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 July 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)
James Langell - proxy Ashleigh Curry (Mesilla Citizen Rep)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
James Nunez (City of Las Cruces Rep)
Blake Stogner - proxy Gabriel Rochelle (Bicycle Com. Rep.)
Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County)
David Shearer (NMSU - Environmental Safety)
Lance Shepan (Mesilla Marshall's Department)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Andrew Bencomo (Ped. Community Rep)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (MPO)
Michael McAdams (MPO)
Zach Taraschi (MPO)
Marcus Lopez (MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT: Stephen Howie (EBID)
Ron Johnson (Zia Engineering)
Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

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

Pearson: It's about 5:00 so I'll call the Mesilla Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to order for July 19th. As part of that we'll just go through and have everybody introduce themselves. We'll start with Mark.

Leisher: Mark Leisher, Dona Ana County Representative, Citizens' Rep.

Billings: Maggie Billings, Bicycle Community Representative.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Shepan: Lance Shepan, Town of Mesilla.

Stogner: Blake Stogner, I'm proxy for Gabriel Rochelle.

Shearer: David Shearer, NMSU Rep.

Nunez: James Nunez, City of Las Cruces.

Paz: Samuel Paz, Dona Ana County.

Langell: Jim Langell, proxy for Ashleigh Curry.

Pearson: Okay.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Pearson: Next is Approval of the Agenda. Do we have any comments on the agenda? If not I'll hear a motion to accept the agenda as presented.

Nunez: I'll make a motion.

Shearer: Second.

Pearson: Okay. So there's, James and then, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none, those are approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 May 17, 2016

Pearson: Next we have Approval of the Minutes. Do we have any discussion for the minutes? Hearing none, I'll hear a motion to accept the minutes as presented.

Shepan: I'll make a motion.

Pearson: And a second?

Shearer: *(Inaudible)*

Pearson: We have a motion and a second for the minutes as presented. All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? So that passes.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Next we have an opportunity for public comment. Doesn't look like we have any public here though, do we or …

6.1 Crash Data Discussion

Pearson: So move on to the next item, Action Items. We have a TIP amendment.

McAdams: I would like to switch the items a little bit and have the crash report first and then we'll discuss the TIP, the TIP amendment and the multi-use trail. And Marcus Lopez who is a Co-Op of ours, of ours will explain the crash data. Okay.

Pearson: Okay. So we're doing next item 6.1. right now.

McAdams: Yes, correct.

MARCUS LOPEZ GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Nunez: Which scope did, excuse me Mr., Mr. Chair. Did you include the pedestrian fatality at NMSU?

Lopez: Yeah, I believe that was the one.

Nunez: Okay. So you, and my point is, is that you took how much of the region? Did you take Dona Ana and the city and …

Lopez: It was the …

Nunez: The University?

Lopez: Entire Dona Ana.

Nunez: I didn't hear you, I'm sorry.

Lopez: Yeah. It was the entire Dona Ana study area. So basically wherever you saw a signalized intersection within the MPO boundary, we basically looked at all the data from crashes that occur at those points.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: So did you guys just get the, the crash data from NMDOT or did you actually look at the crash reports also?

Lopez: Within the crash data they were included with reports that police had filed including you know what day it happened, what time, what type of crash it was, who the reporting agency was. So it was included with a whole bunch of information that was included there but for the sake of the project we only included relevant information that we thought might portray a crash analysis better.

Herrera: I'm just wondering because if you go back to the slide on well pedestrians and bike crashes there's a pretty long bar next to "None" for the reason.

Lopez: That's all on part ...

Herrera: Or the factor.

Lopez: Of the police agency reporting it. Either they forgot to fill it out which would be "None" or "N/A" or it's just, there was no contributing factor.

Herrera: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: So the ...

Lopez: Any more?

Pearson: Crash times you have fairly large groupings, like from 6 a.m. to 12 p.m. Can you granulize that any, can you show you know from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m., 8 a.m. to 10 a.m.?

Lopez: We can go a little deeper into it. It's just that given that there were a limited amount of occurrences that occurred within the three years, being 23 sometimes there was like two that occurred at 6, one that occurred at 7, one occurred that at, one that occurred at 8, two occurred at 9.

Pearson: Cause what would be more interesting is, is, are these school kids, is it school crossing incidents ...

Lopez: Yeah, I mean that's ...

Pearson: Or is it something else?

Lopez: That's definitely something we can look into for in a further study if we want to dig a little deeper into looking at pedestrians specifically involved we can even extend it back, I think ten more years is what we have data on regarding pedestrian-involved crashes. So it can be made into a larger study given the opportunity.

