



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mvmppo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **October 21, 2014** at the amended time of **4:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](#).

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. August 19, 2014 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Renewal Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. BPAC Annual Report _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
 - 6.1. Local Projects update _____ **CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff**
 - 6.2. NMDOT Projects update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 6.3. Transportation Plan update _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

NOTE: MEETING TIME HAS CHANGED

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
3

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory
5 Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held
6 August 19, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government
7 Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
10 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT Rep)
11 Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
12 Albert Casillas (Proxy - Dona Ana County Rep)
13 Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)
14 Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)
15 Scott Farnham (City of Las Cruces Rep) - Arrived 5:13
16 David Shearer (NMSU - Envir.Health & Safety) - Arrived 5:22
17 Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla) - Arrived 5:26
18

19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Committee Rep)
20

21 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO)
22 Andrew Wray (MPO)
23 Orlando Fierro (MPO)
24

25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Ben Rawson (DAC Commissioner)
26 Ken Sholar (DAC)
27 Curtis Tarin (DAC)
28 Robert Armijo (DAC)
29 Denise Weston (Bohannon Huston)
30 Andrew Guerra (Bohannon Huston)
31 Helen Zagona (Bike & Chowder)
32 Beth Bardwell
33 Michael Meeker
34 Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
35

36 **1. CALL TO ORDER**
37

38 Meeting called to order at 5:05 p.m.
39

40 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
41

42 Leslie Kryder motioned to approve the agenda.
43 Mark Leisher seconds the motion.
44 All in favor.
45
46

1 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 **3.1 July 15, 2014**

4
5 Herrera: Mr. Chair?

6
7 Pearson: Yes.

8
9 Herrera: I just had a comment. Andrew I noticed that the minutes have a lot of gonna
10 instead of going to, and I don't know if that's something that the BPAC
11 members really care about, but it seems a little informal to me. So.

12
13 Wray: That will ... that can be corrected. Also Mr. Chair, I need to bring to the
14 attention of the Committee on page number 29 of your packet, on line 40
15 during Mr. Farnham's comments, it says the next 30 years that should
16 actually read the next 3 year.

17
18 Pearson: Okay. Any other comments?

19
20 Jolene Herrera motioned to approve the minutes as amended.

21 Leslie Kryder seconds the motion.

22 All in favor- none opposed.

23
24 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

25
26 Sholar: Ken Sholar. I just wanted to float an idea out there for a bicycle trail.

27
28 Pearson: Okay.

29
30 Sholar: And if I could just pass these two copies so you'll have a little bit of reference
31 discussing it you'll have a little bit of a reference. The idea in a nutshell is to
32 embrace the monuments. They're enjoyable. There's quite of a bit of
33 bicycling up to Dripping Springs from the township of Las Cruces. Very few
34 folks though actually know that there's a road called Corralitos, on the
35 Corralitos Ranch, and that it is excellent bicycling. I've seen maybe one or
36 two bicycles out there pretty steady. I do more work at the fairground, just
37 help out there at the fair with facilities and parks.

38
39 Pearson: Closer to the mic please.

40
41 Sholar: So we were looking at maybe making a little bit of a bicycle center where a
42 little bit changing and bathrooms outside the fence at the fairgrounds. People
43 could park their vehicles coming in from a distance, change; enjoy an
44 exploration of the New Mexico desert. It's a different desert than Dripping
45 Springs. Dripping Springs is a short desert run that ends pretty much at ...
46 it's a pretty quick run. Here you see the scope of New Mexico desert.

1 There's a lot of road out there if you get off of my trail. My trail comes up to
2 Broad Canyon where if you jog a short distance up through there or carry
3 your bike, which I found there was some bicyclists that do that, part of their
4 routine, you go through the petroglyphs. And it's a decision if any of that
5 could be improved a little bit for handicap access coming off the bike trail, you
6 know. That's all up for future discussion. But it is a beautiful piece of desert.
7 And it actually comes back out north, a lot of bicyclists would like the fact that
8 they could pick up another road, come all the way out on pavement, come
9 back through traffic. But one of the appeals to that is, in our tourist economy
10 and family bicycling, this is pretty much non-traffic. A few trucks servicing the
11 towers.
12
13 Pearson: I have one question for you. I haven't been out around the Blue Mesa area,
14 but is it paved north of Blue Mesa still?
15
16 Sholar: All the way to that center, where that center high tower is.
17
18 Pearson: To the tower it's paved.
19
20 Sholar: Before it goes to the Uvas.
21
22 Pearson: Right.
23
24 Sholar: Right. And then where Broad Canyon is the diversion off.
25
26 Pearson: Right.
27
28 Sholar: And then as soon as you go through that Broad Canyon you pick up a county
29 rock road on the other side of that, so we measured it by those distances
30
31 Pearson: Okay.
32
33 Sholar: And then an ATV bike it's wide open with another 100 miles of riding out
34 there. There's a lot of road.
35
36 Leisher: Okay
37
38 Sholar: More road than most people have seen. And it's just an idea to ... we're
39 wondering about who can we approach for funding. So we knew this
40 Committee could discuss it and work with Mr. Casillas, and that way we could
41 go a little further. We've got one source of funding identified, but we're really
42 we're looking for more partners to pull this through. Thank you for your time.
43
44 Pearson: Okay.
45
46 Rishel: What is the one source of funding that you have identified thus far?

1
2 Sholar: New Mexico's ... this is where I'd wished I'd had brought my notes. What is
3 that Alternatives ... New Mexico's Transportation Alternatives Grant.
4
5 Pearson: Okay, well there's the Transportation ... the TAP.
6
7 Sholar: Yes.
8
9 Pearson: And there's also the RTP (Recreational Trails Program).
10
11 Sholar: TAP.
12
13 Pearson: Okay. I don't know if TAP would qualify, maybe NMDOT can comment on
14 that.
15
16 Herrera: It might. I think possibly the Rec Trails funding might be more appropriate.
17 We'll have to look into it more, but I do know at this point that no funding has
18 been awarded for this project. It certainly is an opportunity for funding
19 possibly though.
20
21 Sholar: Right. They just ... they put it out for ... looking for early ideas and so I said
22 "well, this could be exactly how we open up one of our largest pieces of
23 recreational area in the county. The Corralitos."
24
25 Rishel: And I must agree sir. It ... we bicycle that area many many times and it is
26 absolutely a beautiful area.
27
28 Sholar: So you're the people out there I'm seeing. I've been out there were I thought
29 I was the in the middle of nowhere and four or five bicycles come through and
30 I'm like okay. But the big problem they said, or one group, they came up to
31 me and they said "My God county thank you. How do we find a road back
32 out". They are all very little signs.
33
34 Pearson: That's true too.
35
36 Sholar: So that's where we thought maybe as we start the project with small steps
37 that could be what we did, was ... and then my colleague that I'm looking for
38 with the most knowledge would be Robert and he's going to help me on this.
39
40 Pearson: Okay.
41
42 Sholar: We're looking at a sort of a multi team county approach on it, and so I'll get a
43 lot of help from planning, Community Development Planning and engineering
44 to try and put it together. Its facilities and parks taking that long view and
45 we've got the nice fairgrounds out there. It's just ... and what people ... what

