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 January 19, 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)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla Citizen Rep)
Andrew Bencomo (Ped. Community Rep)
Lance Shepan (Mesilla Marshall's Department)
Gabriel Rochelle (Bicycle Community Rep)
Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Duane Bentley (Bicycle Community Rep)
James Nunez (City of Las Cruces Rep)
David Shearer (NMSU - Environmental Safety)
Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)

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

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

1. CALL TO ORDER (5:00)

Pearson: Okay. It's 5:00 so I'll call the ...

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Pearson: January 19th, 2016 meeting of the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrians Facility Advisory Committee to order. I think we'll start by every member introducing themselves just so we know who's here. Why don't we start down at the end over there?

Bencomo: Andrew Bencomo.

Pearson: And the group you represent.

Bencomo: The pedestrian, Citizens' Pedestrian.

Pearson: Thank you.

Paz: Samuel Paz, Dona Ana County.

Rochelle: Father Gabriel Rochelle, Bicycling Community Representative.

Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Town of Mesilla, Citizen's Rep.

Shepan: Lance Shepan, Mesilla Marshall's Department.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Pearson: I'm George Pearson, the City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Pearson: So next is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any changes or comments on the agenda as presented?

Murphy: No.

Pearson: Then we'll hear a motion to accept …

Rochelle: So moved.

Pearson: The agenda.

Curry: And I second.

Pearson: Gabriel moved and Ashleigh seconded. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none.

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Pearson: This is our first meeting of the year so the next order of business is election of officers. If I can turn it over to the MPO staff to run this part of the meeting.

Murphy: Oh.

Pearson: Until we have a new Chair elected.

Murphy: Okay. I will I guess open the floor and accept a nomination for Chair for the upcoming calendar year.

Curry: I would nominate George Pearson to be Chair.

Rochelle: Second.

Murphy: Who was the second please?

Rochelle: Rochelle.

Murphy: Okay. Are there any other nominations? Motion to, would, can I get a motion to close the nominations for Chair?

Rochelle: Motion.

Bencomo: Second.

Murphy: Okay. So the, the nominations are closed for Committee Chair. We have one, one nominee and I think we can ask for a vote of, by acclimation. All in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Murphy: Any opposed "no?" Okay. Motion, all, the motion carries. Open the floor for a nomination for Vice Chair.

Pearson: I'll move Ashleigh Curry.

Rochelle: Second.

Murphy: Okay.

Pearson: I'll move to close the nominations.

Rochelle: Second.

Murphy: Any objections to closing? Okay. One, again one, one candidate. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Murphy: Any opposed "no?" Okay. So we have George Pearson as Chair and Ashleigh Curry as Vice Chair once again. I'll turn the meeting back over to you Mr. Chair.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 October 20, 2015

Pearson: Okay. So now our next item is Approval of the Minutes of October 20th. Is there any discussion on the meeting minutes? I had one comment. I noticed it starts off with "we called it at four p.m. I think it should've been 5:04 p.m. which is the time stamp that's above that but the, the text just says four. Any other comments? I'll hear a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Rochelle: So moved.

Bencomo: Second.

Pearson: By Gabriel, second by was it Lance? No? Andrew. Having a motion and a second all in favor of approving the minutes say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? So the minutes are approved.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Next we have an opportunity for public comment. Anyone from the public want to address us? Hearing none.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Pearson: We'll go on to the next item. Action Item: We have a TIP amendment.

Wray: Just a second Mr. Chair.

Pearson: You need a document?

Wray: I negligently failed to print myself a packet so I need to borrow one from a Member of the Committee.

Curry: You owe me one.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you Ms. Curry for providing my, my lack of paper.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: Any questions from the Committee?

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I have a question. That rolling stock is pretty clear. What is support? What is that?

Wray: Basically that is operations support.

Bencomo: Oh, like personnel.

Wray: Basically what keeps everything running.

Pearson: Secretaries and telephones and lights.

Wray: Yeah. That, that sort of thing.

Bencomo: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: I'll hear a motion to accept the TIP amendment as provided.

Herrera: Move to approve.

Pearson: Jolene …

Herrera: Jolene.

Pearson: Moves.

Rochelle: Second.

Pearson: From Gabriel, second. All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? So we have approved that item.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Unified Planning Work Program Update Presentation

Pearson: Our next is a discussion item. Unified Planning Work Program update presentation.

TOM MURPHY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: Any questions from Committee Members?

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yeah.

Herrera: I don't have a question but a comment. It's the same one that I made at the TAC meeting when you did this presentation about the regional safety study. I just don't see it on this list. And you added the other ones from TAC so just a ...

Murphy: Andrew took a note.

Herrera: Just a friendly reminder. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Okay. You mentioned an MPO webpage. You're hosted underneath the City website. Are you going to be able to still retain your identity? I mean you got the MVMPO, you've got some URL to start out with but then all of a sudden you're sucked into the City and you look very much like a City website. Does that, what's going to change?

Murphy: We are, we are going to be hosted on a third party site so it'll, it'll be completely ours. We are getting a new, a, a new URL associated with that. We will still, we will still have a link to our new website on the City's website but ...

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: We will be independent of the City's page.

Pearson: Okay. Good. On the, you were talking about automated bus passenger counting. Would that also have an ability somehow to count, track bicycles that are used in the bike racks? And also what would be important is when those are filled and somebody wants to use a bike rack and it's not available.

Murphy: Unfortunately the, the technology is it, it, there's a, there's a beam that catches people coming on and going through the doors and which direction they're going, going in. I know at some point and it, it's a, a matter of driver training that they can have input when the, when the, when the bikes are, are loaded onto the racks but they don't, I don't think they have a procedure for when the bikes come off the racks.

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: So and we're ...

Pearson: It might be ...

Murphy: We're not there yet.

Pearson: Even if it's, it might be worthwhile to set up some metrics where maybe pick a, a, a week or a month to do counting so that we can start accumulating usage over a period of time.

Murphy: I think, I think we, we tracked total number of usage as long as the drivers are reminded to input that key so it's an, it's an ongoing training issue and I think again it's, it's something that it, you know but I'm with you on that. We want to capture all the data that we can that's useful for us.

Pearson: Right.

Curry: Mr. Chair. May I ask a quick question? I'm, I'm not sure that this is necessarily pertinent but it, it seems to relate at the time you're talking about bus training. Is, is there any bus training that has to do with other vulnerable users? I mean it, as far as the bus drivers, you talked about them training counting and things but is there training that they do with how to deal with cyclists, how to do it with pedestrian/school zones, that type of thing?

Murphy: They do have an, they do have an ongoing training requirement with a safety aspect in it so I do, I'm not aware of the current code curriculum right but I will look into that …

Curry: I'd appreciate it.

Murphy: And have an answer for you.

Curry: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: And last thing I have is I believe the State at a statewide level is going to do a bike plan and I don't know how they're going to divide it up but if they do it kind of regionally would the MPO participate in that or how would that work? Would that be on your list?

Murphy: Yes. We would participate with the, the DOT on anything that they're working on in this, in this region. We do have a general line item within the UPWP with our State and Federal coordination. I guess it depends upon the, the intensity of the, of the effort whether it would, whether we would have it listed or as a separate item or not.

