# MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held May 5, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**
Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
David Wallace - proxy for Bill Childress (BLM)
Todd Gregory (LCPS)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Harold Love (NMDOT)
Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
Daniel Sambrano - proxy for Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**
David Armijo (SCRTD)
John Gwynne (DAC Flood Commission)
Dale Harrell (NMSU)
Stephen Howie (EBID)
SooGyu Lee (CLC)
Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)
Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)

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

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

## 1. CALL TO ORDER (4:05 p.m.)

Bartholomew: It looks like we have a quorum now so I'll call the meeting to order of the, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's Technical Advisory Committee for May 5th, 2016. First item, oh actually the first item I, I'd like to remind the Committee Members whenever you speak to state your name for the record so the clerk knows who's, who to associate the comments to. And if, if everybody that's present could please introduce themselves and I'll start on my far right.

Sambrano: Daniel Sambrano, Dona Ana County.

Baum: Your microphone's not on.

Sambrano: Daniel Sambrano, Dona Ana County Engineering.

Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.

Wallace: Dave Wallace, Bureau of Land Management.

Lujan: Debbi Lujan, Town of Mesilla.

Bartholomew: Mike Bartholomew, City of Las Cruces RoadRUNNER Transit.

Trevino: Tony Trevino, City of Las Cruces Public Works.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Gregory: Todd Gregory, Las Cruces Public Schools.

Bartholomew: Thank you.

## 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Bartholomew: The first item is the Approval of the Agenda. Does staff have any changes before we make that approval?

Wray: No Mr. Chair.

Bartholomew: Okay. Do I have a motion to approve the agenda?

Love: So moved.

Trevino: Second.

Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor please say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed?

## 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 3.1 April 7, 2016

Bartholomew: Next is the Approval of the Minutes from April 7th, 2016. Hopefully everybody's had a chance to look over the minutes and are there any corrections of, and if not is there a motion to accept them? Is there a, anybody'd like to make a motion to accept the minutes then?

Trevino: Tony Trevino.

Bartholomew: You move to …

Trevino: Motion, motion to approve.

Bartholomew: Okay.

Herrera: I second.

Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor please say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed? Motion passes.

## 4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bartholomew: Next is Public Comment. I don't know that I see any members of the public here so.

## 5. ACTION ITEMS

### 5.1 Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Bartholomew: I'll move on to the next, the first Action Item 5.1: Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Bartholomew: Do any other Committee Members have questions about the amendments being proposed? If not I'll, I'll take a motion to, to recommend the amendments to the Policy Committee.

Love: So moved.

Trevino: Second.

Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor please say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed?

## 5.2 Multi-Use Loop Trail Alternative Selection

Bartholomew: The next item, Action Item is the Multi-Use Loop Trail Alternative Selection.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Bartholomew: Any comments and questions from Committee Members? Does Mesilla have any particular comments on uh the merits of either option?

Lujan: Mesilla prefers Option A for University, down University.

Bartholomew: Mr. Wray I was wondering can you go back to the maps, one of them, at least one of them showing the two options on the one map?

Wray: I'll just go back to the one that shows both.

Bartholomew: Okay.

Wray: Both options.

Bartholomew: Now when you said on the Union one that it was uh, or the, the University one was more direct to the town core, is that because you're considering like even from, from Zia Middle School as being part of the core or, it just seems like it's just two different ways to get to the same area without much difference.

Wray: We're, we're looking more at the core as defined by the proximity to the Plaza um which the, the University option is closer to the Plaza is, actually let me move this so I can see the screen myself but it's, it's in this vicinity right there and University is much closer to, to the Plaza than the Union option.

Bartholomew: And my other question was is there any ways like to kind of do a blending of you know where, where you could use either like McDowell or Bowman to cross over, were those kind of looked at too?

Wray: We did not look at that because the issues along the University Corridor are, are heavily centered along this area so in order to get to utilize University to get to Bowman it, it, it's dealing with, with many of the issues already. The, the biggest advantage that would have would be to avoid the, the, the crossing of Main Street which it could be an advantage to that but under the circumstances we, we just looked at it from that prospect. I suppose the, the TAC could offer an amended proposal um if they wished.