1 little bit I've found is when people are coming down as recreational riders from
2 other areas they want a safe place to lock up their vehicle.
3
4 Rishel: Okay.
5
6 Kryder: Mr. Chair?
7
8 Pearson: Yes.
9
10 Kryder: May I present a couple of questions. I'm sorry I didn't catch who you work
11 for?
12
13 Sholar: I'm with the County. I helped Armando Cordilla, he is facilities and parks.
14
15 Kryder: Okay.
16
17 Sholar: I'm vector. A background in ecology and mosquito control but he and I were
18 talking about futuring. You know, what's out there that the County needed to
19 embrace from that bigger picture facilities and parks.
20
21 Kryder: Yes, second question. Do you at this time have an idea of what the entire
22 project might cost well rough ballpark?
23
24 Sholar: Given that most of the road is already paved, we were going to sit down,
25 Robert and I and Tom, and a few other people and we were looking for an
26 expert in bicycle trails to come in the field with us and do more measurements
27 then our GIS and start looking at what this is going to cost. But the key thing
28 is the bulk of that road is already established as paved trail.
29
30 Kryder: The other thing you've mentioned very briefly was something about
31 petroglyphs. Does the road pass near or through an area?
32
33 Sholar: Oh, when you come through Broad Canyon you're in a beautiful stand of well-
34 established petroglyphs. That are not ... no damage at all. The natives of the
35 local Las Cruces have always taken care of this group of petroglyphs and
36 they're in excellent shape, and then if you do any more exploring it's hard to
37 walk around Uvas and not find a carved wall. There's a lot of carved wall out
38 there. It's not going to match maybe New Mexico's Three Rivers display, but
39 it is unique to its culture. It's the Man Cap, the human figure jaguar, the
40 Shaman image.
41
42 Kryder: Yeah.
43
44 Sholar: You see him as the tribal Shaman's mark on a rock that will have no other
45 carving on it and then you'll go to the hunter's rock with multiple carvings,
46 very interesting.

1
2 Kryder: I guess just an initial concern that I have, would be that if ... it might be a
3 good idea to go around that area because if we have a lot of traffic through
4 that area, there might be a tendency to deface the petroglyphs.
5
6 Sholar: That's where the BLM and I are just in the early stages of this idea and we
7 decided though that to a certain point, hopefully that we would not increase
8 any vandalism. To date, it's been a very well preserved site but it is very
9 accessible. I mean it was originally, when you came in from the Radium
10 Springs area, this was a road that you hauled mineral to the rail. The original
11 leg line and the local folks have recreationally gone back there for years and it
12 just hasn't been damaged.
13
14 Kryder: Yeah, it's just the concern that if it becomes known as a cycling trail and
15 suddenly you have five times as many people using it, that you might have
16 more folks who are less careful of those things.
17
18 Sholar: Right, but when you look at the amount of carved out, out there in that area,
19 it's under appreciated. Very few people have visited these panels.
20
21 Pearson: Okay. Does MPO staff have one of these or can we share this with the staff?
22
23 Sholar: Oh, if you need additional copies and can make a request throughout, we will
24 be glad to send you the email version, the large link and such and we'd love if
25 there were people with interest in trying to help and steer us on this, we would
26 love for just a follow up meeting.
27
28 Pearson: Because I wonder how much of this is within the MPO itself. Whether this
29 should be part of our MPO trails system or not and ...
30
31 Wray: Mr. Chair, I haven't seen the map; I don't know anything about this so I can't
32 give an opinion.
33
34 Herrera: Mr. Chair?
35
36 Pearson: Yes.
37
38 Herrera: I think even if it is slightly outside the MPO boundaries the fact that the riders
39 will most likely be from Las Cruces, I think makes a good push for putting it on
40 the trails map anyway. If MPO staff feels that it's appropriate.
41
42 Pearson: Okay, well thank you for your input and we would like to ask staff to maybe
43 look at adding this to our MPO trail maps at the minimum. Okay, any other,
44 anybody else for public comments on the first go round?
45
46

1 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

2
3 **5.1 Amendments to the 2014-20-19 TIP**

4
5 Andrew Wray gave a brief explanation/presentation.

6
7 Herrera: Yes Mr. Chair. I'm not sure what needs to happen right now, if we need to
8 make a motion first or what, but I need to make a floor amendment to one of
9 the projects. It's a minor change. It's on the first project on that spreadsheet
10 1100830.

11
12 Pearson: So what will we be actually approving ... working from to approve? Page 39
13 or page 37-38?

14
15 Herrera: They should contain the same information. I did find one typo on page 37
16 that is different from page 39 and it's the second project, LC00150. The fiscal
17 year listed on page 37 is 2016 and it should actually be 2015.

18
19 Wray: Mr. Chair. For the record the document actually being voted on is the one on
20 page 39.

21
22 Pearson: Okay.

23
24 Herrera: Okay.

25
26 Pearson: Okay, so for the Committee's reference on the second line item LC00150
27 should be 2015.

28
29 Herrera: Yes sir.

30
31 Pearson: But we won't need amendments since it is correct in the spreadsheet which
32 we'll actually be sending to the Policy Committee.

33
34 Leisher: Actually, Mr. Chair, it says 2016 in the page 39 as well.

