my questions. Do you have sort of a rough estimate as to what that build would cost if you looked at the one with the pedestrian and the bicycle path?

Sussman: The short answer is no because that's not, we, we look at magnitude of costs as part of the Phase A study but we're not in a position where we can pinpoint the full construction costs. The one kind of exception to that is looking at the drainage infrastructure required. It's probably worth noting that would, even though it would just be an, an extension, or creation of a bicycle facility it would probably require the same level of drainage infrastructure as a full roadway. There's some very large arroyo systems on the north side of Centennial High School that would need to be navigated. Those aren't prohibitive but they're real. So it, it's something that would need to be evaluated further by a local entity if they were to pursue, pursue that project for funding.

Curry: So no ball point that you could give us.

Sussman: I can't give you ballpark at this point.

Curry: Okay.

Sussman: No.

Curry: Thanks.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry.

Pearson: Go ahead.

Bencomo: So the, the, looking at the map and all that and the, the bicycle/pedestrian, sorry I have to say pedestrian too, thank you Ashleigh for saying pedestrian also, facility alone, that goes straight and crosses arroyos. Does it not follow arroyos perhaps where they could, and the cost might, oh then you extend the, the distance so I'd assume it might cost more but those crossings are expensive. I understand that. Any time you cross, does it, does it take those into account as far as using the natural flow of those for some kind of pathways and stuff?

Sussman: The short answer is that's, that's kind of the logical extension of the work that we've done. We've identified this from a, essentially a high-level planning perspective as something that produces quite a bit of benefit. But that level of engineering would need to be done at the next phase.

Shearer: Mr. Chair. Can I just ask if you show us again that map that shows where you're talking about, the pedestrian, pedestrian/bicycle route?

Sussman: So this is the very, very rough alignment for the bicycle/pedestrian non-motorized path facility. The important point here is that it is an extension from the existing Missouri Avenue to Sonoma Ranch Boulevard along the northern edge of Centennial High School. The exact alignment has not been identified but we can very much say that this is the general trajectory that that path could follow.

Shearer: Okay. And on your metrics it has 1.27 miles as the shortest route, route of all the selections you've got here, is that correct, somewhere in that neighborhood?

Sussman: Yeah. I'm not sure that I, I think that should be interpreted as sort of a relative, it, because we would not need to necessarily align with the Roadrunner and Missouri roadway alignments as depicted in the Future Thoroughfare Map, there's some flexibility in terms of taking the shortest path. That's the best guess in terms of length that we have at this time but that number should be treated as, there, there's a, there's certainly a margin of error there.

Shearer: And, and this is more or less the same route that we're talking about if you built the Missouri extension.

Sussman: Correct.

Shearer: I see. So, so it would be the cheapest option other than the no-build here so.

Sussman: Correct.

Shearer: And, and ...

Sussman: There's definitely, we can say with certainty that in terms of magnitude of costs that there would be far lower costs to construct the non-motorized path as opposed to the full roadway typical. The point about drainage infrastructure is that that's not a cost that could be avoided though, so there still would be some engineering challenges and some, some tangible costs associated with it.

Shearer: Okay. And, and where, what's the next step here from your study?

Sussman: That is a good question. So this is a project that, and a study that was conducted through the MPO as the sponsor for the study. As you all know the MPO is not an implementation agency so we would need a local

project sponsor to take the lead for construction for this. Because of the, the level of analysis that we were able to conduct at this phase we don't believe that it would require a full NMDOT-funded Phase B location study before we could move into those later stages. This is something that we feel is ready for the, for environmental analysis and for the questions about design and, and full, full costs. Those, those are things that could be evaluated as a next step. But it does need, it would need a local project sponsor.

Curry: Mr. Chair. One more question. Is the, would the entire project then, I'm looking at this, maybe stating the obvious, be on BLM land so there's no part of it that would be in City or County or anything else, and would BLM oversee that whole project?