Pearson: Yeah. I don't know if the State's done the request for a proposal yet. Do you know anything about that?

Herrera: Mr. Chair. We did already put out the RFP for the bike suitability map. Is that the one that you're talking about?

Pearson: No. It'd be a, more, a statewide plan, much like with the multimodal plan, on that model.

Herrera: Right. So we're still working on the RFP for that.

Pearson: Okay. Yeah. I think ...

Herrera: And we hope to have that done ...

Pearson: *(inaudible)*

Herrera: This summer so that we can put it out first thing Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and we definitely would include all of the MPOs as well as the RTPOs in that coordination. Sort of like Tom said there's the, the general line item but if we needed to amend the UPWP later to add more budget to that or something we could always do that.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: Or I guess the MPO can always do that.

Pearson: Any other comments or questions? So ...

Curry: Well actually I do have one more question if I may. Is, is it my understanding that the MPO the, the different funding levels the way the MPOs work around the country is that it's 200,000 people who live in the MPO region and then it bumps up. How close are we? Oh and have I got that number mistaken? How close are we to being an MPO that does funding instead of it going through the State?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. You are, you're correct. There is a special dividing line at 200,000 residents for the area. It's called a transportation management association and they, they do have, they do have more direct programming authority than an MPO that is between 50,000 and 200,000. As of the, as of the 2010 census we had approximately 155,000 people in our MPO planning boundary.

Curry: Okay. Thank you.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I have a question.

Pearson: Okay.

Bencomo: It's kind of a follow-up on hers. So the, your, this MPO doesn't cover all of Dona Ana County. El Paso covers the southern portion of it. So why is it

divided up that way? Because if it was covering the whole thing then you'd probably be there or almost there, closer anyway.

Murphy: That's correct. If we cover, if we had covered all of Dona Ana County the, the population of Dona Ana County's 209,000 as of the census. But they, it's not, the, the MPOs are not picked on a county by county basis. They're determined based on what the Census Department has classified as an urbanized area and the urbanized area is so many consecutive, not consecutive but I'm losing, losing the word.

Pearson: Contiguous.

Rochelle: Contiguous.

Murphy: Thank you. Contiguous census block groups and tracts that reach a minimum population density threshold. Most, much of the southern Dona Ana County area is contiguous with the urbanized area of El Paso. So they're, they're in the El Paso MPO because they're part of a contiguous urban area. Between us and the El Paso urbanized area we do have some, some areas that are still rural so we don't, we're not contiguous with those areas of Dona Ana County and then of course once we get north of, north of Las Cruces it, it go, it gets rural very fast again and doesn't pick up again until Hatch so that's why we're at 155 rather than the 209.

Bencomo: Okay. Thank you. I learned my one new thing today.

Pearson: So going north the density drops significantly so then it becomes rural and it doesn't pick up and so that's why we stop so short? We, we don't even reach to Radium Springs, right?

Murphy: That's correct.

Pearson: Doesn't even go, does it include, doesn't even include Dona Ana.

Murphy: Yes it does.

Pearson: Does it? It does include Dona Ana. Okay. I don't remember the map.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: If I can just add to that. So the, the RTPO, the Regional Transportation Planning Organization covers the northern part of Dona Ana County so nothing's actually left out of planning. It's just not included in this MPO.

Pearson: Right.

Herrera: Thanks.

Pearson: Right. That's actually something I didn't figure out until a long time in the process is that the MPO and the RPO covers the entire state. Any other comments? Okay.

7.2 Committee Attendance Discussion

Pearson: I'll go on to the next item now. Committee Attendance Discussion. We have a member appointed, Mr. Duane Bentley who applied through the Policy Committee, attended one meeting, and hasn't attended since. I put out an e-mail asking if he was still around or interested, did not get a response. We had a similar circumstance not terribly long ago so this is just some discussion. I guess I'm inclined to suggest that we recommend to the Policy Committee to remove this member. Is there any other discussion?

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. Being new to the Committee and I apologize for this, I probably should know this but the, the Bylaws whatever, the, that guy just, what are, what are the requirements they have to, are there? They miss so many meetings and what, what is the criteria and has that person reached that threshold and if they have then it sounds to me like it'd be obvious.

Pearson: Do you want to respond?

Murphy: Yes. I, if you wish I'll respond to that. The, the Bylaws state that you are required to attend a minimum of 75% of the meetings in a, in a calendar year. It also additionally allows that, or calls on the Chair to notify the Policy Committee if a member is to miss more than two consecutive meetings. This individual has not been on it for a year yet but I believe he's made two meetings and this is number ...

Pearson: I think only one meeting.

Murphy: Only one? He, he only made one meeting and he's, this'll be the fourth one that he's missed so he's well below, he's well below that 75% threshold so ...

Pearson: Yeah. I think so. It's, the statement is attending the meeting is a requirement. I think we flexed that ...

Murphy: That's right.

Pearson: In allowing proxy appointees so if you know you're not going to make it you can assign a proxy to fulfill the, the requirement, the attendance need. So I think we're quite flexible on allowing coverage and since, especially since there wasn't a response I think …

Curry: I put forth a motion to remove if you're at that point.

Pearson: Well it's not, it's only a discussion item.

Curry: Oh, it's only a discussion item. All right.

Pearson: But …

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. Another comment I have if you don't mind. So yeah I, I can see what, it sounds like if he's made one and missed four that sounds like he's not attending or not planning to attend. If, if somebody were to miss, cause now you're talking as if 75% of, of a certain number of meetings at the beginning or is it for in a calendar year and then, so if I come and I miss two meetings but then I come to every other meeting after, for six months and then I miss another one and then come to every other, I, you could still possibly make 75% throughout the course of the year.

Pearson: Right. And if you told us you were going to miss one …

Bencomo: Right.

Pearson: We would recognize …

Bencomo: But if …

Pearson: And it wouldn't …

Bencomo: Yeah, if there's no communication from them …

Pearson: Right.

Bencomo: And you've tried to contact them and they've missed this many meetings seems obvious to me they're not, I think we could make the assumption that they're not going to attend 75% even going, this is January so.

Pearson: So the, the Bylaws section is on the screen so I think it's pretty clear.

Murphy: It is a 12-month period not a calendar year so I think we always interpreted that as a rolling 12-month period.

Pearson: Right.

Bencomo: Thank you.

Pearson: But we can say ...

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: Sorry to interrupt you. What position is this person filling right now?

Pearson: It's a Bicycle Community Representative.

Herrera: Okay.

Pearson: Representative. So a replacement would be appointed by the Policy Committee but it'd be open to anybody that has any interests in bicycling, which could be pretty much anybody. So ...

Rochelle: Well is there a process, excuse me Mr. Chairman. Is there a process for removal? Is it, is it just ...

Pearson: Well it goes to the ...

Rochelle: Moving and seconding and ...

Pearson: Policy Committee. So I think ...

Murphy: The, the process for removal would be that the, that the Chair notifies the Policy Committee in writing that the Member has, has missed and then the Policy Committee may vote to remove that individual from office. I think what our discussion here today is the Chair wants to get input, feedback from the rest of the Committee whether he should submit that written notification.