35
36 Herrera: The amendment is actually all the way on the very right side of those
37 spreadsheets under the change column. I probably should have made that
38 more clear. What I was trying to show is what it currently is in the TIP, on
39 kind of the left side and then what it's changing to over towards the right. And
40 I guess the change that I need to make here now at this meeting is 1100830
41 the termini; the beginning milepost will now be 140.5 instead of milepost 141.
42 That is to accommodate the acceleration lane extensions.

43
44 Pearson: Can you repeat please?

45
46 Herrera: Yes; 1100830, the new beginning milepost will be 140.5 instead of 141.

1
2 Leisher: Just out of curiosity, what ... where are the CCTV units being installed?
3
4 Herrera: I have no idea. I'm sorry. I haven't seen the ITS plans yet. I imagine they'll
5 be on the light poles somewhere, but I'm just not sure exactly where. I can
6 get that information for you soon though.
7
8 Leisher: I'm just curios.
9
10 Pearson: Can you give us a little more than the milepost as far as ... is this by US 70 or
11 is this by I-25?
12
13 Herrera: No, these ... these are the bridges on I-10 that are by Union and the ramp E
14 part of University.
15
16 Pearson: Okay.
17
18 Herrera: So, they're the last bridges on our I-10 stretch through Las Cruces and we will
19 be done with bridges in Las Cruces for a while.
20
21 Pearson: Okay, that's for the bridge rehab and then the CCTV, does that cover the
22 same area?
23
24 Herrera: Yes. It's just part of the project.
25
26 Pearson: Okay, I guess I'm still confused on the spreadsheet. Is it ... it moves to fiscal
27 year 2015, but then it says 2016 here.
28
29 Herrera: Right that's the currently program, it's the year that it's currently programmed
30 in the TIP in.
31
32 Pearson: So as long as you're happy with those changes I guess we will be happy.
33
34 Herrera: As long as this Committee is happy with us moving that project to 2015 then I
35 think we're okay.
36
37 Pearson: Okay and then can we have some more discussion information about the new
38 projects on US 70?
39
40 Herrera: Certainly. As Andrew stated, this project was awarded through the Highway
41 Safety Improvement Program as a result of the road safety audit that was
42 done last year. We were able to secure a \$4.36M for that project and
43 basically the scope will be to widen the shoulders. We're trying to make a
44 minimum 10-foot shoulder, but in areas where we can't, it'll be at least five-
45 feet of rideable surface.
46

1 Pearson: Okay, because one of the things during the last resurfacing, reconstruction
2 project, rehabilitation project, whatever it was for US 70, in front of the
3 guardrails, I haven't been up there, but I have heard that we have got the
4 rumble strips were added in front of the guardrails when they weren't
5 supposed to be added, so will this remove those rumble strips?
6

7 Herrera: Yes. they will
8

9 Pearson: Accommodate those changes, okay.
10

11 Herrera: So I guess the bottom line is it seems like a really kind of broad scope, but it's
12 everything that we need to do to make the shoulders wider, which will be
13 moving the concrete wall barrier back, extending drainage structures, all of
14 those things that need to happen in order to make wider shoulders with the
15 goal being that we have at least five-foot of rideable surface, that's without
16 any bumps or rumbles strips or anything.
17

18 Pearson: Okay, any other discussion among us? I guess we should also have noted
19 that Scott Farnham joined us during public input. Oh and David Shearer is
20 also here, slipped in on me, and Ashleigh Curry is entering the meeting now.
21 Any further discussion on this item? Motion to approve the TIP as amended.
22

23 Leisher motions to approve the TIP as amended.

24 Rishel seconds the motion.

25 All in favor.
26

27 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

28 **6.1 Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Renewal Discussion**

29 Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.
30

31 Pearson: So maybe we will have a name of a person assigned this task by the October
32 meeting?
33

34 Wray: I can try and get that done and extend an invitation if the Committee would
35 like to speak to them.
36

37 Pearson: Okay, because yeah I think ...
38

39 Wray: Okay.
40

41 Pearson: We would love to ... we would probably ... certain Committee members at
42 least would probably able to assist with that process, because it's a fairly long
43 and detailed application. But it's good to know that the City is stepping up.
44 Any other comments? Questions?
45
46

1
2 Kryder: Do we need to take any kind of action to invite this person to attend our
3 October meeting?
4
5 Pearson: No.
6
7 Leisher: Out of curiosity, was this done from internal pressure, external pressure, or
8 just in the course of business?
9
10 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Leisher. I'm not going to answer that.

11 **6.2 Soledad Canyon Project Presentation**

12
13
14 Pearson: Let's go onto the next item then which is 6.2 Soledad Canyon project
15 presentation.

16
17 Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.

18
19 Pearson: Okay.

20
21 Armijo: Good morning Mr. Chair, Commissioner, members. My name is again is
22 Robert Armijo.

23
24 Pearson: It's been a long day for you.

25
26 Armijo: Yes, it has. My name is Robert Armijo; I'm the County Engineer for Dona Ana
27 County. With me is Curtis Tarin, Engineering, and also Denise Weston with
28 Bohannon-Huston, and Andrew Guerra with Bohannon-Huston, they're
29 assisting us with this project.

30
31 Robert Armijo gave a presentation.

32
33 Pearson: Okay I guess ... I was at that meeting where the different cross sections were
34 presented and from what I recall there were several options that put the
35 bicycle lanes in the main roadway.

36
37 Armijo: Right.

38
39 Pearson: And I don't think this idea was even one of those options were the bicycles
40 were on a separate path or it's a separate path. I wonder if you can go into
41 why the separate path was chosen and why there wouldn't be, I guess why
42 the separation? How you would separate from the roadway, or what
43 separation on the one with ... that seems to be level, and if you could say
44 whether you're going to have, which side of the road, north side or the south
45 side, you would have the multi-use path versus the cycle path?
46

1 Armijo: Sure, well the ... these two again as I mentioned that came from this
2 comment matrix. You know they took all these comments and tried to do a
3 best fit to get a couple of options that were viable that would kind of suffice for
4 all the residents. You're never going to satisfy everybody and everybody is
5 going to have a different idea about what they want. So we looked at it and
6 we decided well these are probably the two best ideas that we came up with.
7 We don't want to go ... so we're going to a second meeting here ... excuse
8 me ... so end of September, beginning of October. So we will go back and
9 present them with a couple of options and say "look can you know, this is
10 what we've come up with can you know pick one of these two." And this ...
11 and I don't think it really matter which side at this point the bicyclist or the
12 pedestrians are on, you know that can be, at this point we're just in
13 conceptual stage so that can be changed.
14