Sussman: So if you're asking if the, if BLM would be a sort of, the lead agency to construct this path, I don't believe that that's very likely but it could be pursued by either the City or the County or ...

Curry: So I, I'm, I'm ...

Sussman: Yeah.

Curry: Maybe I'm just ignorant in this, well obviously I'm just ignorant in this. Is BLM, or how does BLM overlap City and County kind of right-of-way?

Sussman: So that, because this would pass through BLM right-of-way there would need to be an easement to pass through BLM land. That's part of the environmental analysis process that would need to be pursued. BLM's participation in this project has been very consistent and very positive so that it would, there would need to be an approval for right-of-way easement but that again by all indications is consistent with the intended uses of this land. So it, and we have identified some means of mitigating some of the, the potentially negative impacts to the natural environment. But that process would need to be adhered to and respected, the BLM environmental analysis process and the process for obtaining a right-of-way easement through BLM land.

Curry: And so otherwise the, the land surrounding it is City versus County.

Sussman: So all of the land in the study area is unincorporated Dona Ana County land but it's maintained and overseen by the Bureau of Land Management.

Curry: Okay.

Sussman: At this time.

Curry: Okay. Thank you very much.

Sussman: Yes.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So just to, for clarification, so the County would probably be the most likely sponsor of this cause it's, is County, it's in County jurisdiction if you want to call it that, outside the City. And so B, so BLM has been part of this and they want to use that space as like kind of open space use, so based on that, that, if you put a facility in there and it's a public use facility that's typically the easiest one and lowest cost to work with BLM as far as obtaining the land. So that's a positive as far as it being a, a public use, a, a recreation type trail and, and things like that. So I'm guessing working with the County might be the next step, you think? I don't know. Opinion?

Sussman: I'm going to refrain from offering a personal opinion.

Bencomo: Okay.

Sussman: That's probably a good question for MPO staff. But I don't think that anything that you said is incorrect.

Nunez: Mr. Chair. Let me, let me just ask. What, what, if I could. MPO staff can you help me? I'm not used to this. It, what is actually the more likely scenario? Cause is the County going to want, what's the benefit to the County? Are they going to want to provide access to a school or is the City more likely to try to obtain this? And if, if, if this were even pursued ...

Wray: Mr. Chair. We're not going to venture an opinion ...

Nunez: Well ...

Wray: At this time on that either.

Nunez: What's happened in the past? I, I don't, it, it's not like we're setting policy here. I am just curious.

Wray: Well we could use the example of, of Centennial High School but in a way the development and the selection of that particular site was, was kind of anomalous so that's not really good precedent that staff wants to utilize to cite in this conversation at this time. I personally am not aware of any other particular sequence of events within the time that I've lived in Las Cruces that really would closely parallel this set of circumstances that we're discussing right now, so, and I, I cannot speak for the County or the City so I can't offer an opinion ...

Nunez: Me either ...

Wray: Regarding that.

Nunez: Really in this sense but I'd, I was just trying to figure out ...

Pearson: Well as a guess ...

Nunez: What, what ...

Pearson: The Sonoma Ranch extension is through the BLM land area but the City built and paid for that. So the City certainly could pursue this if they decided to. The La Llorona Trail is outside city limits. They could decide that it extends the, the trail system enough, that benefits the City enough that the City might want to pursue it. But that's all speculation at this point.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Castillo: Mr. Chair.

Bencomo: I believe you're, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Castillo: Mr. Chair. So it, I think that the, the, there's a potential for some new scenarios. I think Andrew's correct. There isn't a good precedent out there right now. There are some, there is some precedent for the County having easements or having access or long-term agreements with BLM for access for other purposes. But this also sets up a good opportunity for possibly like a City-County joint sponsorship of a, of a, of a, of, of a project and for use of that property so I think it sets up a good example.

