

1 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 **3.1 March 6, 2014**

4
5 Bill Childress motioned to approve the minutes of March 6, 2014.
6 Greg Walke seconds the motion.
7 All in favor.

8
9 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

10
11 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

12
13 **5.1 Functional Classification**

14
15 The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recommends that states review the functional
16 classification of their road system every 10 years (following the decennial Census).

17
18 Current Functional Classification in the MPO region does not group 'Collectors' into Major
19 and Minor subcategories. The new guideline necessitates categorizing Collectors into one
20 of the two classes.

21
22 Murphy: Mr. Chair last month we had for you as a discussion item some work with
23 updating of the functional classification for the roadway system in the
24 Mesilla Valley MPO. We presented some preliminary findings, preliminary
25 work on it, and asked for some direction. The main cause or the main
26 work item was we needed to separate our collectors into major and minor
27 collectors, for both urban and rural areas. From my staff Chowdhury
28 Siddiqui has a presentation. From the item we'll be asking for a
29 recommendation to the policy committee on the work.

30
31 Chowdhury Siddiqui gave a presentation.

32
33 Bartholomew: Any questions?

34
35 Love: So how many is the City looking at....any of its roadways to higher than
36 what's currently being classified?

37
38 Siddiqui: Mr. Love, Mr. Chair, no we are not yet.

39
40 Love: Okay.

41
42 Bartholomew: Any other questions? Anybody want to see a particular road, I heard he
43 had a more high resolution map if anybody wanted to look at it.

1 Gwynne: I noticed on Soledad Canyon Road you have it as a major collector. Is
2 there a particular reason why you labeled it as a major without traffic
3 counts?
4

5 Siddiqui: I'm sorry Mr. Gwynne; can you repeat the name of the road please?
6

7 Gwynne: Soledad Canyon.
8

9 Siddiqui: Oh, okay. Mr. Murphy do you want to go ahead and add something, if you
10 want?
11

12 Murphy: Mr. Chair, members of the committee, I think probably the reasoning for
13 Soledad Canyon being listed a major collector, is it does, that the point
14 that we do have as a collector status, it is part of a roadway that leads to a
15 lot of residential and then ultimately, also what is a regional traffic
16 generator with the existing further east along that alignment the BLM trails
17 at the terminus of Soledad Canyon. Although we only have it up to the
18 point where it's interconnected with other MPO thoroughfares. I think we
19 have Padre, Lost Padre as a future collector, so that determines where the
20 terminus of Soledad Canyon as a collector exists.
21

22 Walke: And yet you have Dripping Springs Road past Soledad Canyon as also a
23 major collector and again there aren't any traffic count numbers. So I
24 wonder, I see minor, you have a lot of streets that don't have traffic counts
25 and some are minor and some are major. Do they all kind of follow that
26 classification system where you just look at it and kind of see how many
27 roads are leading into it or something like that?
28

29 Murphy: That's the initial basis. We look at where it fits in with the rest of the
30 system as far as connectivity, when there's not an AADT. I will state that
31 all of these roads that are being identified as a collector will be put on to
32 the traffic count program. So moving forward in the future we will have
33 those AADT numbers. But right now it was just kind of a subjective call on
34 the part of staff as far as what land uses that facility served and it's
35 connectivity within the greater system.
36

37 Childress: So when making a decision on the Dripping Springs route, was it, did you
38 take into consideration the FLAP program where we're looking at
39 potentially upgrading that road from dirt to pavement?
40

41 Murphy: We have not looked at it with that, specifically. I think that would be one of
42 the things, once something like, once that project's completed we would
43 reevaluate it.
44

1 Childress: On the Soledad Canyon the road makes the distinction between major
2 and minor collector. That is just short of the Sierra Vista Trail, is that
3 correct?
4

5 Murphy: I don't know right off. But I do believe it is, it does end west of that trail.
6

7 Childress: Thank you.
8

9 Marmolejo: Mr. Chair?
10

11 Bartholomew: Yes
12

13 Marmolejo: Also, I would look at number 66, Tortugas Drive. It's listed as a minor.
14 There also is a note of the traffic counts there. That right, I can, just by
15 me, there's a lot of traffic going through there and there's also a bottleneck
16 when you're coming out of the village and towards Main. There are a lot
17 of pedestrians making their way to the gas station and Pic Quik there. So
18 I would look at that also, as well.
19

20 Murphy: So you'd like to see Tortugas listed as a major collector?
21

22 Marmolejo: Collector, if nothing else, because it's acting also as a, you're getting
23 people off of the, is it Stern Drive? They make their way down through
24 Tortugas through Tigua and then on down through Tortugas Drive, down
25 to Main Street. I'm not sure you'd call it a major but it does that, act as a
26 collector and it also, you could get some transit that people just go through
27 that segment.
28