Pearson: So the crash reports, this is, I guess NMDOT gets all the uniform crash, accident reports or whatever the, anytime there's an incident, the cop shows up, they fill out a report that goes to NMDOT, and that's where you drew that information from?

Lopez: Yes.

Pearson: So you should've been, so you did get that from on campus and ...

Lopez: Yeah. As long as ...

Pearson: All the MPO area.

Lopez: It was reported by a police agency whether it be campus PD or ...

Pearson: So you tried to ...

Lopez: State Police, Las Cruces.

Pearson: Do the MPO area so ...

Lopez: Yeah.

Pearson: Further south. You didn't just stop at Main and Union. You also collected down to Berino.

Lopez: Yeah. Yeah, any place that there was a signalized intersection within the MPO area it got data associated with it.

Pearson: Oh, so this is only signalized.

Lopez: Yes. Yes. The data does exist for non-signalized intersections, for any points that occurred whether it be on segments or in parking lots. But for the sake of the, the project itself it was only looking at signalized intersections.

Pearson: Is that to try to figure out which intersections need improvement ...

Lopez: Yes.

Pearson: As opposed to which roadways might need improvement?

Lopez: Yeah. Yeah, projects can be done that can, we can begin to look at roadways but the scope of this project originally started just looking at intersections to see if there were any contributing factors consistently at particular intersections like at Lohman and Walton if we're looking at why

rear-ends keep on occurring at that one point. Is it because of the left-hand turn lane or, or something else just to ...

Pearson: Because the fatality that I recall, pedestrian fatality was on Telshor so that wouldn't have been part of this data then. Is that, is in the middle of ...

Lopez: If it didn't occur at a signalized intersection, it wouldn't be.

Pearson: Right. Do you have speed limit data as part of this?

Lopez: We have speed limit data we're, for our traffic count programs but they were not associated with this project.

Pearson: Cause I guess what would be important to me would be the non-signalized intersections probably on rural, on roadways if somebody's going, if it's, well unmarked roadways in the urban area the speed limit is 30 miles an hour. And a pedestrian crash at 30 miles an hour there's probably a, a 70% ...

Lopez: Yeah.

Pearson: Chance of a fatality. Reduce that, well at 20 mile I think it's a 90% chance of surviving the crash.

Lopez: Yeah.

Pearson: So being able to evaluate speed as part of the contributing factors ...

Lopez: Yeah.

Pearson: Could also be important.

Lopez: Yeah. I mean if we look at the contributing factors data that's in the, that's in the complete spreadsheet of the project itself, which was too big to include in it there are factors that do include excessive speed as a cause of fatality, injury, property damage.

Pearson: So now that you've done the report what are you going to do with it?

Lopez: That's up to the scope of the higher-ups of the MPO. I think Michael McAdams can *(inaudible)* on this.

McAdams: This is directed toward looking at more quantification and performance measures so we're going to do this. We're also looking at things like bus ridership as well and so crashes is an important segment of looking at how well our, our road facilities are working. We can extend the, the study to corridor but corridor analysis is different from intersections. Intersections

focus mainly on geometrics, of what possible geometrics can improve the situation. But corridors are, deal with I think a different issue, still maybe geometric but like driveway cuts, people crossing illegally or you know jaywalking etc. So if, if you'd like to the, if the Committee would like to address this we can extend this to look at corridor too. But I think I would like to have, I think we'd like to have some directive from the Committee on this aspect if you think it's important enough. But again it's, it's, to summarize it, this is a way to, we're going ahead and doing our performance measure before the state or the feds and we think that accident rates are a, they're always important part of looking at how intersections and corridors are responding you know, and so, and the standard way of looking at crash rates which is per you know volume is the best way to look at because you have an accident that it's a low-volume intersection it use, identifies a more severe case while you have an accident, say one accident's like at Telshor and Lohman, that's normal as far as probability right. Cause it doesn't matter how many, like we have 100,000 cars for example enter an intersection, you would normally just by chance, probability have one or two accidents just by the amount of vehicles. But if we have like example one accident occurring in a, in a intersection that's 1,000 vehicles or three or four, that indicates a real problem. So that's what we're really looking at, at where there may be problem issues like the top ten and then looking at further I think it's an indication to other agencies, to City, County, and the Town of Mesilla if there, where, where the *(inaudible)*, it really means these are intersections that we, we, that, that deserve further study, geometric, it, you know this is where you go into crash analysis, you know the diagrams and see if there may be some geometric reasons or other reasons you know. So really this is sort of saying, and also looking at, I think in crash analysis you're looking at when we improve intersections, you know like we're doing at El Paseo, does that reduce accidents? We hope it will, we hope the channelization, some of the channelization like right turn, exclusive right turn lane will I think like decrease hit, not hit-and-run but you know rear-ends maybe. But I think it's a good indication when we do improvements, does that reduce the accidents rate? Maybe it's no, it's not geometric relation, it may be like in some situation, situations we have like inattention. Is that inattention related to texting? They don't have stats you know so, but I, I think we can, we would be glad to extend and look at corridors but the overall purpose to look at how we, we're, how intersections are, collisions and are they going up or down or are several, are they consistently on the list, you know. And that indicates we, there's a severe problem or it's a problem we, we should address, all right.