Kind of as a quick follow-up to that though, I wanted to bring up a, an issue on environmental impacts. The way I read the, what is it, the six-font size, most of the environmental impact was all negative. I, the, I, I would, I would encourage you to look at some positives. I think some of the positives are you, you kind of alluded to them in some of your discussion and that is some improvements to the, to the storm water issues along those trails. And if they are going to abut other arroyos or other waterways I think there's a way also to, it, it, it enhances the opportunity to leverage other funds from some of those other agencies that their basic charge is to maintain storm water and maintain the, the flow of arroyos, but to do some joint projects. And I think you see that happen in southern Arizona and some other places where there's a major flood improvement project that includes bicycle and pedestrian trails with it. So I think, I would encourage you to look at that as well. Thank you.

Sussman: Thank you.

Pearson: Okay. Well thank you for the presentation. It was very informative.

Sussman: Thank you.

Pearson: Does staff have any more?

McAdams: We have one more just a little quick thing. On this, 25th of this, of the, July the RoadRUNNER Transit started a new route system and in the back we have the new routes. If you have any questions, routes and schedules, if any questions we'll be glad to answer. As far as other questions you know Mike Bartholomew will be glad to answer like operational stuff. Just a little FYI.

Wray: Mr. Chair. The map is actually being distributed to the Committee ...

McAdams: Oh good. Okay.

Wray: Right now.

McAdams: Okay. Good.

Pearson: Take one and pass it on.

McAdams: So it's not a, we discussed it before, the RoadRUNNER Transit. This is the manifestation of the plan. Some operational changes have been made. We think it, it, it offers a variety of advantages and that it connects, you don't have to transfer for grocery stores which is a major thing. Also we've, in the plan we looked at you know connecting bicycles and of course bicycles are using the facilities very much, I mean the bike, the buses a lot. We think it's a improvement and, but if you have any questions we'll be, I'll be glad to answer them either now or later.

Pearson: Okay. Okay. I had a couple of questions for staff that I thought would be appropriate at this point in the proceedings. The agenda was sent, just sent out and I didn't get, wasn't asked any opinion about the agenda. My understanding is the Chair is, the only thing the Chair gets to do is to say the, the agenda is okay so I wanted to question, maybe just remind staff to let me know about the agenda so that I can, you know.

Wray: Mr. Chair. The, the primary responsibility for the BPAC has shifted to Mr. McAdams over the past couple of months and that's going to be the way it will continue to be in the future. Mr. McAdams was traveling for work at the time when the agenda was being compiled and due to that, the disruption by that, it was a, an oversight on the part of staff.

McAdams: Okay.

Pearson: Okay. The other question I had had to do with the Policy Committee item, the trail recommendation that came through. I saw in the supporting material that was sent that the wrong item was identified as the, what we had voted on and I wonder if that had been corrected properly by the time Policy Committee saw it. I did send an e-mail to Tom and to the Committee Chair pointing that out. But I didn't get any feedback on that.

Wray: Mr. Chair. That was an oversight on our part. The, the information that was in the packet was actually completely correct. It's just that I neglected to add in the, the subsequent I don't remember what months it was, the BPAC and the, the TAC made the recommendations. But what was in there was the original recommendation which was Option B and then the subsequent recommendation from both Committees was Option D and I neglected to add in there, but that was ...

Pearson: Okay. Cause that was in the, the front page material and so it looked like we recommended something else. The other question I had was directly related. The Policy Committee, in part of the Policy Committee packet the minutes, draft minutes from this Committee were not available. The draft minutes should be available ten days after our meeting. Why wouldn't the draft minutes been part of the packet for the Policy Committee?

Wray: I'm, I'm not sure what you mean. The minutes for ...

Pearson: The minutes from our meeting, that made the recommendation to the Policy Committee, the ...

Wray: Oh, you wanted them to be in the Policy Committee packet?

Pearson: That would've given the Policy Committee to, the ability to see what our discussion was concerning those items.

Wray: I can only apologize, Mr. Chair. That was not something that occurred to us.

Pearson: Okay. Done with staff updates?

McAdams: That's it.

6.2 Local Projects update

Pearson: Local Project Updates. City of Las Cruces.