Pearson: And I think the feeling is that yes, I should and so I will.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Bencomo: Yeah, from my perspective I would, basically what I said a while ago. I, I would think that looking at this that the recommendation we need to go forward. If we, if we need somebody to fill that position and he hasn't been coming it's important for somebody to be here.

Pearson: Right.

Bencomo: And so I, I would suggest that we look for somebody new. Especially since you've tried to make contact and haven't been able to. Thank you.

Pearson: Okay.

7.3 BPAC Quorum, Bylaw Amendment Discussion

Pearson: So we'll go on to the next item which is kind of continuation: The quorum needed to have a meeting. I think this was just kind of a side effect of the, my discussion with staff over this position and right now a quorum requires a majority of, of members. So if we have an even number of members sitting we needed a half plus one. So I wonder if, and during the summer, later in the summer we have TIP amendments and things. Sometimes we have difficulty getting a quorum. I wonder if it's worth pursuing changing that to be simply half rather than a majority. Open that to discussion if that's a good idea or, or we should just let this go by.

Murphy: Mr. ... oh sorry.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. The only issue I see is that if there's a split vote but I guess by nature then that fails, right, if a motion is made and there's a split vote then the motion fails.

Pearson: But we would have that problem with, depending on who's present anyway.

Herrera: That's true.

Pearson: Well we have seven today but ...

Curry: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Seven out of 12.

Curry: How many Committee Members do we have, or should we have with a full, with a full house?

Pearson: Ten.

Wray: Mr. Chair. It's 11.

Shepan: It's 11.

Pearson: Eleven? So I can't count.

Shepan: One here. You got this. You should have that somewhere.

Pearson: Oh. I went from the last minutes so I'm …

Curry: Oh I think we're supposed to sign that and pass it around.

Rochelle: Oh is that the, oh.

Curry: Yeah. That's to sign in.

Rochelle: I didn't sign it either.

Curry: Okay.

Rochelle: That should be going around, right. Sorry.

Pearson: Ten, 11. Okay. I missed one on my list. I had …

Curry: And so if I may ask how, how often does it happen that we don't have a quorum?

Pearson: It has happened since I've been Chair three times, maybe.

Curry: In that period of time?

Pearson: Would that be, staff have a different …

Murphy: Did, did we research it? It hasn't happened, occurred in a while but …

Wray: It has not occurred in a while and in my research the past couple times looking at the attendance I was not specifically looking for meetings that failed to do the quorum but three sounds about right, maybe even at least since I've been in this position maybe only once.

Pearson: Yeah. That's …

Wray: So maybe two times before I started.

Murphy: Well no …

Pearson: Sounds about right.

Murphy: If I could, Mr. Chair. If I offer some, a little bit of historical perspective. There have been times where we've, we've gone into the Planning Office at the, at the County here and, and dragged one of the planners out so

that we did make quorum but so the, while we haven't missed a meeting we've gone to some extreme lengths in order to make sure that we did have, we did, were able to meet.

Pearson: Um ...

Curry: Would, would there be something that we could do that people need to give a week's notice or something like that if they know that they're not going to be able to be at a meeting so that there's time? I mean obviously they should be sending a proxy but if they were to give a week's notice and say, "I know I'm going to be out of town. I can't be at that." It would give a little bit more time but, and "I can't find a proxy," for another person to be added, the, added to the attendance.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. Effectively I guess the, the agenda notification would serve as that. I have not explicitly used that vocabulary in the notices. I'm not sure if I ever did it for BPAC. I know I do it for TAC because we were having problems with TAC a number of years ago, two years ago about, we were having quorum problems. I can start putting that vocabulary into the BPAC, probably not the agenda since that goes out to everyone but the notification that the packet is on the website. I can certainly put vocabulary asking people to notify us if they're not going to be here and send a proxy if at all possible.

Herrera: And Mr. Chair. I, if I can remember the, there was one time where we didn't have quorum and we had TIP amendments to approve so we had to call another special meeting and it was a really big deal trying to get everyone together on a different day so I do remember only one time but it was a really important meeting.

Pearson: Yeah cause we would be holding up the TIP amendments which are, it's money. So ...

Herrera: Right, money in the MPO area.

Pearson: So we ...

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Well let's, staff go.

Murphy: Oh. I just wanted to kind of add some information. We did change the quorum for the TAC. Quorum on TAC is seven out of 15 members so Robert's Rules of Order allows the Committee to set its own quorum at less than a majority so ...

Rochelle: That's true.

Murphy: We're not necessarily tied to 50% plus one. You know for any reason, you know and this is, this is a, an extreme example you could decide to set your quorum at two so any two of you together would constitute a quorum. Now not going to do that I'm pretty sure but, but Robert's Rule of Order allows you to set it as low as you need to do in order that you, you can trust that you can get the business, business handled.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I guess with that being said, I like five.

Pearson: I was running that through my calculations and five, I think five is a good number.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. Can I, can I make a suggestion?

Pearson: Yeah.

Bencomo: So maybe at this point I don't know, I, I'm, once again I'm fairly new to this Committee. Maybe at this point the, the numbers maybe don't need to change. Maybe our processes need to change. So when the notice goes out from Andrew perhaps, cause right now it's, it's an e-mail and it has the attachments here so all the information. Is there a way to do a, perhaps like a calendar appointment and then the expectation of the Board, of this, this Committee is to respond "yes" or "no" to that? You, you have to respond to that. And then you know at least that distance ahead who may or may not be coming. Then you already have an idea of that. Right now you have to walk in the door before you know if we're going to be here or not. If we have to, if we're, an expectation is for us to respond to that calendar appointment then you would know ahead of time, for the most part.

Pearson: Yeah.

Bencomo: Perhaps. I don't know. Just a suggestion. I'm, I'm good with changing the numbers too. It's not a, that big of a deal to me but maybe that's something we could do.

Wray: Mr. Chair. The, the way that I phrase the vocabulary and I, I don't, I don't believe I've ever said this for the BPAC but the way that I do it is I ask people to let me know if they will not be in attendance so I get that …

Bencomo: Right.

Wray: That response back from members who know that they're not going to be there and then we have a dialogue about "Please send a proxy." We

could, we could attempt, we could, we could try sending out a calendar appointment if, if that's what the Committee wants to do but I, I just wanted to let you know there is a mechanism already in, in place that I've been using with the TAC that has worked fairly, I mean obviously you're not going to get 100%. People say they'll be there and then stuff happens and, and so forth so even, even doing the calendar appointment would not necessarily cover all eventualities but with, with the TAC it has been fairly successful with my just asking them to give me the input and reply back which I think does to some extent engage the member in question a little bit more because they have to actually send back the response to me regarding their absence. So I just wanted to offer that up as my experience with the other committee.

Herrera: Yeah.

Bencomo: Correct. Which is for all intents and purposes what a response on a calendar appointment would be.

Curry: Well ...

Bencomo: Yes or no and, and then not only that but then you could go, we would probably have access to that calendar that, that day at least and we could look at it and we ourselves could also see who's coming and who's not coming. So it's a, just more information for the Committee but I'm good with any direction we go.