Bartholomew: I was just thinking if, I, I was thinking blended like if there is, it, it's part of the corridor plan already on University that says have been some consideration of this and it sounds like one of the big issues is the crossing at Main and I-10.

Wray: That is an ...

Bartholomew: I-10 in there and if the transition could be like at Bowman or something like that, I was just curious if that was a, and that would, either Bowman or what's the other one that goes in front of Mesilla Park, Linden, is that ...

Lujan: McDowell.

Bartholomew: The, the Mesilla Park, or the Papen Center, that was what I meant.

Lujan: Oh.

Bartholomew: Is that Linden, I think?

Wray: I don't remember.

Lujan: Yes.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Andrew can I ask, which I think I already know the answer to but I want to ask anyway: Is the reason this map is being updated right now with the intention for somebody to apply for TAP funding?

Wray: Yes. That is exactly the intention.

Herrera: Okay. Well if that's the case then there's going to be less issue with going down Union because the right-of-way on University, there's some problems there with a short-term type project. I'm not saying that it can't be done, it's just going to take longer and specifically in the TAP guidelines purchase of right-of-way is not an eligible activity. Also working through the easement process with EBID is going to be a process. There's no telling how long that could take so just to give the Committee the full background, if we're looking for a short-term project that one of the agencies could submit for this funding cycle, we're probably gonna want to pick Union.

Trevino: Mr. Chair. Andrew can you go back to, or forward to where you have the map of Option B that has the Tier 1, Tier, or, or in the ...

Wray: Certainly.

Trevino: Downgraded version.

Wray: There we go.

Trevino: So right there where we cross Main Street it's going to, find myself again, it's going to go from a Tier 1, it's going to be downgraded for a certain distance along that small stretch of right-of-way and then back up to a Tier 1 so it's going to ...

Wray: No. The reason why it is, it, it's designated that way on this current map, that is actually a, a good catch, it is, it, it got confused with the existing line. I believe the existing line overwrote the, the proposed so that, that is a good catch but that is the reason why that happened.

Trevino: So the entire length will be a Tier 1.

Wray: Yes, the, the entire length. Good catch but thank you, we'll need to correct that.

Trevino: And just another comment, and just regards to the, the increase of, of bicycle accidents along Union, it kind of makes no sense. If there is already a problem there, that needs to be addressed.

Wray: There, there are issues along either corridor, whichever one is selected there, there will be issues that will have to be addressed. Neither one is, is free of problems.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Another question, do you have a sense Andrew of who would possibly be sponsoring the project?

Wray: Um, I'm, I'm honestly not sure that I really want to say too much about that at this moment in time for, for various reasons so can I just beg off of that question?

Herrera: Well can I ask the entities then that are on the TAC? Would the Town of Mesilla or the City be interested in sponsoring a TAP project along one of these two alignments?

Lujan: At this time I can't make that decision without taking it to the Board and to the Mayor.

Trevino: Same issue here, with just the little amount of travel that's actually in the city limits it's going to be a discussion for the third floor of the City Hall.

Bartholomew: So before you, right now you would like us to come, recommend either Option A or B to the Policy Committee, is that the, the action you're looking for?

Wray: Yes, that's the action we're looking for but the, an amendment of some sort could also be proposed which we would then obviously forward on to the Policy Committee.

Bartholomew: Is there a will of the Committee? Sound, sounds like from what I'm hearing there's a lot of, it seems to be a, more advantages towards the Option B, correct for, for Union. Although there's some desire, it, it, the, because of it being a part of the corridor and everything along University that sounds like there's a lot more problems along that way as well. Does, is, is there any Committee Member that would like to make a motion that perhaps that we could discuss?

Love: I would like to recommend that we go with Option B.

Bartholomew: Okay. There's been a recommendation for Option B. Is there a second for that?

Herrera: Second.

Bartholomew: There's been a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on that before we would like to vote?

Gregory: So when you talk about the issues on the University Corridor cause I'm kind of on Town of Mesilla side here that it would help solve some issues since we did a study on the University Corridor and have some plans for a nice route through that area, getting these MOUs with, it, is there a lot more of them on, on University than there is Union or ...