15 Leisher: I think from my perspective as a cyclist who rides ... we're talking Soledad
16 Canyon Road and Baylor Canyon Road correct?
17

18 Armijo: Soledad Canyon Road, yes sir, specifically.
19

20 Leisher: So the cross section is going to be the same on both? Soledad specifically?
21

22 Armijo: Yes sir.
23

24 Leisher: Okay, in-road facilities would probably be a little more affective, that way
25 you're not turning across traffic if you've got a separate cycle track going on.
26

27 Armijo: Right
28

29 Pearson: How many intersections are involved in this roadway? A lot.
30

31 Armijo: There are dozens; yeah there are a lot of intersections. The idea was to
32 separate it again from the comments, a lot of people wanted to separate the
33 bicyclists from the pedestrian because you know going up and down ... well
34 going down Soledad Canyon Road you're going to get some high speed
35 going so the wanted to avoid that conflict with the pedestrians.
36

37 Leisher: Well, if there're in-road facilities that will keep them off the multi-use path.
38

39 Armijo: Sure.
40

41 Leisher: The multi-use path is there.
42

43 Armijo: So are you looking at the second option or where you considering something
44 more like four-feet on each side of the ...
45

46 Leisher: It would be the second option just laid out slightly differently.

1
2 Armijo: Okay.
3
4 Pearson: Well in-road facilities of the bicycle lanes on ... in place of shoulders on both
5 sides, so not ... neither of these. It would be the third option which would
6 have a bicycle lane in place of a shoulder.
7
8 Armijo: Okay.
9
10 Pearson: And I think that would, that's going to do two things; it's going to be much
11 safer because ... especially on the downhill side you're going to get bicyclists
12 going 40, 50, not 50, but 30 to 40 miles an hour.
13
14 Armijo: Right.
15
16 Pearson: You're not going to have ... those bicyclists are not going to be able to stop at
17 intersections to deal with cars that are going to be stopped across the bicycle
18 trail.
19
20 Armijo: Right.
21
22 Pearson: Or bicycle path, whatever that is. I think I'm on the down ... we at least need
23 a downhill option for in-road bicycle facility.
24
25 Armijo: So Mr. Chair are you talking again specifically about two different lanes on
26 each side?
27
28 Pearson: Correct.
29
30 Armijo: Okay.
31
32 Pearson: I so. I think five-foot you know AASHTO compliant, five-foot bicycle lanes,
33 which would take up, you know take away the separate cycle path that you
34 have here; would go into the main line of the road and I would suggest that
35 the multi-use path be on the south side of the road, so that bicyclists that are
36 not comfortable going up that hill can actually get off, dismount and use the
37 multi-use path instead.
38
39 Armijo: That makes sense.
40
41 Curry: And I'd just like to second or third what Mark Leisher and George Pearson
42 have said in agreement with in-lane ... in-road bike lanes going up and the
43 multi-use path being on the south side.
44
45 Armijo: Okay that makes a lot of sense, and what we'll be doing again and I
46 encourage you to attend this public meeting to give your input and kind of

1 give your advice, and you all are involved in this on a regular basis so maybe
2 you know maybe even have ... Mr. Chair you could attend it and explain the
3 logic, the reasoning for doing that. It makes perfect sense to me; again we're
4 never going to satisfy everybody. There are a lot of different ideas and some
5 are pretty ... some people were pretty strong about them, but makes perfect
6 sense to me, so that's possibly a third option that we can present at that
7 meeting.
8

9 Kryder: Yeah, because I think the safety issue is going to be foremost at
10 intersections. In the City of Las Cruces we passed an ordinance that
11 bicyclists that choose to use the sidewalk, which also applies to multi-use
12 path, need to dismount at the intersections, cross as pedestrians.
13

14 Armijo: Right.

15
16 Kryder: And that's just not going to be practical going 40 miles an hour down the
17 roadway.
18

19 Armijo: Sure.
20

21 Kryder: Mr. Chair? One thing I do like about option one is that the cyclists' lane is
22 raised a little bit above the main traffic lane and I'm wondering, I'd like to hear
23 other members' opinions on this, but if we go to a cycling lane on either side,
24 could it be raised a few inches above the main traffic path? I think there's a
25 tendency for cars to not swerve over into the lane when it's like that.
26

27 Pearson: I would imagine it's a safety issue. If it's there instead of a shoulder, you
28 couldn't raise it. Correct?
29

30 Armijo: Right. You could put them outside of the curb and gutters, so it would be
31 raised in on either side, but then you're getting outside of the traveled way, so
32 you would have those conflicts with the intersections. And plus the bicyclists
33 would be closer to the pedestrians unless there was some physical boundary
34 or some space put in there. So, it can be done but it kind of ... then you're
35 heading back to something like one, you know it's not that much of a
36 difference between the two, other than the safety of separating the bicyclists,
37 but then you're putting the ... possibly the pedestrians in conflict with the
38 bicyclists.
39

40 Pearson: I think this is a probably rural enough of an area that you don't want the
41 separated cycle track. Things that are like in New York City, Washington DC,
42 where even at the control signals they've got separate signalization for
43 bicycles.
44

45 Armijo: Sure.
46

1 Pearson: I think if we had a ... we might look at doing lane striping if you have some
2 extra separation. If you have enough room to do, you know a seven-foot area
3 for the shoulder and bicycle lanes, you might be able to put in a two-foot
4 buffer area between the travel lanes. So you might have an 11-foot travel
5 lane, two-foot buffer, and four-foot/five-foot bicycle lane.
6

7 Armijo: Alright.
8

9 Pearson: But it probably would need to be at the same level, because it's also a safety
10 issue for travelers. If there's a break down for traffic, you know room for ... to
11 use a shoulder as a shoulder, which is going to be an impediment, if it's an
12 emergency situation for that car then, so bicycles would have to deal with that
13 as they come across it.
14