Wray: The, Mr. Chair. The City uses Outlook. I don't know whether or not the, I don't know what, what softwares each one of you is using. I don't know that you could necessarily see who is or is not going to be there. If you're using Outlook I don't believe that's going to be the case, just FYI.

Curry: May I add one more thing? I think you know just devil's advocate and again I'm like Mr. Bencomo. I think either way is fine with me. If we want to move to five that's fine. But I think if you require a response in some way or another, not just "Let me know if you're not going to be here," "Tell me that you are going to be here." You can weed out if somebody's e-mail's changed or they're not getting the messages cause if they don't get the message to let you know that they're not going to be there then you'll get no response whereas if you ask for a positive response and you get nothing, then you might know to look and say, "Okay. If they're not getting my e-mails, I've tried you know every month and we're not hearing back from this person perhaps there's another way to contact them."

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. I have not done that, that with TAC because I don't want to be flooded with e-mails. It is a larger committee. We, I could do that with this one since it's smaller. Although if they're not getting my e-

mails usually the, the e-mails will be bounced back because the, the e-mail account is closed but I, I could ask for a positive or negative affirmation from everybody if the Committee wants.

Curry: Not to make more work. I mean it, it, it's, you, really either way for me. I don't have a strong opinion.

Pearson: Jolene.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I still like five.

Pearson: Well we're dealing with holding up the process so I also like five. I wonder if we shouldn't pursue, what would be the steps? We would have to …

Murphy: Just a, Mr. Chair. The steps would be next meeting staff will bring back language change for a proposed Bylaw amendment, this Committee would make a recommendation on it, then we would take it to the Policy Committee for them to, to decide whether or not to adopt such a change. So staff, staff will, will prepare the language either way and then you know we can vote on it next month.

Pearson: I think that's, unless there's a strong objection against and I already heard a, a good argument for. I think we should go ahead and make that change. I hear you.

Rochelle: Mr. Chair. I've got a side question I'd like to ask.

Pearson: Okay.

Rochelle: Which is how do we determine, is there any, are there any criteria for proxies? Is that, is there anything in the Bylaws about that?

Pearson: I know what …

Rochelle: I need a …

Pearson: Accepted practice has been …

Rochelle: Copy of these obviously.

Pearson: Whether it's in the Bylaws or not.

Murphy: We, we do have some language in the Bylaws I need to …

Rochelle: I mean do you simply pick somebody off the street for that day?

Murphy: Okay. "Each, each representative from ...

Rochelle: Don't put that in the minutes.

Murphy: A represented entity may appoint an alternate to the Committee to serve when the appointment, Member cannot attend. The represented entity shall submit a letter to the MPO Officer designating the alternate Member." All that meaning says send me, Andrew, Michael an e-mail who's going to be sitting at the meeting for you.

Pearson: And that is accepted practice. So long as you ...

Murphy: That is the ...

Pearson: I think ...

Murphy: Accepted practice in the digital age.

Pearson: An hour or two ahead of the meeting it is, even makes, makes the, the rules work.

Rochelle: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: Okay. I think we've solved that one.

7.4 Bicycle Loop Adjustment Discussion

Pearson: On to, it's Bicycle Loop Adjustment Discussion and when I first saw it I was, I was thinking of the loop indicators in, for traffic but it is instead the, the loop trail around the city.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Curry: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, Mr. Wray. I support the idea of going through NMSU and using the underpass when that's constructed. I do think that alleviates, there's a lot of, a lot going on on University Avenue and for a cyclist I don't really see much opportunity to put in a really safe bike path and you have a really nice facility that goes, the Triviz Trail, the outfall channel, the La Llorona, all of that connects really well. So you know for the use of the trail by families, I think putting them on University is not a very viable option at this, not that I can envision so I support the, in favor of going through the university and finding alternate loops.

Rochelle: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to add my support to that too as someone who rides that road, that section of the city all the time it, it, University is, I can't imagine that University can be altered for the long haul to be friendly to

bicycles so we, I invariably go on other roads when I'm going from say Route 25 to my home in Mesilla. I live right off, I live on University only of course it's called Sur in Mesilla but I have to find alternative ways because I'm not, it's, it's too dangerous for cyclists, even people as experienced as me and others on this Committee. So I'm in, very much in favor of it.

Paz: Mr. Chair. I also support the, the bicycling the NMSU route. I think one campus to reference would be the University of Arizona. They have a strong bicycle avenue that bisects campus and it connects two lanes of bicycle infrastructure. I think it's a good system to look at.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I, I just have some questions. So the original, the loop as it was originally planned, was it going to go down University correct and then all the way past Main Street or was it going to go down Union, University then to Union?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. Unfortunately the cursor is not terribly visible the way that it, I'm not sure if I can ...

Curry: I can see it.

Bencomo: I can see it. We can see it.

Wray: Okay. Right now the connection is along right in there and there is a facility along that stretch but as you can see it's kind of, it's a bit isolated. The, the conversations that we're having with NMSU would put the, the trail more somewhere in the southern, I, I, I did, I have heard some, some options mentioned but I, I won't mention them at this time but somewhere more along down in, in this vicinity with the Triviz Trail coming down and meeting up with it down here. That's, that's just the, kind of the vision of where that connection will be and so this facility would still remain but it wouldn't necessarily be considered part of the, the, the loop around Las Cruces in the future.

Bencomo: Okay. But, but my question is the, the, the original plan for the loop, was it going to go down University and then connect to Union or go all the way down University to, into Mesilla?

Wray: There, there've been varying levels of visions.

Bencomo: Okay.

Wray: So kind of both have been correct at ...

Pearson: I remember a City resolution that identifies University as the loop.

Wray: Both, both statements are correct. Both of them have been the vision at different points in time. We're, we're hoping as part of this process to nail that down more concretely going forward as to what that, that vision should be.

Bencomo: Okay. And part of the reason I'm asking the question is because we know that there, work on University's going to happen between Main and 28 which would create a great new ...

Pearson: Right.

Bencomo: Section but then the disconnection up here so I'm just, if we go through campus which I'm not opposed to. I think it's a great idea especially if they're going to extend underneath University with Triviz and either go down Wells or all the way out to Cholla, then you end up out on Stern going down Cholla or, and, either that or you come back around on Sam Steele then you end up on Union again. So that's why I was wondering where the original thought was if it was going to go to Union cause either way it's going to lead you back to Union.

Curry: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wray. And if I may add what, can we look at alternatives that it doesn't necessarily have to follow a road? For example the outfall channel follows irrigation ditches. Could we hop on that irrigation ditch whatever it's called behind Whiskey Dick's that would theoretically go all the way through into Mesilla so you would just cross over the light that intersects basically at I-10 and Union where Stern hits Union?

Bencomo: We could, except that ditch doesn't go to, it heads south. It doesn't go to Mesilla. I've run on that before.

Curry: But the one I've, I, the one I've run on goes to Mesilla. So it would go up behind Zia and continue on behind Zia and basically you could, you could get your way to Calle de Sur or Calle del Norte from that one.

Bencomo: Correct. That's the ...

Curry: So you could be off ...

Bencomo: But that's not the same one that's behind Whiskey Dick.