Nunez: I got a number of streets here that we're resurfacing and adding pedestrian/ADA ramps, so lot of, I mean go through the list here: Utah, El

Prado, Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth Street, Willow, Lee, Boston, Pinon. Soon we're going to be doing Farney, Lavender, Roadrunner, and we're about to have a pretty big part, project there on North Solano from Mulberry to Juniper with adding ADA accessibility. And then on Elks we're, should, that's probably going to end up finally completing that project, well I shouldn't say "finally," it's on schedule but there from Hatfield on northern Elks by Engler, but they're going to add that six-foot-wide bicycle lane.

And let's see, what else? Oh yeah. The Dam Trails should be done at the end of this next month and in the last meeting the question came up, somebody had mentioned that when the La Llorona Trail was completed there was no celebration, ribbon cutting, or anything. I did ask a few people and they said that the City has been, used to do a lot of those and then they cut way back to just some of the larger projects. So it doesn't mean that we can't or someone else can't arrange something. I even thought of, and I have not yet talked to the, call it the Wellness Program. They've got the people there at, in the Meerscheidt Center for, thought of having some sort of walk or something to, but I do know that they can basically put it in their, the announcements when, when projects are done. They will have that at the City. But they have, right now they don't have anything planned for any ribbon cutting or anything like that on the Dam Trials.

Pearson: Yeah. That, the Dam Trails seems like a significant project that it might merit good public announcement.

Nunez: I talked to two levels of management. I can go up another level. But you all can too, everybody on this Committee actually may have a lot more pull than I do.

Curry: Mr. Chair. It seems like that's a perfect opportunity for a bike/pedestrian coordinator within the City to be able to pull together such celebrations of the things that we have around here.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I agree. I saw the, the minutes for the last meeting and it talked about maybe even have like a 5k or 10k run there, some, that, that would be great if we could do that. I mean I, I, we could probably get the Las Cruces Running Club to set it up and sponsor, do all those things. It wouldn't be anything in-depth. It would be very informal but it would be a way to get people out there to see that. I rode my bike a couple of, on Sunday through there, up across the rock dam and it, it looks really nice. The trails back there are coming along really well. So to be able to do something like that would be great, and getting the community involved. It's another one of those ones where there's so many people that are active in the community but they don't know what facilities we have. When I mention trails and things we have they're like, "Really? I didn't know that

was there." And so we, we really need to get the word out about these things.

Pearson: Okay. Dona Ana County.

Castillo: Yes. One quick update. This week Dona Ana County submitted a TAP application to the El Paso MPO. We are a part of the El Paso MPOs on the areas that are adjacent to the Texas border so it includes Chaparral, Anthony, and Sunland Park. And that's a project that Samuel has been diligently working on so I will let him give you the details at the, at the next meeting.

Pearson: Could you just tell us ...

Castillo: It's basically in Chaparral. It's a small connectivity project on Lisa Road connecting a park facility to, to the school areas where the two elementary schools, I don't know how many of you are familiar with the Chaparral community but I think, I think it's, it, it, it would set a good precedent. It's, so it's basically a multi, multi-use path.

Pearson: That sounds good. Town of Mesilla.

Shepan: Nothing Mr. Chair.

Pearson: NMSU.

Shearer: Yeah. Well school's starting. Classes begin tomorrow. We're going to try and get the students involved a little bit more in, in some of the Task Force. We're working on a bike-friendly university. Some of the things that recently come to light, Espina we, we're scheduled for doing a road diet on Espina which is one of the main entrances into the school and changing it from a four-lane to a two-lane with bike lanes on either side but that's been delayed at the recommendation of one of the engineering firms for a traffic study. Nevertheless we anticipate probably by Christmas that will be done and we'll restripe the road in there which would make for a, a improvement on Espina I think, reduce some of the, the traffic coming into that area.