Pearson: Right. For vehicle crashes probably the intersection's the greatest incidence.

McAdams: Probably the greatest, yes. Yeah.

Pearson: But for pedestrian/bicycle that's specially where the, I think looking at all the crash data might be worthwhile. The jaywalking that happens on University Avenue, that happens between intersections so ...

McAdams: It had ...

Pearson: It sounds like that would fall outside of this study.

McAdams: Well you know there's several other corridors like that, Solano which I go up and down every day, you see people ...

Pearson: El Paseo.

McAdams: El Paseo, you see people jaywalking and I think El Paseo and Solano should be looked at further but I think that's more of a City issue and they are trying to direct some of, it, they're trying to address some of this in their El Paseo study so.

Pearson: Right. But you're collecting the data for them to be able to look at this, right?

McAdams: Yeah. We're, what we're doing is we're, as the MPO we, we're not an implementing agency. So we're kind of like, "Here's a warning sign, here's something that can be studied further by the City officials," and truly more traffic engineering type of situation or, and so Soo is doing some of this stuff. He's actually looking at you know collecting stuff before it gets to NMDOT from the, the police you know.

Pearson: Right.

Billings: I think that a corridor study would be very good for the City to help understand bicycle streets because we have a couple streets designated in the city like Alameda and El Paseo as a bicycle street that is just dangerous. I noticed that the intersections with Alameda were on the data as some of the highest crash incidences so I, for bicycles so I think that a study on that would help ...

McAdams: Okay.

Billings: You know understand where we should put bike streets and where we shouldn't.

McAdams: Right. I agree.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I could also add some information. So part of collecting data like this is in preparation for setting the targets for ...

McAdams: Right.

Herrera: Performance measures. FHWA did release the safety performance measures and so now NMDOT has a year to set our targets and then the MPOs will also be setting targets as well. So we need data to know what targets we should be setting so we don't set something that's unattainable.

McAdams: Exactly.

Herrera: So this definitely helps. I would agree with what the other Members said and I think if there are specific corridors that we know of I guess if we, if we know that there's a corridor where there's a high number of pedestrians or bicycles or crashes then maybe we can ask the MPO to look at those.

McAdams: I think we'd look at, as far as accident corridors you can clearly see from the diagrams you know North Main here you can see is the major corridors we'd know and those are, but I think that, but core, this is on an intersection, corridor analysis and intersection analysis for crash rates are two different animals to a large degree.

Herrera: Right. But I think it's important data that the ...

McAdams: Definitely.

Herrera: MPO can look at.

McAdams: Oh yeah. I agree.

Pearson: Even if it's only the bike/ped portion of it.

Herrera: Right. And that's kind of what I'm getting at is to get ...

McAdams: Right.

Herrera: Away from the vehicle portion of, I mean not take it out completely, obviously but to focus on corridors that maybe this body can help prioritize as far as what we know is important for bikes, bicycle and pedestrians specifically.

McAdams: Just my two cents, probably expanding to years would make, get more data. We could also say if there's been improvement, if we improved intersection has the pedestrian/bicycle crashes gone down. But I think three years maybe, and I'm just saying that really maybe, may be limited and so expanding the years may give more, will give more data for sure but maybe more causes and look at more data and help us explain some of the reasons you know.

Pearson: Okay. Any other Member comments?

Shepan: Mr. Chair. On the, somebody mentioned it earlier about trying to get more data. On the Uniform Crash Report just for example, somebody, it's driver inattention. Nowhere in that report will it say why, was it a cell phone or whatever. You need to look at the traffic citation itself because there it'll say, "Driver was on cell phone," "Driver's picking his nose," whatever. But on the crash report itself it's just a pull-down menus that we check off and if it's driver inattention, it's driver inattention. You know if it's illegal left-hand turn, there's no place for an explanation of what it was because ...