Curry: Oh, is it ...

Pearson: Yeah.

Bencomo: It's a different one. But yeah I, I, I agree using the irrigation ditches to me instead of staying on roadways, I, I, I would love if we did that. In fact I would, I'd want to push to do that and start using ...

Curry: Yeah.

Bencomo: Those irrigation ditches. I think it creates more opportunities if they're safer and you don't have to worry about the road widths as much and try to pack everything into it like ...

Curry: Right.

Bencomo: We did, the discussions we've had.

Curry: I think, yeah.

Bencomo: But anyway. Sorry for, for all the questions. I just, I'm trying to figure everything out but I do support it going into campus. I think it's a great connection to the university and helps that synergy between the community and the university. Just looping it back around is the only question I had. Where are we going to loop back out to complete that loop? Are we creating more issues going farther that way by doing that? And so lots of questions.

Wray: That, that'll be something that gets resolved when they actually get to the, the drawing of, of lines on paper which we're certainly not to at this moment in time and, and we can certainly look at all, all available facilities to make, to make those connections so, but we're, we're just starting out at this point ...

Pearson: Right.

Wray: Still beginning the conversation. We have not actually looked at in detail. We're just kind of starting with what we have now and what can we do to improve this.

Pearson: Right. I think the key questions are first: How far on the campus? What happens after you get past University on Triviz? You come down Cholla and then after that how do you get across I-10? And then you've got the length down to the river. There's, I think that there's a drain of some sort, probably EBID drain that might be usable for that kind of thing.

Wray: Well ...

Pearson: I have some memory of that but I couldn't pick it out.

Wray: We'll, we'll try and get EBID involved in the process and obviously NMSU is going to need to be heavily involved in the ...

Pearson: Right.

Wray: Process as well.

Pearson: Because it'll, that's going to be a congested area getting across campus and then figuring out how to get it underneath the interstate. Might require just going out into the interchange or something. I don't know ...

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: I think, I think a new hole underneath the interstate would be a big deal.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I do, I, I do agree though coming off of University especially between the interstate and Union/El Paseo, the foot traffic there is so heavy and mixing bicycles and foot traffic that's crossing back and forth under campus and bicycle traffic going this way, it's, it's going to be, it can be very congested. So I think going into campus is a great idea, somewhere farther to the south.

Pearson: Yeah. I think ideally a facility like the outfall channel, like the La Llorona Trail, a what is it, 12-foot asphalt multiuse facility is the ultimate goal for the loop path and then connecting down to the river and that part would become part of the Rio Grande Trail probably.

Wray: Could be.

Bencomo: And then maybe NMSU's ability to pull funds from the state legislature would kick into place too. Who knows?

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: Can I make a comment? They're actually related to that comment. It's actually a very timely place to mention that our, it's still called Transportation Alternatives Program and our Rec Trails Program, we're looking at doing a call for projects this spring, applications due August or September of this year for Fiscal Years '18 and '19 so if we could finish this in a timely manner maybe we can get some of the entities involved to apply for some of those funds.

Pearson: So this would be new funding from the Transportation cause the Rio Grande Trail Commission meeting there was a discussion that the RTP,

the Recreational Trail funding there's about half a million dollars apparently would be used for a plan for the Rio Grande Trail but then if we do that plan then we have an opportunity for implementation with the next budget funds.

Herrera: Right. And then we're also looking at some, well I guess some new Rec Trails funding for the two upcoming fiscal years. Cause right now we're programmed in '16 and '17 so this is for '18 and '19.

Curry: What was the date, the call for proposals date?

Herrera: We're looking at sometime this spring. We don't have a hard date right now. They're still sort of working on updating the guidebooks just to make sure that everything's in line with ...

Pearson: We ...

Herrera: The new transportation laws.

Pearson: Why don't we have that discussion in the updates? Because I ...

Herrera: Oh. Okay.

Pearson: I intended to direct us towards that.

Herrera: Well he brought up funding so.

Pearson: And as part of this also I wonder if we should look at the trails in general, the trail plan. During the Amador Proximo the EBID facility was identified as a potential trail location. It might be worthwhile especially in light of you know the new funding coming up to identify potential projects.

Wray: Mr. Chair. I would say that yes that's a very good idea but specifically in light of the opportunity here we may not want to broaden the scope of this any further if we're going to be operating with that kind of timeline of call for projects in spring and then applications due in August or September. I'd say that'd be something that we might, that we should consider as a next step after this particular process.

Pearson: Okay. So if we're looking at, how much of the, the multiuse trail would be part of the University interchange project, it would extend how far?

Herrera: I'm not sure yet. We're still sort of looking at the old design. That consulting firm that did the design no longer exists so we kind of have to start not all over but sort of, and so that is also up for discussion.

Pearson: Because where that project ends we need to continue that to wherever it makes the turn down towards the river.

Herrera: Right. And as far as I know it's, it's very preliminary but those discussions have taken place with NMSU to make sure that when we do connect under we're not just sort of dumping people with no place to go.

Pearson: Right. Yeah that's ...

Herrera: So ...

Pearson: We don't have our NMSU rep here today but that's, obviously that planning effort is very important. So the feel really is to keep our concentration this go-round on this project.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair.

Pearson: So at our, as we continue this you're going to bring us some more maps ...

Wray: Yes. Definitely.

Pearson: And we're going to look more closely and ...

Wray: Yes.

Pearson: And maybe ...

Wray: You'll be hearing a lot about this the next couple of months.

Pearson: Okay. Do I have any other questions or discussion for this item right now?

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

8.1 MPO Staff Update: University and Missouri Study Corridors Update

Pearson: Let's go on to our next one: Committee and Staff Comments. So we have MPO staff update right now.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to announce that the Policy Committee last Wednesday approved the Phase A study of the University Avenue corridor. It's, quite pleased about that. I've worked on that for nearly a year, year-ish, about a year to get that done. We do have two, two recommended alternatives to take forward to a potential Phase B so we're hoping to be able to do that.

On the Missouri project we had a, a staff meeting with the different jurisdictions last Wednesday. We got a, a lot of very good feedback from the City and the County on that one. We are in the process of digesting that information that we received. We're, we're right now thinking that we may have two more public input meetings before taking this up to the Policy Committee to, for their review. We will be bringing the Missouri study corridor to this Committee for, for their review. We don't have a timeline for that one right at the moment but we will be bringing it to this Committee for, for their examination. Was there anything else that we have going on? Believe that concludes staff updates.

Pearson: Okay.

8.2 Local Projects update

Pearson: Now we have Local Projects updates. We're missing a chunk of our local representation. City of Las Cruces, I was going to ask about the status of the La Llorona Trail and if there was any information on, well the TAP projects, the extension of La Llorona and the, behind the dam project.

Murphy: Mr. Chair. We can certainly get, get those definitely from the minutes of the TAC. If I remember correctly the City, the City notified their, the, the Technical Advisory Committee that those two projects are going to be bidding soon or they have recently bid but we will, we'll ...

Pearson: But La Llorona one is substantially done.

Murphy: That's, that's correct and then it's the Las Cruces Dam that's bidding.

Pearson: Okay. That's still onto the bidding process.