29 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Marmolejo, we do have it as a minor collector right now but
30 if it's this Committee's, if the Committee agrees, we can change that to a
31 major collector.
32

33 Marmolejo: I guess what I want to say is that, I mean without traffic count, but there's
34 also, there's a lack of, there's a lot of pedestrian, pedestrians going up
35 through that roadway, and there's a lack of sidewalks. Especially if you
36 see the lateral going north and south there. Right there is a really, people
37 are walking along that bank, and on the south side, towards that
38 commercial strip. I would think maybe, that maybe the traffic count would
39 warrant some additional improvements in that area.
40

41 Murphy: This list doesn't list anything as far as ranking it for improvements. So as
42 far as, as far as from a regional standpoint, its existence as a minor
43 collector or major collector is not gonna affect its priority for improvements.
44 Our design standards do not have any, our regional design standards do
45 not have any difference between major and minor collector, and since it's
46 urban, I think also, from a funding standpoint and have Jolene pop in if

1 she, if she knows the answer different than I do, that urban major and
2 minor collectors are both eligible for federal aid. However, given the
3 nature of funding conversations in Washington, I would say that the
4 likelihood of getting federal aid for anything that's not on the state
5 highway, not on interstate highway or the national highway system, is
6 probably pretty low.
7
8 Herrera: Mr. Chair?
9
10 Bartholomew: Yes Ms. Herrera.
11
12 Herrera: Yeah, Tom you're right, it's in the urban areas, minor collectors are eligible
13 funding. But I think it's really important to make it clear that just because a
14 road is functionally classified a certain way does not guarantee funding
15 ever in any scenario. So it's really about how the road is functioning right
16 now. If it's functioning as a major collector then that's one thing but I don't
17 want anyone to think that because we're gonna classify it as a major
18 collector it's gonna be higher in priority for funding.
19
20 Marmolejo: But would a traffic count at least sets the stage for possible local funding
21 for this or would it be up to local entity to make those traffic counts?
22
23 Murphy: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Marmolejo, we actually are also using this exercise
24 here to better organize our traffic count program. Through this exercise
25 we've discovered things that were listed in the last Transportation Plan
26 were classified collector, arterial and so on, and we did not at the same
27 time put them on to the traffic count program. So what I'm saying, every
28 single one of these that we are giving the designation or the classification
29 now, will be added to the traffic count program. So moving forward in the
30 future, all of these roadways will have traffic counts.
31
32 Marmolejo: Thank you.
33
34 Bartholomew: Are there any other questions?
35
36 Grijalva: I was looking at Wisconsin from Locust to Triviz; it looks like that's just like
37 big commercial lots adjacent to that road.
38
39 Siddiqui: Mr. Chair, Mr. Grijalva that is correct. That's why when we started looking
40 into the land use pattern. I adjusted land use pattern for each road. We
41 identified that and we, that for this particular segment adjusted land use
42 pattern as non-commercial for this case. I'm sorry, non-residential.
43
44 Bartholomew: Any other questions at this time? I guess what the staff needs is a
45 recommendation to bring this revised classificational system forward to the
46 Policy Committee. Is that correct?

1
2 Siddiqui: Yes Mr. Chair.
3
4 Bartholomew: If there's no further discussion and anybody want to make that motion?
5
6 Childress: I'll make a motion to accept the proposal to move forward.
7
8 Altamirano: I second.
9
10 Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded, and the since there is an action item, is
11 there anybody out there in the audience that wants to speak to it? If not
12 then call for the motion. All those in favor of recommending this to the
13 Policy Committee, please say aye.
14
15 All in favor.
16
17 Bartholomew: The next is a discussion item. I did have just a point of clarification, is this
18 additional handout we got, is that something on the agenda somewhere?
19
20 Murphy: That's gonna be some information on the TIP and we're gonna handle that
21 through staff comments.
22

23 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

24 **6.1 Transportation Safety and Asset Management Plan**

25
26
27 Bartholomew: Okay thank you. So the next item is discussion item 6.1 Transportation
28 Safety and Asset Management Plan.
29
30 Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.
31
32 Bartholomew: Thank you Tom and maybe before the presentation, I believe there were
33 three Committee members that came in after we made introductions over
34 at the table over here, if we could just have you state your names for the
35 record, so we know that you were here.
36
37 Lujan: Debbie Lujan, Town of Mesilla
38
39 Roman: Willie Roman, City of Las Cruces
40
41 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT
42
43 Bartholomew: Thank you.
44
45 Morales: Good morning also present, Jesus Morales, EBID
46