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Gregory. With regards to the issue with EBID and the MOUs, Union is actually the only one of the two that might potentially have an issue because the existing Laguna Lateral on the north side, which is the side that the trail currently exists on, the trail stops some, some yards short of where the lateral picks up currently. Along University, um the proposals that were entertained at the time of the, of the study um might, well actually they might and still fall into difficulties because there is the trail, the, the, the EBID facility on the south side. However there is possibility of having the facility on the north side of, of, of University so I guess I, I want to walk back from my earlier statement there's, there's no possibility. There is possibility on the University side but there's, there is the option for it, it to be avoided completely depending on which side of the road might or might not be chosen on down the road. So I guess a non-answer is the best answer I can give you.

Gregory: All right. All right. Thanks.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Bartholomew: Yes.

Herrera: If I could just add a little bit to that, so the study that was completed on University was only a Phase A. We at this time don't have funding for the Phase B to move that study forward and narrow down the options to pick a preferred alignment. There are some right-of-way issues. There's also going to be very extensive public involvement because one of the proposals, I think the one that the BPAC liked most and possibly this Committee too I think chose the same one, had a trail going along the EBID ditch if it was piped. But there could be issues with that as far as homeowners because then you would have people on the ditch being able to look right into the back yards there so those are all possibilities. Of course until we get further into the study phases we won't really know what those are. I guess my suggestion was just more of a, if we're looking for a short-term project that can be implemented with this funding cycle, that one might be a little more difficult than the other one. That's not to say that NMDOT doesn't plan on looking for funding to further the University study in the future.

Wray: Mr. Chair. I, I do want to say and I apologize for not saying this sooner. What we are doing today and any, and any construction that may happen in the future in no way excludes any future construction of any facilities that may happen along any of these corridors at any time in the future. We're just trying to get an alignment picked for this purpose for the TAP cycle since it, it does dovetail very nicely with the completion of La Llorona and the impending construction that's going to happen at the University interchange within the next couple of years. That project is, is already programmed in the TIP.

Bartholomew: Okay. That was actually what, going to be my next question is whether it's you know if, if Option B was, it was the selection this Committee made it doesn't preclude ...

Wray: No.

Bartholomew: The possibility that, of still developing out facilities on University in the future.

Wray: No, not in any way.

Bartholomew: Oh, okay. Oh, yes.

Trevino: I just have a question. This is, these alignments were set before I was part of the, the TAC Committee, but was the possibility of combining these

two alignments in, like how you brought up around Bowman or, or along 478 from the intersection of University that heads south down Main Street to get to, to Union to avoid that whole intersection with the freeway there and then combine it all so we can accommodate the City, the Town of Mesilla as requested to be near the core but still avoid the whole crossing of the interstate and that area right there.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Trevino. Staff, we, we, we had a little bit of I guess blinders on, on our thinking because of the University Corridor, we had analyzed it as an entire length of the corridor and so we approached it as, as, as a corridor. As I said if the TAC wishes to, to amend, to offer an amended option we will certainly advance that to the Policy Committee for their consideration. But the reason why is a lot of the right-of-way issues we would already have to have coped with in order to get it to the point of connecting with Bowman to go down to Union so that in and of itself was a bit of a disadvantage to, to that approach. But it does avoid, it does avoid dealing with Main Street and the interchange.

Trevino: Thank you.

Bartholomew: But from what I'm hearing it sounds like with Option B if, if there's an entity that wants to develop this out a bit more that's going to be probably the more expeditious or least obstacles to, to, to surmount to, to develop that one out first. Is, is that what I was hearing, that, from Jolene? Yeah.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I think so. It also seems to me like the data, I know that you know it's kind of theoretical right now but ...

Wray: Use with caution.

Herrera: Right. But it does show that more people are using Union. I don't know if it's one of those things where if you build it they will ride there but for right now having the data that we do, I think Union makes more sense.