Murphy: See give me two weeks and my memory's, memory's gone but we do have, we do have those in the minutes for the TAC so we can probably, probably get ...

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: Get you an update on those projects.

Pearson: Cause it, I drove on the La Llorona one and it looks like the construction is done but it looks like they're going to do some repairs. There were some red Xs on some of the slabs so they, looks like they need to be replaced. I don't know about the, the furniture items or anything else on that, about how close they are to closing that out after, I guess that's the only thing that I'd be interested in is how much further until the project's actually done.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry, can I make a quick comment just cause it's in my head right now? The, so La Llorona at, the, the north piece that they just redid, I've run on that several times. It's great. It's a, it's a nice path that they built there. Just to, to, I wanted to throw this out there before I forget. In the future we may need to look at from Picacho south because that one, the way it's built it's a great path when it's, and I know we don't get that much rain here but when it rains it floods. It's, it's, it's side, end to end is just covered with water and deep too so when we tried to run the Turkey Trot that day it, we were splashing through water and running through the weeds and the grass to get around multiple puddles so that, that may have to be something in the future to look at so I, I'm sorry. I just wanted to throw that out before I forgot.

Pearson: Okay. Dona Ana County do you have anything on any projects that we know about?

Paz: Yes. We have roadway improvement projects occurring along Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs. Construction has started and is, and is scheduled to be completed by the end of May. Engineering staff has reported that there is considerations for bike lanes along those projects.

Pearson: Yeah. That was part of the design as I recall. Town of Mesilla have anything to ...

Shepan: No sir.

Pearson: And no NMSU here.

8.3 NMDOT Projects update

Pearson: We'll go on to the next one: NMDOT.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I'll run quickly through the construction projects and then we can talk about some of the other stuff if you would like.

The North Main project, I'm not going to give any more deadlines because we keep missing them. They're done with the major work. They're just doing a few minor things here and there so ...

Pearson: I saw new orange barrel complaints in Sound Off.

Herrera: Right. Hopefully we should be done soon. I'm just going to leave it at that.

There's some work going on on I-10 between Jackrabbit and I-10/I-25 so you'll notice that they're working on the westbound lanes. When they hit the traffic control for the Union/Ramp E they will stop and then

come back and go the other direction so that traffic control is not conflicting between those two construction sites.

That contractor also got the award for the next phase of I-10 which is from the I-10/I-25 interchange to the Texas state line so we imagine if they finish this portion they'll skip over the bridge, go to the other side, and then come back when the bridge is done so that there's no ...

Pearson: So that ...

Herrera: Conflicting traffic control.

Pearson: The six lanes needs work already?

Herrera: Yes. When we rebuilt the new lane we didn't do anything to the, the two existing lanes except add an overlay so now those need to be ...

Pearson: So it's just the, the two lanes, it's ...

Herrera: Right. It's not the new one that was just built not too long ago.

Pearson: That won't help with people complaining about the traffic though.

Herrera: No. It definitely won't. But the good news is after that's done all of I-10 from the Texas state line to Corralitos should be good for hopefully you know 10, 15 years, and the bridges for a lot longer.

Curry: Ms. Herrera. What's the timeline for the Union bridge? Do you have any idea?

Herrera: I do. According to our January spreadsheets it's halfway done.

Curry: Okay. Okay.

Herrera: I'm not really sure what exactly that means. I haven't had a chance to talk to the project manager lately but he says halfway done on the spreadsheet so ...

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: There's some light at the end of the tunnel.

Curry: Okay. Good. Thanks.

Herrera: The Missouri bridge is moving along quickly. We hope to be done with that one by the end of March. It got pushed back a little bit just due to weather and then some delays with delivery of beams for the bridge but

that's all been worked out so they're moving quickly on that one. We hope to get everything put back together soon.

Curry: And that includes the Triviz Trail, the bike ...

Herrera: Yes.

Curry: Or the multiuse path.

Herrera: Yeah. We'll put that back ...

Curry: Great.

Herrera: As is, or as it was before. And those are all the construction projects in town I believe. Are there any questions on those?

Pearson: Was there public notice, or press release on the traffic control when you changed for the Union bridge project to close Conway and, because I missed it then.

Herrera: Yeah. There was. We, we really need to check on, I think the distribution lists, might have got messed up somehow. So if you're not receiving those e-mails let me know. Now I know that you're not. Just to make sure.

Curry: I'm not either.

Herrera: Okay.

Curry: No.

Pearson: Yeah. I think, well I haven't gotten any since MPO wasn't allowed to forward anymore.

Herrera: Okay.

Pearson: And I didn't see it in the paper and I went, was heading south and had to go the ...

Rochelle: Yeah. Same thing.

Herrera: Yeah. Maybe they're just being sent internally which doesn't seem likely. I don't ...

Pearson: I read the paper and I would think ...

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: It's one of those things that would, I would notice so I was surprised that I didn't notice it.

Herrera: Well and the other, the other thing too is that some of those, the intermittent closures of roads happen sort of quickly so they might not have time to put them in the paper but we definitely do send out press releases for those.

Pearson: Right. Closing the Conway ramp ...

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: Is kind of a big deal.

Herrera: Yeah that is a big deal, and that one should've probably been in the paper. I know that we've had public meetings and that there have been press releases.

Pearson: Cause I know that, I think it happened right around some of the holidays.

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: And I saw, you have a sign with a detour, I saw the arrow was down so I thought that was interesting and then the arrow's pointing, you know pointing the other direction.

Herrera: We've received some calls and hopefully fixed all of those issues.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: But I will definitely make sure anybody who wants to be added to that distribution list for press releases please see me, make sure I have your e-mail addresses and I'll make sure you're added to the list for those.

Pearson: Okay. And I guess let's talk about the TAP stuff and how that's changed and I guess the specific question of the Safe Routes to School program is funded through some date and what will be needed in order to continue that, or apply for it at least.

Herrera: For the Safe Routes to School Coordinator position?

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: So that's still going to be an eligible expenditure or eligible project I guess under TAP. It's still going to be called TAP. Pretty much we haven't changed anything in our guidebooks so the same eligibilities and criteria still apply. The same goes for the Rec Trails Program. So we're just making sure that we reference the new, the new transportation bill, double-checking a few things before we put the guides out. But pretty much nothing has really changed as far as criteria and eligibility. Some of the, I guess the, the process for how to apply for funding has changed. We hope to make it a little bit easier as far as getting approvals from commissions or city councils and things because that sometimes can be cumbersome especially when you're on a crunched timeline and some city councils and county commissions only meet once a month or, so it's a little hard. So we're looking at some of that stuff but really not a whole lot's changed. The funding amount seems to be about the same so we'll have just a little over $5 million in TAP and then probably about $2 million in Rec Trails that will be ...

Curry: And will there be application openings every year? Is that the anticipation?

Herrera: No. We actually are funding on a two-year cycle ...

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: Now and that's really to help local governments to phase the project in a way, in a way that makes them successful so we've been doing design in the first fiscal year and construction in the second fiscal year. That way they don't have like five months to design everything and go out to construction. It just wasn't working that way. So we program two fiscal years out.