Pearson: So texting or cell phone is ...

Shepan: It ...

Pearson: Is driver in, inattention.

Shepan: Yes.

Pearson: So that's really important I think in ...

Shepan: So, now the, if you look at the bottom of a Uniform Crash Report it'll say if the driver was cited, what he was cited for, and that citation number is there. That citation number can be pulled to get the specifics.

Pearson: It's, that'll be different for different jurisdictions won't it?

Shepan: Well here in New Mexico we all use the same, yes.

Pearson: Okay.

Shepan: It's just different agency ...

Pearson: Okay, I wasn't aware of that.

Shepan: Yeah.

Pearson: Because at the New Mexico Safety Summit one of, part of the discussion was expanding on the Uniform Crash Report to have probably some of that kind of data.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I was, yeah, I was going to, well wait for Mr. Nunez over there but then say that, that that is written into our safety plan at the way higher up level than me obviously, they're trying to work on updating the Uniform Crash Report to include more explanations, something more user-friendly

for the officers and also more user-friendly for analyzing the, the data after the fact so.

Pearson: James.

Nunez: I, I'm glad you asked George, the, the question how do, how are you going to use this. I've got a couple questions. One of them is, is, is I haven't seen other reports like this. I was curious if there's a section at the end for you to make suggestions his, his, historically or not or you just leave the data like it is and just, this is the presented data. That's one question. May, let me ask if I, before I forget my other thought. Is the, is similar to how the state uses information like this, I'll be honest with you, I'm curious how the City uses it to help like Soo or, or some of the traffic departments to focus on an intersection to see if it does need to be redesigned. And then the third thing that I have written down here is I stated earlier, I asked the question about the fatality on campus that was, I know that one where that fatality occurred and I believe, I don't, I don't, I wasn't there and I didn't read the full report but I believe that the one driver was a distracted and it may have also been early in the morning with the sun coming up or something, and then also the person walking I heard may have been on their cell phone also. I don't know the situation but it wasn't at a signalized intersection. So back to my question, is this just the 23 pedestrian-involved crashes was, would that not have this data in there or would it? Cause it wasn't a signalized intersection that that fatality occurred. So maybe you can ask the last one, answer the last question first and then hopefully you can answer my other two questions.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. Trying to an, I guess answer your questions and overall, as Jolene alluded to this is the beginning of us meeting the federal regulations to do performance measures, to specifically to your question of "What is going to be contained in the report coming out of the MPO?" Yes. We would certainly like to do recommendations at the end. Part of that process as far as coming up with recommendations does necessarily involve us presenting to you the initial data cause our committees are, you know we, we get work out of you guys. We get good ideas, we get direction. So this is the beginning of that process and hopefully we will develop something you know like, like you had envisioned. Mr. Lopez started off with the, with the intersections. Certainly as we go on, on through developing this we'll extend that to the, you know to the corridors. We'll look for you know problem spots and then we'll be able to dig down deeper into it you know as, as Mr. Shepan note, noted we do have, you know we do have the citation numbers. Obviously we're not going to be able to look at every single citation but if we identify problem spots that tells us where to go to, to start pulling those so we can see the specific factors, you know what cause, what causes the crashes and then is there anything that we can do from an infrastructure standpoint or recommendation of education

to change that and those would, those would again would feed our recommendations.

And then just to kind of, kind of close out on Ms. Herrera's statement, the MPO has also been, we have been putting our voice into that, asking for certain changes in the, in the statewide data, how it's reported so that it's more usable, usable for us as a planning agency, for your agencies as implementing agencies, so, so there's a lot of improvement on it so you know we're hoping that by getting this discussion item here into our other committees we can help that process along.

Nunez: Right. Thanks. No I like the way that, I know you get, have a lot of information and I like the way you've broken it down into categories. I think they're of some value and I'm glad you mentioned that you will have some suggestions cause I think that, well I'll just state that I didn't know if you were worried, or some people worry about making suggestions cause then you start getting into some legal issues maybe or something but, yeah I don't want to touch on that too much. It, I see you reaction over there.

Pearson: Any other Committee comments? Okay. So we'll move on to our next item. You wanted to go through the multi-use next, is that ...

Murphy: Mr. Chair, and I do apologize for coming in late. Did we get to 5.1 on the amendments to the TIP?

Pearson: No.