Bartholomew: I, I think I would favor Option B but I, I don't know whether we'd want to word it in the, in the motion but I, I would want us to you know always keep in mind that the other options along University and perhaps transitioning across to one of the other streets such as Bowman wouldn't be precluded in the future.

Wray: No, certainly not.

Bartholomew: Okay. Is there any further discussion, if there, we, I can call for a vote on the, on the motion at this time, I'll, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor of the motion to ...

Wray: Mr. Chair. Should we do a roll call just since there does seem to be some question?

Bartholomew: Okay. I, I would be happy to do that. I'll do a roll call starting on my far right.

Sambrano: Vote for Option B.

Love: Option B.

Wallace: Option B.

Lujan: Option A, or oppose I guess.

Bartholomew: Option B.

Trevino: Option B.

Herrera: Option B.

Gregory: Option A.

Bartholomew: Thank you everyone.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. The motion does pass.

Bartholomew: Thank you everyone.

## 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### 6.1 Committee Training - Committee Responsibilities

Bartholomew: The next item is a Discussion Item on Committee Training and Committee Responsibilities.

MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Bartholomew: Any questions from the Committee? Thank you.

McAdams: You're welcome. Thank you too.

## 7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

### 7.1 City of Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, SCRTD Project Updates

Bartholomew: Okay. The next item is Committee and Staff Comments and the first would be the various Members of the Committee, any comments. I guess I'll start with the, the City of Las Cruces.

Trevino: As shown here LC00130 which is the El, the El Paseo Safety Project. It's currently under construction and is on schedule. The Las Cruces Dam Trails, LC00190, the contract time has started and construction it, has commenced so hopefully by next month we'll have some more updates on those. Thanks.

Bartholomew: How about Dona Ana County.

Sambrano: Current projects G100030, reconstruction of Dripping Springs is currently on time and should be done according to, in June 2016. The design and construction for the intersection for realignment for El Camino Real and Dona Ana School is, it's still being reviewed by NMDOT General Office. That's all we have.

Bartholomew: Thank you. Any comments from Town of Mesilla? No. Las Cruces, Las Cruces Public Schools.

Gregory: The Safe Routes to School Program is still walking and rolling I, I guess you could say. During the month of April we continued the bicycle and pedestrian safety curriculum in, in the elementary schools. We've implemented walking school buses and bike trains at 19 elementary schools. Our Safe Routes to School Coordinator funded by the grant funds went to the National Safe Routes to School Conference in Columbus, Ohio and gave a presentation, also gave a presentation at the New Mexico Bike Summit. We had a big event at Young Park at the end of April. We, we had a bike, bike fiesta. We partnered with the Junior League and several other entities, City of Las Cruces, to do a bike rodeo, help about bike safety and, and how to, healthy and be fit at that event. And there was something else but I think that's good enough. Can't remember if there was something else.

Bartholomew: Thank you. I guess I'm up next. It's pretty much as it was presented in the, in the documents you have here but uh we are moving forward in implementing our new service routes. We're hoping to implement them in, in July. There's a lot of steps in place to, to move bus stops, print new schedules, get our CAD-AVL service upgraded, there's a lot of steps that we're going to have to take and we're, we're, we're excited about the

change but then we're, we're daunted by the amount of work it's going to take, the change as well. We are having a fare-free week the week of May 16th. We're having a somewhat belated 30th birthday in that RoadRUNNER Transit began service 30 years ago on April 21st and on the Monday, on the, the 16th we're, we're going to from 11 to 2 in our Intermodal Center there's going to be cake and water and, and displays of the new routes that we'll be having in July. So you're all welcome, excuse me, to attend that. The, the City is also putting in a, a, a grant funding request for Section 5339 funds to replace three buses and then expand two buses. The two expansion buses would be used as part of our short-range transit plan in the, one, some of the upcoming phases involved in adding new routes so those additional buses would help with adding those new routes. So if there's no other questions for me I'll move on to, I guess I can, don't have to move on cause SCRTD isn't here right now.

Wray: No.

**7.2 NMDOT Projects Update**

Bartholomew: Next is the NMDOT Project Update.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I'll be doing those. I apologize for not getting something in writing in time for the meeting packet but I'll go over the list that the MPO staff sent to us.