Curry: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: And for non-construction projects they're, they're just handled for two years anyways.

Herrera: Right. Yeah. And the contracts are actually, well the funds expire so you have the year of award plus three years after so I mean technically construction could take up to three years after the award if that gives you some indication. That's the same for the programs as well.

Pearson: And can you go over again what you're expecting the, the timeline for the next phase, that's ...

Herrera: Sure. This morning at our staff meeting we had talked about having the guidebook finalized hopefully by mid-March at the latest. We would

probably release the call to the MPOs and the RTPOs shortly after that in hopes to have the deadline for applications be either late August or early September sometime. We haven't set those dates exactly yet. The MPO process will have to be built into that as far as if you guys are planning on doing feasibility reviews or if you require any additional documentation. We basically say you know, "Here's the application." If the MPO has any other processes that they'd like to follow like going through this Committee and the TAC and the Policy Committee, well that's really up to them to set those internal deadlines.

Rochelle: Do you have the, Mr. Chair, oops, you have to pardon my ignorance. I'm like Mr. Bencomo. I'm trying to play catch-up here. I actually don't know what you mean when you refer to the guidebook.

Herrera: Sorry about that. The, we're talking about two sources of funding. One of them's called Transportation Alternatives Program and one of them is called Recreational Trails Program.

Rochelle: Got that.

Herrera: So these are funding sources available through the State to local governments for alternative modes of transportation. So for bikes, for pedestrians, those kinds of things. And so the guidebook I'm referring to is the rules for those two programs as we run it in our state.

Rochelle: Okay.

Pearson: Do you know what the matching percentage is?

Herrera: It's 14.56% for both programs.

Pearson: Okay. So that's unchanged.

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: Because if we get credit for, cause at the national level it's 20% so if we get extra credit because of all the federal lands or something then we ...

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: Have a payment.

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: In lieu of taxes.

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: *(Inaudible)*

Herrera: Yeah. Are there any other questions on that? No? Mr. Chair I do have just one more update to follow up on the University study that was just completed, or approved by the Policy Committee. I have been talking to Trent and Harold from District 1 and we have agreed to seek funding for additional phases of that project I guess. So we're looking for funding for Phase B all the way up through final design and we're looking at possibly funding a project in the STIP. We don't have a fiscal year yet but, so sorry can't tell you that but ...

Pearson: But that's good news. That's a project that has been desired for many years.

Herrera: Yes. And I think, yeah Trent is making a, an effort to I guess follow-up on more of the things that the MPO's started so.

Rochelle: One more question. When you say 14.5% for both programs for TAP and the Recreational program, what's the base out of which this 14.5% is reckoned? What is that? I, I'm not sure what that means.

Pearson: Well if you have a $100,000 project, you want to build a, a trail for $100,000 whoever is acquiring, who's sponsoring the project so if the City of Las Cruces, let's say they're spending $100,000 to extend La Llorona. The City has to come up with $14,565 thousand, right.

Rochelle: Ah, okay. All right. That's very helpful. Now I get it.

Pearson: So that would be the local match part of the project.

Rochelle: Got it.

Pearson: Okay. So do we have any Committee Member comments want to make? Any questions or comments?

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Bencomo: I always have a comment sorry. And I didn't know how to take your comment a while ago when you said something about being ignorant and then Mr. Bencomo I'm like, *(inaudible)* I don't know how to take that. Anyway I, I, I had mentioned this I guess probably first or second meeting and I would, I'm bringing it up again. Looking at the, the trail map that we

have, I would love for this Committee to get together in a, I don't know if you want to call it a work session, a brainstorming session, something and sit down and look at this map and start in our own minds starting to say, "Hey I think this kind of connectivity would work," or "This ditch/canal would work," or I mean, cause we're already talking about if we went through campus where would it go. How would we, how would we do it? And, and I am, maybe I'm wrong but I'm assuming as a, as a, the Pedestrian Committee Member representing the community because I'm out on those streets and roads using them that that would be my place is to give input and say, "I think we should have connectivity here, I think we should have paths here." So, but it would be great to get this Committee together at, at a brainstorming session, whatever we want to call it and just kind of start throwing our ideas down and, and what we may be want to do with that. Does, is this, does this Committee do those thing, kind of things, have they?

Pearson: Well that's how the map came together in the first place.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. As the Chair said earlier in the meeting a, a follow-up to the, the southern leg of the, the multiuse trail loop could be a reexamination so that, that's already kind of been alluded to this evening, doing just that. It's just that given the timeline that, if we're wanting to get TAP funding this cycle we really need to focus in on the specific project. But we, we certainly can examine the entire trail network and trail priorities plan as a whole as part of the function of this Committee.

Bencomo: Okay. Yeah, that, that'd be great. And I understand that the timeline so if, if that's the piece we need to focus on first maybe it would be great but I would like to look at the whole plan too and see, I mean as, as a Committee Member and especially as a new Committee Member and we have another new Committee Member and, and based on what we kind of talked about today with the removal of members and then maybe possibly needing a new member so now we're going to have three fairly new members. So maybe it's a, it's a good time to, to revisit and re-look at this and brainstorm it again and see if any new ideas come up so, just a suggestion. If we could do that, that, I'm willing to meet and do those type of things.

Pearson: Cause the same could be applied to the bicycle priorities map too I'm sure. It hasn't really been looked at in some amount of time.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I think we've had this conversation probably three or four times but I thought at one point we were going to set priorities or goals for this Committee at the beginning of the year so that we sort of know what direction we're going or what specific things we want to work on. I mean maybe that's something that we want to put on the list for this year.

Pearson: Yes, maybe just pick on one instead of trying to do too much. Maybe the trail priorities should be the one, first emphasis on the loop. Once we're done with the loop then we can start looking at other things. Another question I guess for you Jolene is on the TAP and the RTP, we're talking about the loop trail. Both funds could be used for that, isn't that right? And how do you pick how to apply?

Herrera: It really depends. The TAP program is in its name: Transportation Alternatives so it's really meant for people who are more commuting or those kinds of things. Obviously it can be used for recreation but it's really to, to transport people whereas Rec Trails is more like it says for recreation so along the river or ...

Pearson: Of course we've used ...

Herrera: Something ...

Pearson: The TAP funds ...

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: For those projects.

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: The outfall channel and La Llorona.

Herrera: Because you can make the argument that people use them ...

Pearson: Right.

Herrera: For commuting or, yeah to get around the city. So it's, it's really hard sort of to distinguish. It's really a matter of where you feel like you can have a better chance of getting funds. And some local governments have applied for both simultaneously.

Pearson: Do they go, do, whoever reviews these, do they know that that's happened?

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: So, cause it ...

Herrera: So it's in the same area. The, the difference is that the Rec Trails projects are picked by the Rec Trails Board and it's a coalition of different people

from well not just from the DOT whereas the TAP projects are picked by DOT, a DOT committee.

Pearson: Right.

Curry: So is it possible for, and I don't know how it would work if the Town of Mesilla wanted to apply for, you know whether it's the Rec Trails or whether it's the TAP funds at the same time, I'm thinking if it's a two-year cycle and we miss this one puts us really far out. What if the Town of Mesilla applied for the, for that portion and we're, and again I mean that study would need to be done like Mr. Bencomo said, you know kind of figure out where a trail would be and then the City applies for another or who's, who would be the applying entity here?