Murphy: Okay. So. Thanks.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Amendment to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Pearson: So that's, that's you?

Murphy: Go, you go back in order, yes.

Pearson: Okay. So we'll go to 5.1 then.

Murphy: Okay, 5.1 is a amendment to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. Specifically we were requested by RoadRUNNER Transit who was requested by FTA and NMDOT to add a new, a new project onto the TIP that is a result of the reorganization of funding categories at the, at the federal level. So this project would be to account for the rolling stock for, which is purchase of, of new buses. And with that I, I guess stand for any questions.

Pearson: So it's not really new money, it's just reorganizing?

Murphy: It's reorganizing. I, I do believe that instead of go, flowing through NMDOT Transit and Rail, RoadRUNNER's now the direct recipient of FTA and then the, the project details are meant to reflect that.

Pearson: Okay. Any other questions on this?

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I just have a really minor change. It's, the control number on it actually has another zero. It should be TL00016 but it's so minor.

Murphy: Thank you. We'll ...

Pearson: I'll hear a motion to approve the TIP amendment as presented with, with the extra digit.

Herrera: Move to approve.

Pearson: Second?

Shepan: Second.

Pearson: Okay. We have a motion and a second to approve the TIP amendment. All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none, that passes.

5.2 Multi-Use Loop Trail Alternative Selection

Pearson: So now we're on to 5.2.

TOM MURPHY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Langell: Which is the Laguna lateral?

Murphy: The Laguna lateral is the one that is east of NM-28 and it's a, a pink and black dash then it goes down here to approximately Mesilla Elementary School.

Langell: And, when you, the Laguna lateral is Option What?

Murphy: The Laguna lateral is Option E.

Langell: E. Thank you.

TOM MURPHY CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: Comments? James.

Nunez: I'll *(inaudible)* the discussion a little bit and ask a few people's opinions but I know at one time I think the one that you listed, what was it again, the Tortugas E was it? Was that what you mentioned?

Murphy: The, mentioned like the Laguna lateral.

Nunez: Laguna, sorry, yeah.

Murphy: And ...

Nunez: Laguna E. That one at one time I remember at the very beginnings of the discussions that that one goes by The Bean, right? Is that what some of the people were talking, but it doesn't make the path continuous cause of the congestion at that major corner there. I don't know the intersection. But anyway my point I guess just to drive and give the, yield the floor to some of the people like you all that live there and drive there every day. It's, what, it's nice that, that the, the Mesilla and the, and the EBID I'm really glad that there's discussions to, to consider the paths to go through those regions. So based on all these options available I would kind of defer to some of the people that know that area a little bit better of which one may be the best option at this point. I think, I think it's nice that we have all these options now potentially. So all you have the floor.

Pearson: Who's next?

Shepan: *(Inaudible)*.

Pearson: Yeah.

Shepan: Mr. Chair. Yes, it would be nice to be able to have the trail come off that lateral on 28 and Calle del Norte but like you stated, from Highway 28 west on Calle del Norte for a good quarter of a mile there is no room, and we've already established that. The, the, the residents aren't going to give up any property, neither are the farmers. Personally I think we should stick with what we agreed on the first time.

Langell: I, could you fill me in on what section you're talking about?

Shepan: From ...

Pearson: Highway 28.

Murphy: Let me, let me get to the map of the close-up on E.

Langell: Is it where Calle del Norte goes into Highway 28?

Murphy: It's, yes. It's immediately west of that intersection there ...

Langell: Sure, and that ...

Murphy: Right ...

Langell: And that little section prior to the lateral which is the Mesilla lateral.

Murphy: We believe, I think it's right beyond Calle de Oeste I, I believe is, is the, that western-most street.

Langell: But the Mesilla lateral is due west of that intersection.

Murphy: It is, yes.

Langell: So it's not necessarily falling into that congested area.

Murphy: That's, that's correct. West of the lateral I believe we do have, or at least NMDOT which owns that roadway has more right-of-way there than there is pavement.

Langell: I, I live right near there so it is, I mean it's very wide there. That's, but I do agree as you approach Highway 28 heading east on Calle del Norte it does become somewhat of a funnel and ...

Shepan: Yes.

Langell: But this, that's where Andele's is and there's a lot of traffic going in and out of that parking lot onto Calle del Norte. But I, the Mesilla lateral alleviates that type of congestion, if believe, if I understand the Mesilla lateral being Option C. correct?

Murphy: C and D.

Herrera: Mr. ...

Langell: What is ... Where's D coming in?