The West Mesa Road study is in Phase B. We're moving forward with that now. We just got the notice to proceed last month, late last month so we're just at the very beginning stages of that. The consultant will be doing a presentation to the Policy Committee next week so if you're all interested in that project the meeting's here at one p.m. next Wednesday.

The Spitz/Solano/US-70 intersection project is being designed right now. We're, we had to add a retaining wall to hold up that old retaining wall that's there which sounds crazy but we had to do it so we're in design of that right now. We're looking to let that project in October of this year.

The Safety Project on US-70 through San Augustin Pass, the contract is at the General Office right now for processing so we should hopefully have a kickoff meeting on that one in the next month or so.

The University Interchange, the contract for that one is also at the General Office for processing. We should hopefully be getting underway on that one here in the next couple of months.

And then the Capacity and Safety Study on US-70 from Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses to the I-25 interchange is at the General Office being processed so again we should be starting that one here in the next month or so. So that's what we have in development now.

What we have under construction, the Missouri Project is moving right along. We were supposed to be done by the end of April. That's

been extended a couple of weeks but they're, they're almost done. They're just doing some finishing touches on that. We've got a couple of lanes of traffic open in both directions so, but still there's workers out there so slow down and be, be careful when you're on the road.

The Union/Ramp E Bridge Project is almost completed. We should be done hopefully by the end of May. It might be you know some little punch list items through the end of June so we'll probably have traffic control out there through the end of June.

The I-10 Paving Project from the I-10/I-25 interchange to the Texas state line, they're working at night so they start at six p.m. every day and then they end at six a.m. so here it says right now they're doing the eastbound center lane. They're expected to turn around and come back actually starting this Monday so we're moving right along on that one. We should be done here in the next, well probably by the end of summer with all of that and then we'll come back and do a final coat on all of I-10 from Jackrabbit to the Texas state line and we'll be hopefully done with I-10 through the city for a while. And that's all I have unless there are any questions.

Bartholomew: And, and is the project that's going to be Valley Road at, I, Avenida, is that a joint City and NMDOT one or how's it?

Herrera: I forgot about that project. That one is an NMDOT project. Right now we're in negotiations with the City to do a road transfer agreement, though. We're talking with the Public Works Director on that. We are, one of the TIP amendments that was approved today at the meeting and will go to the Policy Committee next week was to add $3 million. That was to add some of the elements from the Amador Proximo that the City requested. And I don't really know the specifics on that yet, that's still kind of being worked out but it's definitely a, a DOT lead project.

Bartholomew: Okay, yeah. I was wondering it's, as, as a transit operator here when we're going to start having to deal with that and how long out, how far out that might be.

Herrera: So we're looking at a, a let date of May of 2017 right now.

Bartholomew: For, for letting of the ...

Herrera: For letting, yeah. So construction probably a couple months after that and I imagine it would probably be a somewhat lengthy construction process just because it's going to be a pretty complex project so. But we'll definitely keep you and everyone else informed. We'll have some public meetings and things as we get further along.

Bartholomew: So, so we will, we'll be seeing effects probably summer of 2017.

Herrera: Yes.

Bartholomew: Okay.

### 7.3 MPO Staff Projects Update

Bartholomew: And next is the MPO staff.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. The main thing to update the Committee on is the MPO is moving towards the final stages of an update to the MPO Model. I've been working on that for several months now. We're, I don't know if I would say that the end is in sight but we are, are getting, are getting there. Um, also I believe I announced this last month but I want to emphasize it again. We do have a brand-new website, mesillavalleympo.org. I, I hope everyone has utilized it to get their packets, etc. but we're, we're quite pleased with the website. We have yet to receive a single piece of critical feedback which surprises me. But that's all for MPO.

Bartholomew: I, I did tell Tom yesterday it would be nice to have a direct link to the STIP added to it. Any other?

## 8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bartholomew: Let's see, I guess no, no public to make comments.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT (4:58 p.m.)

Bartholomew: So at this point I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Herrera: So moved.

Gregory: Second.

Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor please say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Hope nobody's opposed. Thank you.

Chairperson