15 Armijo: Sure.
16

17 Rishel: I have a question. I understand, I think I understand looking at the proposed
18 different types of facilities, that coming from pedestrians who use you know at
19 least the final portion where you climb the hill, you know many run or walk
20 frequently and it becomes very difficult because the shoulder is so thin and
21 then you know you've got cars as well and so I understand separating the
22 bicycles from the pedestrians. I wonder if, and I know this does not go along
23 with AASHTO guidelines; however, for the final portion of the hill climb, which
24 is a dead-end at the very end and actually on the right hand side of the road
25 does not have any intersections that impact other than dirt roads, isn't that
26 correct?
27

28 Armijo: The south side?
29

30 Rishel: So the final hill climb ... correct on the south side. And so I'm wondering if
31 perhaps something that put bicyclists on one side and pedestrians on the
32 other side and did not go along with AASHTO guidelines, you know and then
33 the rest of it go along with in-road bicycle facilities which is what we always
34 advocate for. If that, you know something creative like that might be better in
35 the long run, because how many times have pedestrians who have been
36 walking or even running the later part of the hill where people are on their
37 bikes 40 to 50 miles an hour coming down the hill, you know that there's
38 impact and potential impact and safety issues.
39

40 Armijo: There are homes up there and there are ... yeah there are driveways that
41 actually intersect even up at the top, close to the top, so, but that's definitely
42 an option that we can take a look at.
43

44 Rishel: Right, I guess I was thinking more of roads than driveways, but yes there are
45 driveways.
46

1 Pearson: The other thing that bothers me about the separate cycle track is in practice
2 are you going to actually be able to separate the pedestrians, the strollers, the
3 people with dogs on leashes and keep them off the cycle track, because
4 there's just going to be some signage and I think if somebody that lives on the
5 cycle track side of the road wants to walk their dog, they're going to use the
6 cycle track and they're going to be in competition with bicyclists that aren't
7 going to be expecting them then because they figure they're the cyclists.
8
9 Armijo: Sure.
10
11 Pearson: So ...
12
13 Leisher: Do we have an idea of what kind of right of way is available? I mean we
14 know at least 22, because of traffic lanes.
15
16 Armijo: Yeah, we'd more than likely have to be ... go after additional right-of-way
17 through that area, but I believe we have 60 feet through there.
18
19 Leisher: Sixty.
20
21 Armijo: We haven't finished the survey through there. We just recently lost our
22 surveyor so, but we're ...
23
24 Leisher: Yeah because I was thinking maybe ... maybe even separate the multi-use
25 trail into two; make them unidirectional; one on each side of the road on the
26 outside of the roadway with the cycling in it.
27
28 Armijo: So just to clarify, you would have the two lanes within the roadway.
29
30 Leisher: For cycling.
31
32 Armijo: For the bicyclists, and then you'd have again the ...
33
34 Leisher: Instead of sidewalks, the multi-use path.
35
36 Armijo: Multi-use path ... yeah
37
38 Leisher: Bigger sidewalks or maybe even a dirt or graveled, crusher fine path running
39 up and down the sides.
40
41 Armijo: Sure. Great idea.
42
43 Herrera: Mr. Chair?
44
45 Pearson: Go ahead.
46

1 Herrera: Can I ask, what's the speed limit for vehicles on that part of the road?
2
3 Armijo: Forty-five.
4
5 Herrera: Forty-five, okay.
6
7 Pearson: And there was some discussion of you doing some traffic counts, bicycle
8 counts? Has that happened? Will that happen?
9
10 Armijo: Yes, the MPO actually went out and did some pedestrian and bicycle counts,
11 but I understand they can be redone.
12
13 Wray: Mr. Chair, yes, there were some counts that were done. Those were partially
14 done to test out the equipment they had. That was only the second time that
15 camera had actually been used for any kind of a count and it was the first
16 time it had ever been used with an intent to try to count bicycles, so the main
17 intent was as a test. The second part of it is; I understand there is some
18 construction going on in that roadway right now that sort of contaminates the
19 sample, so it's my understanding that the count will be redone when the more
20 normal traffic flow has been restored.
21
22 Pearson: Was there any kind of preliminary that there are more than, more cyclists then
23 might be, did you do a weekend or?
24
25 Wray: I would actually have to differ to Mr. Fierro on that one. I did not examine the
26 results. I have no idea as to their contents.
27
28 Fierro: Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. My name is Orlando I'm with the
29 MPO. There were just some preliminary data just like Andrew said, very
30 minimal counts on bicyclists and joggers and walkers, nothing that's realistic
31 that we want to use right now. So when we do a second study out there we
32 will go ahead and take a more of an accurate count.
33
34 Pearson: Okay, so still testing the equipment.
35
36 Fierro: It doesn't depict what actually goes on out there, so, and; of course, the
37 weather was also a factor. It was raining and other factors in there.
38
39 Curry: Mr. Chair. I have one more comment. Just wanted to see if there's been
40 some consideration taken into the erosion and the washes. I know as a
41 cyclist it's one of our main concerns riding especially down Soledad; is with
42 the rain there ends up being a lot of dirt and debris on the road that makes it
43 really unsafe. So I'm assuming that into this whole process the erosion factor
44 with be taken into consideration.
45

1 Pearson: Just as a follow up, I think ... when I was at that meeting I think the thing that
2 really struck me is the first thing that needs to be solved is drainage issues for
3 that roadway, and then after that comes everything else.
4

5 Armijo: Right, Mr. Chair. Yes ma'am, so we are looking at the drainage issues, so a
6 great separation between the water and the traffic. So we will be looking at
7 those issues also.
8

9 Herrera: And, Mr. Chair, that's one thing that I was going to bring up with option
10 number two where you have the cycle track on the same elevation as the
11 traffic is it seems like that might collect debris maybe, and if it's not swept ... I
12 don't know maybe something to consider when you're going really fast on a
13 bike and you hit a rock it's kind of a big deal so.
14

15 Kryder: Mr. Chair?

16

17 Pearson: Yes.

18

19 Kryder: I'm still pondering this question of giving the bicyclists a little bit more
20 definition of their area, and I wonder if it's ever been tried or if anyone has an
21 opinion about maybe putting instead of a curb which I understand in cases of
22 emergency is difficult for the cars, something more along the lines of a speed
23 bump; something that raises or that just clearly defines the two separate area;
24 the travel lane for the cars and the travel lane for the bicycles. So it would be
25 like a speed bump that runs parallel to the direction of travel.
26