Murphy: D, D is the one I have up on the, the difference between C and D is whether it goes down to ...

Langell: University.

Murphy: University or down to Union.

Langell: I see. So D goes all the way to Union?

Murphy: That's correct.

Langell: Okay. And C stops at University and then you take University due east. Is that correct?

Murphy: Yes.

Langell: Okay.

Pearson: Okay well one of the reasons for the, we're call, it's the Las Cruces Loop Trail so it's a loop and a trail and so what strikes me, and we had some discussion on this previously I think that's important is that we have a true multi-use path that separates those, that class of users from the roadway where we could expect to have recreational, low-speed recreational, kids, strollers, walkers, those, that class of users using this facility. So the option E which has that big gap there seems to me is not good and ...

Langell: What is the gap on E, I'm sorry?

Pearson: The one, one we were just talking about. The Calle del Norte piece, essentially from The Bean to the ...

Langell: Oh.

Pearson: Lateral.

Langell: I see what you're saying, the inlet to E. Yeah. Yeah, that's tricky. I mean I would probably ...

Pearson: So ...

Langell: It's a tricky entrance to E.

Pearson: From, my thought is that we approve Route D which should allow us to have a complete trail system. Calle del Norte is going to be a problem that's not going to be implemented for many years probably but that's our only choice at this point unless we come back later and decide that that'll never happen and we have to go further south but under the current selections I think we should recommend D and then E should be an alternate so the, to allow Tier 2 and Tier 3 on the other laterals that were identified.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: I have concerns with Option D and the fact that the EBID, the width, if you could go back to that one Tom. You have the width for that lateral, right? It narrows down to eight feet in some spots I think is what it said, eight and nine feet. So technically to have a multi-use path it has to be a minimum of ten feet. So I don't know if ...

Pearson: Is that a right-of-way or is that just, it's the current ...

Herrera: Well I mean the paved or ...

Pearson: Gravel.

Herrera: Gravel, whatever the kind of surface you have is supposed to be ten feet wide. I imagine there's you know slopes on the ditches so I don't know, I think we'd have to talk to EBID more about that and see how we could handle that.

Leisher: Mr. Chair. We would be routing the, the path along one ditch bank. Is that not correct? Not both ditch banks?

Pearson: I don't expect, that's been the pattern for EBID that says, "Okay, you guys can have this side and we'll keep this side."

Leisher: Yeah. So in that case it looks like the west bank seems to be more consistently wide, ten feet and up.

Murphy: It, Mr. Chair. If I may, may interlude and I'm, I apologize I don't know this off the top of my head but EBID does have a preference for which bank they retain as unpaved and for their maintenance, and obviously that's going to be, be their choice. And then again if I, I think the existing Union path that is east of the lateral, or that is in the city limits, I do believe that, that, there are significant portions where that's below ten feet. I think it's allowed to go down to eight for a portion and that might be something that we just have to, might, may have to just live with and get an exception to those, to those standards and engineer accordingly but ...

Herrera: Right. And we can do that. It's just that if we're going to move forward with something and we're already talking about exceptions, I don't know how the rest of the Committee feels but I personally don't like that, if we're already thinking ...

Langell: I ...

Herrera: About exceptions and then we're ...

Langell: Could you explain the exception to me?

Herrera: Yeah. The exception would be multi-use trails are supposed to be ten feet and we don't have ten feet.

Langell: But I thought it was discussed that the west side of that bank is ten feet.

Herrera: Right. And if EBID says we can't use the west side then we can't use the west side.

Langell: Well the west side would be preferable because it does buttress up to the little community center.

Herrera: Right. And that's at EBID's preference because they do own the property. So they're able to tell us which side of the lateral ...

Langell: Sure. But it seems like it's unknown right now which side they would prefer.

Herrera: Right. And we can probably ask them.

Murphy: They, they had stated a, a preference for which side it was. However Mr. Wray was at that meeting and I wasn't and I forgot to get briefed on that particular point.

Pearson: But this is a planning effort, not a implementation effort so from the planning aspect I still support D.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: I agree with you sort of but if you're going to plan, you're supposed to be planning to implement right, so I guess the other

Pearson: I would ...

Herrera: Question that I have ...

Pearson: The only, this is the only choice that would allow us to have a multi-use path through the entire segment however, and that's going to be my strongest argument I think about why that, this should be selected.