Some of the other things, miscellaneous we're scheduling, or working towards doing a bike master plan. We've had a traffic/transportation study previously and it was brought up a couple times about three years ago and I think we're going to go forward with it now. There's getting enough activity or interest in some of the higher-ups to, in, in the administration to, to look forward doing some sort of a master plan there. So especially since this, like I say the route, Triviz, in a couple years we'll have a route coming across the campus so I think it's appropriate there. As far as general activities we're, and, and you already

know this, I think it, we'd have a, going to have a bike expo on, at the Activity Center there. It's open to the, the community. We're going to have a, a bike swap and a, a bike ride and some repairs and the De Las Cruces should be there also. So it'll be good. It's September 1st, four to six p.m.

And then for Homecoming we're going to do the same as we have for the last two years, three years, have a, a Homecoming Family/Youth Safety Training with a bike rodeo and some bike repairs to, to hopefully train some of our, our younger youth to ride on the right side of the road instead of down the middle and so on. All right. Thank you.

Pearson: Sure.

Lakey: For, for that also we're going to have people in the parade as well. So we're going to have a, the cyclists in the parade on, on October 1st and then afterwards we're going to have the event at NMSU.

Shearer: That's an invitation to anyone that wants to come ...

Lakey: Yeah.

Shearer: Ride in the homecoming parade.

Lakey: Anybody who wants to ride their bike.

Baum: Microphone please.

Shearer: Sorry. So that's an invitation to anyone that wants to come and ride in the homecoming parade. I'm going to put in the entry form for, for Las Cruces Biking to ride in the homecoming parade. Thank you.

Lakey: Yes.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I have a question. Since it's NMSU, we had had a presentation on a possible bike share from NMSU. Is that still in the works, has that died? Put him on the spot.

Shearer: It's temporarily delayed. We're still working towards it but we'll just have to see how it comes. There's been some concerns presented and questions about funding and so on, so on, so it's in the works shall we say. Thank you.

Pearson: Okay.

6.3 NMDOT Projects update

Pearson: NMDOT.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We don't have any projects under construction right now in Las Cruces. How about that? But let me give you the list of projects that are upcoming.

The Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses/US-70 project, we're sending it up to Santa Fe later this month. You should start seeing construction out there January of 2017. So at least there's somewhat of a little break between now and then.

The 17th Street and Picacho traffic signal is scheduled to start construction around May of 2017. We're sending that one up to Santa Fe in November of this year.

The project that we just talked about, the one over the Pass, so you should start seeing construction on that around next summer sometime, August, July, somewhere around there, 2017 is when we'll actually be under construction on that project. I have asked our project development engineer to make sure that while that project is being constructed we try to accommodate cyclists as much as we can. So they're making, that's a consideration as part of the traffic control in the design plans. So they're going to do the best they can do. It's a construction project though so be careful.

The Valley Drive project, we should start seeing construction late summer/early fall of next year. We're sending that one to Santa Fe in May of 2017.

And then the really big project, the University/I-25 interchange, that whole reconstruction should start February of 2019 and so we have plenty of time between now and then to let people know what's happening. We're in very early stages of design right now. Actually we're going through the, the paperwork to get FHWA to approve the changes to the interchange right now. So we haven't really started design work yet. And those are all the projects that we have in the city.

Pearson: So all the bridges are done.

Herrera: All the bridges are done on I-10. We'll be back in 50 years to do them again.

Curry: Nice. Mr. Chair. May I ask a quick question though? I don't know if this is NMDOT or NMSU but I had heard somebody mention that there is going to be a, an exit from I-25, or maybe it was I-10, I think I-25 to the university directly, maybe Wells or something like that, to kind of alleviate some traffic that goes directly to the university. Is that a rumor or is that actually something that's been discussed?

Herrera: That's one of the options that we're looking at. See we've got a whole slew of options of how to funnel traffic off of I-25 and get it to the university faster and kind of avoid you know how the traffic backs up on I-25 now. That's why we added that third lane there between Lohman and University. But we're hoping that we can come up with a design of that whole interchange that moves traffic to the university faster so.