27 Pearson: Right, I would think those ideas I have seen comments about in separated
28 cycle tracks in more organized areas. The NACTO guidelines I think FHWA I
29 think is like ... I've seen something in comment where they are willing to
30 accept NACTO designs, so I wonder if in addition to AASHTO if the NACTO
31 guidelines could be looked at for ideas for this.
32

33 Armijo: Sure. Sure.

34

35 Leisher: Yeah, maybe something as simple as rumble strips or raised dot things, I
36 don't know the technical term
37

38 Armijo: So again, so to clarify that as you're talking about, you'd have the curb and
39 gutter, you have pedestrians on both sides and then you would have the
40 bicycle lanes which are on grade with the vehicles, but you'd have again
41 some sort of curbing or rumble strips or some sort of separation.
42

43 Kryder: Something, yeah, to make it really clear to the cars where their area ends.
44

45 Armijo: Right.
46

1 Herrera: Mr. Chair, the only thing I kind of worry about putting some sort of speed
2 bump to separate the vehicles from cyclists is that you're creating an unsafe
3 condition for the vehicles now at this point, if something should happen, if I
4 don't know, I mean that really has to be kind of weighed and I know that the
5 engineering staff will be looking into all of that stuff.
6

7 Armijo: Yeah, we can take a look at that, we'd definitely look at again driveways,
8 intersections and you know the (*inaudible*) spacing.
9

10 Pearson: That's a question for an engineer; where the NACTO looks at urbanized
11 areas, maybe speed limits of 25 would be appropriate for this. We got a 45
12 speed limit with downhill. If a cyclists need to move into the roadway itself,
13 that could cause a hazard for the bicyclists also.
14

15 Armijo: Sure.
16

17 Pearson: So maybe lane lines would be sufficient, maybe if we get two feet, because
18 what will happen if you've been on the shoulders, any debris that's in the
19 roadway gets swept towards the shoulder, and I don't know if having the two-
20 foot buffer would be enough to keep that from going all the way into the
21 bicycle area or not.
22

23 Armijo: Sure. And let me just clarify again, this is a corridor study, so at the very
24 beginning of this project you know there's a ... we're talking about millions of
25 dollars you know to full build out, so this is going to be a phased project, that
26 you know we may build the road first, and then do the multi-use path later,
27 you know, so we haven't even gotten that far yet. So this is very preliminary.
28 We'll be back in front of you in the future to take a look at the designs and the
29 ...
30

31 Pearson: Yeah, so it's important if we decide we need the bicycles as part of the
32 roadway then the length ... the curb and gutter needs to be put at some point
33 that accommodates that so.
34

35 Armijo: Sure. Sure.
36

37 Herrera: Mr. Chair.
38

39 Pearson: Yes.
40

41 Herrera: Can I ask another question and maybe I missed it, you probably already said
42 it but where did the funding come from? It came from the Legislature right?
43

44 Armijo: Yes.
45

46 Herrera: And how much money was the County given?

1
2 Armijo: So there were, don't quote me exactly, but it was close to \$300,000 for Baylor
3 Canyon Road and Soledad Canyon Road. So we took about \$100,000, mas
4 or menos, to do the corridor study for Soledad Canyon Road, including some
5 other things, but I think it's more like \$70,000 somewhere in there.
6
7 Herrera: Okay, thank you.
8
9 Pearson: So how does the central highway department, I forget their exact name that
10 project come in? Do you know about that Baylor Canyon Road I guess it is
11 and what the central ...
12
13 Herrera: Central Federal Lands.
14
15 Pearson: Central Federal Lands project that's ...
16
17 Armijo: Right, that's a FHWA project. We have close to nine million dollars and
18 FHWA actually they're the ones that are spear heading the whole project from
19 beginning, their going to be designing it, they're going to be building it, and
20 you know with our input and assistance, but they're doing the whole thing.
21
22 Pearson: Right but that's ...
23
24 Armijo: But we are pulling ...
25
26 Pearson: Is there some overlap there with the Baylor Canyon portion of that that you
27 mentioned or?
28
29 Armijo: Very little, very little. It won't affect Soledad Canyon much at all. You know
30 there will be the four-foot lanes along there for bicyclists and can be used as
31 a multi-use type path, but there's not going to be a separate path, you know
32 for pedestrians or anything else on that. But the ...
33
34 Pearson: Right, because the Central Federal Lands project came through on the TIP
35 and that's kind of all we know about it.
36
37 Herrera: Right.
38
39 Armijo: Right.
40
41 Pearson: So if there's other, if there's going to be ... do you know if there's going to be
42 public meetings on that? I guess I'm getting off topic a little bit but it's
43 important.
44
45 Armijo: Yes, Mr. Chair. We're looking again in roughly October is when, October
46 21st, 22nd is when they're planning that first meeting, that first public meeting,

1 FHWA with the engineer that's doing the work, so that'll be coming up here
2 pretty soon.
3

4 Pearson: Okay, I guess if you could express our, this Committee's interest in that
5 project, make sure that we're part of that, at least a press release or be
6 stakeholders or whatever.
7

8 Armijo: Sure, we'll go ahead and extend an invite, let you know what's going on there.
9

10 Herrera: And it sounds like there's a little bit of overlap maybe in the funding, because
11 you said that \$300,000 was awarded to the County for Baylor Canyon and
12 Soledad Canyon Roads.
13

14 Armijo: Right, so part of the money's being used as a match for that FHWA project.
15

16 Herrera: Okay.
17

18 Armijo: And the rest of it's being used for the corridor study.
19

20 Herrera: Okay.
21

22 Armijo: And we have additional money from the legislature to ... as a match.
23

24 Herrera: Okay. That makes perfect sense. Thanks
25

26 Pearson: Okay, do we have any other Committee members who have questions?
27 We've got some members of the public here and I think they're probably
28 interested in this so I think I'd ... rather than wait till the end, I'd be interested
29 in hearing any public comments on the project. Just give us your name
30 please.
31

32 Zagona: My name is Helen Zagona. I represent a large bicycle club here locally. We
33 use this road frequently. We sent in written comments and our written
34 comments were not represented in these two options. The written comments
35 that we made were that we felt ... we use this road all time, let me just remind
36 you, this is a straight road going very steeply downhill, and coming off both
37 sides of this road are dirt roads and ... very frequently. So what you have is
38 you have traffic coming into the Soledad Canyon Road and each time cars
39 come in from either side they bring dirt and debris and rocks, okay. Now if
40 you had this type of set up where you have bicycles on one side, cars are
41 going to come and they're going to be at a stop sign, they're going to go all
42 the way across that bicycle lane, and you have bicycles coming down the hill
43 really fast. That's going to be very very dangerous. And they're going to
44 push dirt, rocks, and debris onto that bicycle lane just exactly the way they
45 now push it onto the road, so this is really not a tenable solution here.