Herrera: Right. I guess my question would be to the Town of Mesilla maybe, do they see implementing any of these options in the near future? I mean are they looking for funding to implement anything?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. We did meet with the, with the Mayor and Ms. Lujan and we think that they are aiming to do an, an initial project which would, which would connect the, the La Llorona up to Calle del Norte and then a multi-use path along Calle del Norte as, as far as funding would allow, perhaps up to the, to the Mesilla lateral. And so they're, they are, the, the, looks like they're centering their proposal around the, the known aspect of this and then allow the rest of this to, to develop.

Herrera: Right. With that being said I'm on board with Option whichever one you chose, George.

Pearson: D.

Herrera: D.

Pearson: Any further discussion? So we would like a motion to move forward with Option D, is that correct?

Leisher: Oh, one minor point or question, or Option D implies Option C. Is that correct?

Pearson: No. C uses University, right? And D is Union, is that, that's the ...

Murphy: Yes.

Pearson: Main difference right? And, and last meeting we pretty much rejected University corridor for pretty much all the things Jolene was talking about, because of lack of right-of-way.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I move that we recommend to the Policy Committee Option D.

Leisher: I second the motion.

Pearson: I have a motion and a second. All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed?

Langell: Just to be clear.

Pearson: Yes.

Langell: And sometimes it's my hearing, but we're talking "D" as in "dog," right?

Pearson: Yes.

Langell: Yes. Thank you.

Pearson: So before we move on I guess the Trail Plan itself we haven't really looked at. It might be worthwhile for this Committee to give the ultimate, you know the plan, last time we had, we were presented two choices that we weren't really happy with. This time we're presented with another choice that we're more happy with but we're not looking at the entire system. I think there are parts of the trail system that need to be identified for improvements, we might be able to connect through the middle of town, the Armijo lateral. One thing that stands out to me is where the outfall channel and Motel Boulevard should connect, there is no connection there. Can we bring that as an item to discuss further?

Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair. We can bring the entire trail map as a, as a discussion ...

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: As a, as a, as an item to work on. We just did this, focused on there so I know that the, that NMSU is seeking an application for TAP funds on the east end. We've had you know discussions as I stated with Mesilla on the west end here so we thought a, a stronger statement of policy would aid their ...

Pearson: Right.

Murphy: Applications in order to get some, some immediate facilities built.

Pearson: But wouldn't that be able to point out to the City for example that this segment's needed and they might have some Parks and Rec funds by magic and ...

Murphy: Yes. So it certainly makes sense to, to at, at a later time bring back the entire, entire map perhaps the ...

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: Perhaps your next meeting we can do that.

Pearson: Okay.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Crash Data Discussion - SEE PAGE 3, BEFORE ACTION ITEMS.

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

7.1 MPO Staff Update:

Pearson: So ready to move on to Committee and Staff Comments. MPO staff comments.

Murphy: Trying to, trying to think. I do want to recognize Zach here. He's, he's, he did much of the work on putting this together and we'll be losing him as of August 5th. He'll be attend, pursuing grad, graduate school but I'd like to you know publicly acknowledge all his hard work and that we, we're, we're very, very grateful to have had him.

Pearson: Okay.

7.2 Local Projects Update

Pearson: Local Project Updates. City of Las Cruces, any project updates to share?

Nunez: We have a, quite a bit of construction going on through the city. A lot of these are some of the minor roads, residential and small sections of other, or is, I'll mention a few. They are adding ADA accessible ramps and, on Sixth Street, on Hadley, and Melendres is in design I believe right now for just a couple of blocks there on Las Cruces to Hadley.

Then we have Elks Drive on the north end that I'd already mentioned a few times that's having the, it'll, we, we will have the bike lane on that, both sides on that section, extension there.

Let's see, I have, I did talk to them about the, the project manager for the Dam Trails and that one did get going I guess a little bit behind schedule but it's on schedule still to be, I think construction completion is supposed to be around September, so those trails should be in by September.

And the other one, the other work that we had is the microsurfacing and, and maintenance and those are, we're, they just put back the, the striping that they had on the road before.

Any questions? That's all I, at, Solano ADA Poplar to Madrid is another one I wrote down here.

Pearson: Melendres is a bicycle facility. That's my neighborhood too so I'd be interested in knowing what's going on there. The trail, the Dam Trail when that's completed, we didn't have any kind of a grand opening or recognition when the La Llorona extension was completed. I wonder if maybe the City shouldn't put together a grand opening and/or some sort of a celebration

which will help notify people that those things actually exist because I think people …

Nunez: That's a …

Pearson: Find it by accident a lot of times.