Curry: So that wouldn't take place before the 2019 build of ...

Herrera: No.

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: No. We won't be doing anything in that area until February of 2019-ish.

Curry: Okay. And the first thing would be the underpass. And it's Triviz going under University, is that correct?

Herrera: Right.

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: That will be part of the project so not separate. It's all going to be constructed at the same time.

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: With that we'll also be rebuilding the bridges over I-25 on University.

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: They will be widened as well cause right now there's no, there's really not a good path for cyclists or pedestrians across the bridge and we do realize that a lot of students live on the other side so that's part of why we're reconstructing the bridges.

Curry: Great. Thank you so much.

Pearson: Okay. Thank you. Now we're up for Public Comment.

Rochelle: Well Mr. Chairman. I have two concerns before that if you will.

Pearson: Okay. I'm sorry, yeah.

Rochelle: Excuse me. One it, the, a number of people in this cycling community have brought two issues to me. One is the crossing at Missouri and, and

Triviz where the curbing was put in, it's painted yellow which is obviously pretty evident. But it, a number of people have said they couldn't quite figure out why the curbing was put in because it actually obscures the bike path when you cross Missouri at that point. So that's one issue and I don't know where to lodge that but I just want to report it.

The second issue is on the trail from the river up to Triviz it's, there's a certain amount of bafflement as to when the barriers are up and when they're down. When they're down there is about a four-foot connection on the, at the, at the base and actually I've known of two people who, for better or worse you know, they weren't maybe paying attention but they've hit those, the little, the connecting blocks in that, that are in the pavement. So I'm, I mean we, the, we got past the issue of having a ridiculous number of barriers there. Some of them were taken down to make it easier for cyclists to go through. When the path, you'll remember when the path was first built you had to dismount to go through those barriers which made no particular sense if it was really in use for a cyclist. But I, I don't know what to do, I don't know who to ask really about the, when those barriers up, are up and when they're down at, but I think it's a hazard when they're down for, possibly even for pedestrians who may not notice that the barriers are actually down but that there are these connecting pipes in the, in the ground that, that create a, a, a hazard at any rate.

Pearson: You mean the bollards.

Rochelle: Yeah. Right. Forgot the right name for them. So those are two concerns from the cycling community.

Pearson: Maybe we can ask staff to direct that to the City someplace and get a report back at our next meeting.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Any other Committee Member comments?

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Okay. So now Public Comment. Have an opportunity for public comment. Just give us your name and give us your comments.

Carter: Good evening. My name is Dan Carter and I'm the President of the Southern New Mexico Trail Alliance several of you are familiar faces. So we know each other. I apologize for coming in a little late as really wanted to catch the trail report but I was busy learning how to build trails so, so late, have to get that summary later. But I, I just wanted to introduce myself for those who don't know of the Southern New Mexico Trail

Alliance. We're a local trail advocacy group here in Las Cruces aiming to preserve and enhance the trails and non-motorized transportation options in Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, and greater southern New Mexico borderland region. And I'm looking forward to working with a lot of you and your organizations to make that happen. We're also working with a NMSU grad student in the Geography Depart, Department doing a, kind of a master trail connectivity map for the region. So a lot of the, there's like a lot of the data has been done and so I'll probably be pestering y'all whenever that comes about. Yeah. So if you have any questions about the Trail Alliance just feel free to ask me anytime. And one other question that we've had from several members of the Trail Alliance, some trail users: Is the current status of the ditch, irrigation ditch network within the city as far as recreation use on those, is there any, what is the current update or status on recreation use along those ditch ways?

Nunez: I don't know, I can attempt to try to answer partially. The laterals and the drains belong to EBID and they have control of those. We, we have, I don't even, sure of the agreements that we have to use those. And so are you asking cause certain ones are restricting or are you asking because you want to elaborate and use more of them? Before I yield the floor to you I will say that I'm not up, real up on a lot of it but I have heard that, that because we don't irrigate through the middle of the city anymore some of those they don't even want to use anymore, or want to give to the City, I've heard. But so, and I think they're, we're working with them to try to obtain how we can use those and maybe the way you envision it, that we use them. But as terms of like the outer lane ones that they still fill to irrigate, you know the channel and go through the city. Again those belong to, the, they have, EBID is in control of those.