Herrera: That would ...

Curry: Just whomever, so ...

Herrera: That would have to be worked out. The only, the only stipulation is that the DOT is not eligible for those funds so it has to be a local government.

Curry: So theoretically we could put in two applications, one that's the City or NMSU, is NMSU eligible?

Herrera: Yes.

Curry: So we could put in three, we could put in NMSU and the City and the Town of Mesilla, all that would sort of be the same project worked on but different pieces of the, of the project.

Herrera: Yes and I think that would be a really good idea.

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: If you can show partnership between different entities completing things like the bicycle loop that's a priority for this MPO, those are things that give you more sort of points in the application process.

Curry: Okay.

Pearson: So the Town of Mesilla could look at completing the La Llorona up to Calle del Norte so that you could actually ride it on a bicycle.

Rochelle: Right.

Curry: Right.

Pearson: And, NMSU ...

Curry: Or even ...

Pearson: Might do ...

Curry: If, yeah.

Pearson: Extension underneath, the Triviz extension and then maybe the City'll look at doing like they did for the outfall channel, connect between.

Herrera: Right. It's just really a matter of how much funding each local government is able to match.

Curry: Correct, yeah. Are there any other grants that are able to, to help with that match? Sort of seem to remember something about that on a webinar that I watched about that funding.

Herrera: There are. The only stipulation really is that you can't match federal funds with other federal funds but you can use state funding so if, if somebody was to use their local government road fund which is also a DOT program but it's, it's the state funding portion, some local governments do use that to match federal grants, you can also apply for funding through the legislature. There's several state funding sources that you can apply as a match ...

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: Toward your *(inaudible)*.

Curry: Cause I'm thinking some of these entities may not have the money, the 14.56% so if they could use a different grant and match it, and then how does that work out if those grants are sort of being applied for simultaneously you know and you don't get the one that you were hoping for to match but you receive the other one and you can't do it. Do you decline that money or how does that end up working?

Herrera: Yes. When, when we send out award letters most of them have language "If you cannot use this funding please let us know so that we can reallocate it." So.

Curry: Okay.

Herrera: The only problem with that is that that's something that we look at in the criteria for when we're awarding projects so if we were to give someone funding, they weren't able to use it, they might not score as high in, in ...

Curry: Future.

Herrera: Future funding *(inaudible).*

Curry: Right. Yeah. That makes sense.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Bencomo: Comment. So I, I, I'm guessing when you apply for those funds you, it's, it's almost natural that you have to show that you already have, "This is how we're going to match our portion."

Herrera: Right.

Bencomo: If you can't show that then you're probably not going to even be awarded.

Herrera: Right.

Bencomo: So my question also is this project, the, especially going underneath ...

Herrera: University.

Bencomo: University and Triviz, sorry. Lost my brain a minute there. So one side is the City, the other side is NMSU and then if we're talking the loop, so can there be a joint application, all three entities on one application or does it have to be three separate ones?

Herrera: No. I would suggest if that's, if that's the route that the three entities want to go to do one joint application.

Bencomo: Okay. And then my next question is: Is that something the MPO would drive since it's three different local governmental entities but it's within the same MPO or does that have to be done separately? I don't, I don't know how all the nuts and bolts of that.

Herrera: I think the MPO can help with some of the technical aspects and maybe filling out the application. I can also help with that. But really it's, it's on the local governments ...

Bencomo: Yeah.

Herrera: To sort of coordinate that ...

Pearson: So if the ...

Herrera: Within themselves.

Pearson: Committee we decide we would like to see this project, we could do a recommendation to the Policy Committee that they recommend to their entities that that's a good project.

Herrera: Right. Because that Board has, well all three entities minus NMSU but I'm sure they can get them involved.

Bencomo: Okay. Yeah and I didn't necessarily mean the, the MPO would actually be doing all that.

Herrera: Right.

Bencomo: They're, they're probably like, "Oh my God what's he trying to do to us?" I just meant more they're that link that brings these communities together and so, the common link so.

Herrera: Right. And those, those links are already set up I think through this Committee, through the TAC Committee, and then through the Policy Committee so.

Bencomo: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: Yeah. If we made a recommendation like that it would go to the TAC also, right?

Wray: Yes.

Pearson: Okay. Any other Committee Members have comments? I guess I'll have a couple of comments. The Rio Grande Trail Commission had their meeting down here, seemed very successful. I attended it. Their, the big announcement that I got out of it was the, the RTP funds that are available will be used towards a overall planning guide for the, the trail. So that would, that's a really important step. The trail itself is going to go, is planned from the Texas border to the Colorado border and it's, can be a great economic driver, tourism, think Appalachian trail, things like that.

The other thing is on August 23rd of, April 23rd of this year is the New Mexico Bike Summit which will be hosted here in Las Cruces. It'll be at the WIA Building. Everybody's certainly encouraged to participate. There'll be more information. It's nmbikeed.org is the website for the

sponsoring organization. City of Las Cruces is sponsoring, or supporting it. We'll be looking for any other support that people might be interested in. Probably want to talk to Jolene about NMDOT participation. Rosa has participated previously in our panel discussion that we have.

Prior to that we're, there's going to be an LCI seminar, League Cycling Instructor seminar which is the training to receive to be certified as a League Cycling Instructor. If anybody's interested in pursuing that there is a prerequisite course, the Traffic Skills 101 and that's planned for February and that could be useful. Law enforcement up in Albuquerque, the Bernalillo County Sheriffs have some LCIs and they use that as part of their public, public contact and that helps them understand how cyclists should be riding in the roadway and that's what that training really is, is learn how to ride safely. The LCI is the teach the teacher kind of thing so then once you're an LCI then you can hold classes and help people ride safely in our environment. Any other comments from anybody?

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

- NO PUBLIC WAS IN ATTENDANCE

10. ADJOURNMENT (6:27)

Pearson: Hear a motion to adjourn.

Bencomo: So moved.

Herrera: Second.

Rochelle: I have a comment actually. It's minor but I looked on the MPO website and there, there's no listing for the members of it, of committees and I would find that helpful in terms of just simple communication.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Rochelle: Or is there?

Wray: Mr. Rochelle. That is by design.

Rochelle: Oh. Okay.

Wray: We, we consciously made an, a decision not to include listing of, I can speak to you privately after the meeting's over. I don't want to take up everyone else's ...

Rochelle: Right.

Wray: Time with the nuance of that but it was a conscious decision to do so.

Rochelle: I get it.

Pearson: Is the meeting schedule on there?

Wray: Yes.

Rochelle: The meeting schedule's on, yes.

Pearson: Okay. I didn't, I was looking for that. So that's, also we should say when our next meeting is before we adjourn which is next month, right?

Wray: February but I don't know what the date is.

Pearson: Third Tuesday.

Wray: Yeah. Third, third Tuesday of February.

Pearson: Okay. We'll try again. Motion to adjourn?

Shepan: So moved.

Pearson: Any ...

Curry: Second.

Pearson: All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: We're adjourned.

Chairperson