1 What we recommended was that there would be wide bicycle lanes on
2 each side of the road and we also recommended ... one of the options that
3 were presented at the meeting that we had out there at the fire station was a
4 turn lane in the middle; so you have a lane of traffic on each side, you have
5 bicycle lanes on the outer sides, and in the middle you have a turn lane,
6 because there are lots and lots of vehicles making turns off Soledad Canyon
7 and actually even coming onto Soledad Canyon. We have people cutting
8 right in front of us all the time going ... while we're coming down the hill going
9 really fast. We recommend a turning lane in the middle, a traffic lane on each
10 side and the bicycle lanes to be right there in the road. That way cars could
11 move around us very easily and there wouldn't be any problem, cause there
12 would be plenty of room. So our suggestions were not really taken in this and
13 we are very emphatic that people who ride bicycles and who know that road
14 well should have a lot of input into this design, and this is not what people
15 who ride bicycles up there all the time would suggest. Thank you
16

17 Pearson: Thank you. Anybody else from the public wish to comment? Okay.

18
19 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I ask one more question? I'm sure you've done traffic counts
20 or the MPO, somebodies done traffic counts out there right? And have you
21 looked at the turning movements there and done kind of analysis of that or
22 will that be part of this study?
23

24 Armijo: At this point we have not looked ... we have not gone that in depth into the
25 traffic counts, the turning counts.
26

27 Herrera: Okay.
28

29 Armijo: So it'll be part of it. We will be looking at the basic traffic counts, but as we
30 start getting into design that's where we start looking more about what we
31 need in those areas.
32

33 Herrera: Okay. It looks like Bohannan-Houston is ...
34

35 Guerra: Mr. Chair, Committee members to answer your question, counts were done
36 on ...
37

38 Pearson: Can you just give us your name?
39

40 Guerra: Andrew Guerra, I'm sorry. Traffic counts were done on Soledad Canyon and
41 the turning movements were not warranted.
42

43 Herrera: Okay.
44

45 Guerra: Just the two-lane eastbound, westbound were just needed, so that's what
46 we're incorporated into the study.

1
2 Herrera: Right.
3
4 Guerra: But we want to integrate the bicycle lanes and multi-use paths into that
5 corridor so we can accommodate as much as possible.
6
7 Herrera: Right, thank you. I think that was really the question that I was getting at is
8 whether the center turn lane was warranted to not.
9
10 Farnham: I guess there are a lot of dirt roads that come into this, so is there going to be
11 some accommodation where we can extend pavement into those
12 intersections a little bit further, or is that outside the scope that's available for
13 this project?
14
15 Guerra: Yeah I can foresee that something in the future we'd look at, but you know the
16 ... we can only go as far as the right-of-way, we couldn't pave you know
17 further into the dirt roads of course, but we can go up to the right-of-way.
18
19 Farnham: Are those county roads, the dirt roads, or are those ... become private roads?
20
21 Guerra: Most of the county roads, there may be, I'd have to double check, but I think
22 the majority of those dirt roads that come into Soledad Canyon Road are not
23 maintained by the County.
24
25 Farnham: So they would provide, so we wouldn't be able to get in, you can only go to
26 the right-of-way in any case.
27
28 Guerra: Correct.
29
30 Pearson: Well, part of the process of redoing the road would raise ... possibly raise the
31 roadbed anyway wouldn't it? More of an angle for the rocks and dirt.
32
33 Guerra: Right.
34
35 Farnham: If you could extend it in to the right-of-way which would be past the multi-use
36 path or ... into wherever the sidewalk is so I guess that would be something
37 to look at to see how far you can extend the pavement into the intersections
38 to prevent that problem with the extra debris.
39
40 Guerra: Right.
41
42 Rishel: I'm sorry Mr. Chair, I just have one final question concerning your
43 commentary matrix from the public meeting. Just if you could please, if you
44 have any further information that you can provide us with ... who and what
45 where the concerns in separating the bicyclists and the pedestrians on the
46 south side and the north side of the road?

1
2 Guerra: We ... at that second public meeting we can definitely address some of those.
3 At this point I wouldn't be prepared honestly to answer those, but I do
4 appreciate all the public input that we get you know and I hope you
5 understand that we do get various comments you know across the spectrum,
6 so we really try hard to accommodate everybody; you know additional turning
7 lane is definitely possible, it'll add considerable cost, but that's something we
8 can definitely look at and it will take longer to build possibly, but we will look at
9 all options.

10
11 Farnham: Okay, well the first ... I think the first issue is drainage, the second issue is
12 safety.

13
14 Guerra: Right

15
16 Farnham: Which builds right into the drainage anyways.

17
18 Guerra: Sure.

19
20 Pearson: Okay. Thank you for coming to present this to us. Hopefully we've learned
21 from you and you can learn from us.

22
23 Guerra: Well thank you very much and I look forward to working with you on this here
24 in the future. Thank you.

25
26 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

27
28 **7.1 Local Projects update**

29
30 Pearson: Next item is Committee and staff comments, or do we go to local projects
31 updates and then we'll go to ...

32
33 Wray gave staff updates.

34
35 Pearson: Okay and we have any local projects update?

36
37 Albert Casillas gave updates.

38
39 Herrera: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

40
41 Pearson: Yes.

42
43 Herrera: Do you happen to know what the status is with the safety project that the
44 County has?

45
46 Casillas: No, no, I wouldn't.