Carter: Yeah. You, yeah you touched on a lot of things and I was trying to clarify that. I was under the understanding that if there was an agreement that recreational uses were fine on some of those laterals within the city. I was, wasn't aware if that was still the current case, if that had been approved still and it's still the, the current status of them. And if not I guess we would, as the Trail Alliance and our users we just encourage that to continue, that agreement with EBID so that trail users have that access through the city, would be really great. And working to identify which ones possibly could be turned more into city routes, city trails would be great.

Wray: Mr. Chair. I need to note that the agreement between the City and EBID has lapsed as of 2014 so the status of the use of the trails for recreational purposes is ambiguous at this time.

Pearson: Okay. Well that's something, I mean the Trail Plan that we have, it's a plan. We're a planning organization and that's why we're, part of our

discussion is to come up with a list of priority projects that can actually be implemented. Before, top of that list needs to be to renew that agreement with EBID. I think it's necessary for some small parts of the Outfall Channel, I'm not really sure what EBID facilities are currently under trail ...

Wray: Mr. Chair. The outfall channel is owned by the City. I, I thought that parts of it were owned by EBID but it is owned entirely by the City. There's no EBID facilities as part of the Outfall Trail.

Pearson: Okay. So even at the intersection where the EBID channels go through, still we're on the right-of-way that the City owns.

Wray: I've, I've been assured by multiple City staff that the City owns the entirety of the portion that, that is, that's ...

Pearson: Okay.

Wray: Currently being utilized by the trail. So the, the lapse of the agreement doesn't impact that in any way. Cause that was one of the first things that I was asking about when I found out that there was the lapse.

Pearson: Right. Okay. But this is an area where we've talked about having a work, we're having a work session next month that this is how we want to identify projects and your input is certainly valuable in that. We encourage you to attend that.

Carter: Yeah. Thanks. I'll definitely be there so.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. And, and knowing Dan I, he, him and, and his group's working on trails all over the county. They actually have a, cleanup days on the ditches already where they go out on Thursdays and do cleanup along different sections of the ditches because they do use them for recreation. So he's, he's very well aware of the, who owns them and all those type of things. I think it, more, what you're looking for, or the questions you're asking is I think we as a Committee in general and I hope I'm speaking for everybody cause I think we've discussed it several times, is in support of using those ditches. It's the details that we have to work through, the planning we have to work through, and we're at the very beginning stages of that. So it's a good time for I think groups like the Trail Alliance to come in and, and work with us on that and give feedback and input. That's my opinion anyway, doing that.

Carter: Great. Thanks.

Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I just add one comment. So it's not just the City, all of the, the entities are working with EBID to formalize agreements right now, so to include I believe the Town of Mesilla as well as Dona Ana County and NMDOT. So it is something that I think we're working on. It's just, it takes a while so.

Carter: Oh I completely understand the, the, the time frame on that. But yeah, it's encouraging though to hear that everybody's working on it as well. So thanks.

Rochelle: Mr. Chair. It, it might be useful if you, for the benefit of those few people, well maybe there's more than few people who don't know your website and that sort of thing. If you'd just rattle that off for people to have.

Carter: Okay. Yeah, it's, it's just an acronym: snmta.org.

Rochelle: Yup.

Carter: So you can ...

Rochelle: Thank you.

Carter: Find us there and also Facebook so.

Pearson: Okay. Thank you. Any other public comment? Seeing none.

8. ADJOURNMENT (7:57 p.m.)

Pearson: I'll hear a motion to adjourn.

Curry: I'll put forth a motion to adjourn.

Rochelle: Second.

Pearson: All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? We're adjourned.

Chairperson