Nunez: That's a good idea. The, I'll make the suggestion. I actually may even in conjunction with the Parks and Rec or something and having some sort of 5k/10k run or something. But yeah, I'll make the suggestion. Oh, you've got something Tom?

Murphy: Yeah. I'm, I'm sorry and I, I, I can wait till you're finished with, with the City items cause I have another City item that I'm pretty …

Nunez: I'm done. Go ahead.

Murphy: Okay. I probably should've handled this in ours but this is a city transit. The Short-Range Transit Plan that MPO was involved in and, and recommended a restructuring of the routes, well those routes will, are going to be implemented on July 25th. Route maps are available on the City's website, they're available on the MPO's website. So there'll be some changes on, on how people get around town and since all the old buses have bike racks on them I do know that it is of interest to this group.

Pearson: Okay. Thank you. Dona Ana County, any updates for us?

Paz: No updates at this time.

Pearson: Okay. Well I will comment, I did ride on the Dripping Springs Road all the way up to Dripping Springs Recreation Area and it's a nice road. It gets pretty steep at the end but …

Paz: The, the downhill's pretty fun as well.

Pearson: Town of Mesilla?

Shepan: No, nothing sir.

Pearson: NMSU?

Shearer: Nothing new.

7.3 NMDOT Projects Update

Pearson: Okay. NMDOT.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll briefly go over projects under construction now. The Missouri Avenue project is pretty much complete. The contractor's doing just minor items. There's supposed to be a closure or maybe that already happened. My days are all mixed up. The City's also doing some minor things under the bridge so there's closures overnight for probably the next couple of weeks. There were press releases sent out so watch for those.

The Union Avenue project, we're doing minor guard rail and seeding on that. It should be wrapped up probably in the next few weeks.

Pearson: That's the bridge?

Herrera: That's the, yeah, the bridges at Ramp E and Union on I-10. So we should be looking at wrapping up everything in that area with, probably by the end of August we'll be completely out of there.

The two projects on I-10, the mill and inlays are pretty much done. They were going to do the, the final on grade friction coarse this week and striping this week also, so that's going to be from Jackrabbit all the way to the Texas state line so there's still some cones out there. Be careful when you're driving. But we should be finished with that within the next couple of weeks, actually they say by August 11th on this paper so let's see if we can meet that deadline.

One project that's not under construction but's in, is in development and I know is of interest to this Committee is the University Avenue interchange. It's the large project that we have coming up in Fiscal Year 2018. I have asked the consultant Molzen Corbin to come to this Committee once they start doing development to talk about how to connect the trail on the other side of Triviz to NMSU. And so I'd like some input from this Committee on that. George, you're also listed as the point of contact for the BPAC and should be invited to stakeholder meetings and things for that project.

Pearson: Okay. There is a stakeholder meeting for the safety projects? The ...

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: Highway 70, do you have that information?

Herrera: Yes, I ...

Pearson: Just have the date.

Herrera: Do, let me look at it. I believe it's next week.

Pearson: Tuesday, July 26th at ...

Herrera: Yes. Tuesday, July 26th at 2 p.m.

Pearson: Two p.m.

Herrera: At the Solano Yard, the District 1 main building, the brick building right when you drive in. George is the point of contact for BPAC but you know if any of the other Members would like to go you're more than welcome. And it's to go over the, the safety project on US-70 from Organ to Aguirre Springs, or actually to White Sands, to widen the shoulders wide enough for, for bikes. So we're just kind of starting that project. We're going to go over different options at that meeting, talking about a path on the other side of the concrete wall barrier, moving the concrete wall barrier back, we'll be going over all of the options presented in the road safety assessment and picking one to go with.

Pearson: And the Valley Drive project, is that just cruising along?

Herrera: It's cruising along, yes. We're almost at 30% design plans so.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: Yeah. And then I think that's all we have in the area.

Pearson: Okay. Any other Committee Members have any comments to add? So our next meeting is next month? I don't have it on my calendar in front of me but it should be August something, August, third Tuesday?

Murphy: One moment, I'll look that up.

Herrera: Sixteenth, maybe? The third Tuesday?

Murphy: That would be correct.

Herrera: Yeah, okay.

Murphy: And then just a general and I don't know if we have public comment or anybody desiring.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Yeah we'll, ready for that. So any public comment? Hearing none.

9. ADJOURNMENT (6:04 p.m.)

Pearson: We'll go on to adjournment. Hear a motion to adjourn?

Shepan: Motion.

Pearson: And a second?

Herrera: Second.

Pearson: All in favor, "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: We're adjourned. It's what, 6, 6:04.

Chairperson