1
2 Herrera: Okay.
3
4 Casillas: Do you know what departments?
5
6 Herrera: It's being handled through the Engineering Department. I'm looking it up right
7 now; it's the realignment of the intersection at Dona Ana School Road and El
8 Camino Real.
9
10 Casillas: I think that one's been in the works for a little bit; the main issue I guess was
11 just right-of-way acquisition, but with the Tom being gone, I don't know how
12 it's going to affect that project.
13
14 Herrera: Okay, thank you.
15
16 Farnham: Mr. Chair, you had asked at the last meeting for me to look into the coupler
17 overlay maintenance projects.
18
19 Pearson: Yes.
20
21 Farnham: And I do have a list of the street areas, the lengths and the widths that are
22 being repaved. Some of that is near the ... they're getting ready to do the
23 striping. I am aware that there are certain areas that will be striped for bicycle
24 lanes. I am still trying to find that information.
25
26 Pearson: Okay, I guess one area that I noticed; Locust, I don't know if that was part of
27 the Cutler or some other project, but Locust was resurfaced and the last time I
28 was there, there was no lane striping and that's an area, Locust and
29 University southbound would connect with the University, and the University
30 has bike lanes on their side and the old striping had a very wide right turn
31 lane which looked to me, not being an engineer, that there would have been
32 room to put a four-foot bicycle dedicated straight through lane there, so I
33 wonder if you could ask about that one?
34
35 Farnham: Yeah and that was, that is on the Culter Overlay list here.
36
37 Pearson: Okay.
38
39 Farnham: And that's Locust and goes down to University, it's about 2,400, 2,430 linear
40 feet.
41
42 Pearson: Right there was a bike lane ...
43
44 Farnham: Fifty-feet wide.
45

1 Pearson: All the way from Missouri to University, so I'm sure they put back the bike
2 lane but the concern would be right at the intersection with University,
3 because straight through ... bicycle traffic has a tendency to stay on the right
4 side which is in the right turn only lane and a large part of that is University
5 traffic that's going to go straight across causing conflict. So if we actually had
6 a dedicated bike lane that goes through, and we have examples of that at
7 some other intersections, I can't think of right off hand.
8

9 Farnham: I will try to get that information here this week and I can e-mail it out to
10 Andrew who can get that out to you.
11

12 Pearson: And I think the other one to look at is University. Parts of University to the
13 east have quite a wide travel lanes with the old striping that might be useful to
14 look at maybe even do a ... Narrow the travel lanes. I think that some of
15 those are like 15-foot vehicle travel lanes and then bicycle lane, or shoulder
16 lane, bicycle lane there. Perhaps an opportunity to narrow the travel lane to
17 11 or 12-foot and then maybe even a couple of foot buffer area and then a
18 four/five-foot bicycle lane.
19

20 Farnham: Okay. I'll look into ... see what they are currently planning for that area. One
21 other item that was approved yesterday at City Council for micro surfacing list
22 also and that includes Brooks Circle, Crown Pointe, Hadley Avenue, various
23 other locations. I can get that information also over to you.
24

25 Pearson: Okay.
26

27 **7.2 NMDOT Projects update**

28

29 Pearson: So we're onto NMDOT.
30

31 Herrera: Mr. Chair, I am happy to report that I heard from Mr. Doolittle District 1
32 Engineer, that Avenida de Mesilla should be done by September 15th. So
33 hopefully if the weather cooperates we should be done by then. The North
34 Main project that's happening right now, that one is scheduled for 360
35 calendar days and it started at the beginning of April so we've got a ways to
36 go on that one yet. And then the concrete wall barrier that's happening on US
37 70 from the I-25 interchange to Rinconada should be done here in the next
38 couple of months. I don't have an exact date on that yet, but I did want to
39 make everyone aware, if you didn't see Andrew's e-mail that US 70 will be
40 closed completely this Thursday from 7pm to 6 am at Rinconada to install a
41 message board. So just be aware that that's happening. The frontage roads
42 will be open so if you need to go up that way just remember to take the
43 frontage roads. That's kind of all we have I think in the works right now.
44 There's a lot of things in development. We should be having the kick off
45 meeting for the Valley Drive project soon here in the next couple of months.
46 We haven't had that yet because Molson has been focusing on another

1 project; the Missouri bridge project that we have to get out this year, but
2 they're looking to start that process here soon and I have made them aware
3 that this Committee will need to be involved in that one.

4
5 Wray: Mr. Chair, if I may, how is the progress on the Missouri bridge project going?

6
7 Herrera: It's going great. We're turning in plans later this month, next week actually.
8 Yes, so ...

9
10 Wray: That would be all of this month that's left, yes.

11
12 Herrera: Yeah, I had to think about that. So everything's going well. That one
13 probably will be a pretty long project as far as construction goes, but we're
14 adding a third lane on each side between Lohman and University to help
15 relieve some of that traffic that gets backed up onto the interstate from
16 University, so hopefully it'll help.

17
18 Pearson: Do you know about the Mesquite and Vado interchange, is that working?

19
20 Herrera: I do. There is work being done. We were behind a little bit on that project,
21 there were some issues with some of the bridge elements. I think we got
22 those resolved. There are 360 calendar days on that project, so we've still
23 got a ways to go on that one. And we did make a commitment to the County
24 that we wouldn't work on both interchanges at the same time, so we won't
25 start on Vado until Mesquite is done. Were there any other questions?

26
27 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

28
29 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

30
31 Jolene Herrera motioned to adjourn meeting at 6:10 p.m.
32 All in favor.

33
34
35
36
37 _____
38 Chairperson
39



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 21, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 City of Las Cruces Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

The City of Las Cruces designation of Bronze Level Bicycle Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists expires in mid-2015.

MPO Staff has invited Carol McCall, City of Las Cruces Staff, to speak to the BPAC regarding the status of this process.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 21, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 BPAC Annual Report

ANNUAL REPORT:

With relation to bicycle and pedestrian issues, this past federal fiscal year MPO Staff has:

- Worked on City of Las Cruces Design Standards with CLC Staff to ensure implementation of complete streets
- Worked with CLC Staff on the Picturing El Paseo project to develop that corridor into a complete street
- Coordinated with CLC Staff regarding the renewal of the City of Las Cruces Bronze level certification as a Bicycle Friendly Community
- Provided crash and traffic count data to the City of Las Cruces regarding a proposed road diet on Idaho
- MPO Staff also worked on updating the Bicycle Suitability Map and anticipates publishing the update within the coming year

According to the information provided by City of Las Cruces Staff, the City currently has approximately:

- 60 miles of in-road bicycle facilities
- 34 miles of share the road facilities
- 24 miles of multi-use paths

Doña Ana County Staff stated that there are bike facilities within the County but did not give a mile amount.

Town of Mesilla did not respond to inquiries.