1 Denise Weston and Jennifer Hill from Bohannon-Huston gave a presentation.
2
3 Bartholomew: Thank you.
4
5 Bartholomew: Any questions from the Committee?
6
7 Marmolejo: Could you go back to that last frame please? The last slide. On the GIS
8 framework data management, who, at this point in time, who do you see
9 as the best to manage that GIS data?
10
11 Westin: Well as you know, the County has a pretty, pretty sophisticated system for
12 the whole county and, but the City also has one and NMSU also has one.
13 You know, I think it would be really who wanted to take on that champion
14 effort and was given the political, you know, leadership to do that. I think
15 any one of the agencies could do it, no offense, other than the Town of
16 Mesilla. But any one of the agencies could do that.
17
18 Marmolejo: What about the MPO? I know they're not....
19
20 Westin: Well I meant the City, but the MPO, you use the City's GIS system but
21 absolutely the MPO could do that if that were the regional boundary for
22 your asset management plan.
23
24 Murphy: Yes, to echo Denise, I think that the MPO would be a very convenient
25 place to locate that. I think the way we would work that is we would work
26 with each of your agencies to input that data. We're working closely with
27 the City's GIS system in order to develop these databases and we're also
28 participating in Dr. Brown's effort at NMSU to kind of develop a regional
29 GIS portal so that everybody within the region can view it. But I would see
30 that, as far as a work product, I see that as MPO staff reaching out to each
31 of your agencies to gather the data that you've collected and house it in
32 the one location so that it's readily accessible for the decision makers.
33
34 Walke: Have you developed a cost estimate for this leadership, the leadership
35 recommendations? How much would it cost the MPO or any other agency
36 to do these things?
37
38 Westin: That's a good question. We have not done that. We'd be willing to do a
39 little research on that and see if I could get maybe; I have a couple of
40 locations that have done it. I could try to collect some numbers for you, if
41 that would be helpful.
42
43 Walke: It would be. Thanks.
44
45 Bartholomew: Any other questions? I had one. I don't know if I know exactly how to ask
46 it but in terms of measurement of this and I assume that if the MPO would

1 kind of be the coordinator of this, at some point, there's gonna be
2 decisions made and you have to digest this into the measurements of this
3 data, based on this data and everything. Is there gonna be, or wouldn't
4 this might be something the leadership team would have to work on, are
5 there gonna be like a software that everybody could share to manage it, or
6 how is it, or are we all gonna be kind of comparing apples and oranges,
7 because we might be doing it a little differently?
8

9 Westin: It's a little bit of both I think because I think that's important that each
10 agency and you can speak up Jennifer if you have a different thought, but
11 each agency needs to develop their own criteria for level of service and
12 performance measures. So you will be comparing apples to apples within
13 your agency, within your jurisdiction, and the assets that are under your
14 ownership. But, yes, you know, the comparison between the expectations
15 of sidewalks in the county are gonna be different that the expectations of
16 sidewalks within the city. So those will be different. But, the data
17 collection process, that would be part of the goal of building one GIS
18 format to develop a consistent process, a consistent list of attributes, a
19 consistent way and the way the data is collected, so that it could be
20 compared and used, sort of efficiently across all the agencies. There is
21 software out there. There definitely is, and I know that the County, I don't
22 know if you want to speak up, if you know more about that, but there is
23 certainly software programs that you can pay a lot of money for, and you
24 can have them come in and build sort of your system for you. But you can
25 also do it yourself if you want to collect the data and work with the
26 leadership team, and build your own framework. I don't know that that
27 answered it, except it is a good question, it's valid, and it has to be worked
28 out.

29
30 Bartholomew: Right. Well like even with sidewalks, it would, say you're having county
31 sidewalks and city sidewalks, you could still measure things in some ways,
32 in the same way.
33

34 Westin: Totally, and you can make decisions on measuring your condition the
35 same because I would assume that you would all want the same, you
36 know type, like a good, bad and fair sidewalk, right? You could make a
37 decision to do your measurements that way, absolutely, as a region and
38 those are examples that we've put in there and you can choose as a
39 region, "you know I like that way that they measured that, let's just all keep
40 that." Yeah.

41
42 Bartholomew: Okay. Any other questions. Yes sir.

43
44 Libbin: Hello, my name is Zack Libbin, I'm an engineer for the EBID. The
45 comment that I have is a little bit too specific maybe about the plan or
46 about the document. It's on the trails. So I have a concern that there's a

1 ton of trails on the map specifically and then many miles donated,
2 demarcated as proposed unpaved EBID trail and I'd like to make the
3 clarification that those aren't EBID trails. They, a little bit of background
4 would be that EBID can't have trails on our property. We have, EBID can't
5 own the trail, we take too much liability by having a trail on our own. So
6 EBID showed quite a bit of cooperation for having trails, but an example of
7 that is working through a memorandum of understanding with the City of
8 Las Cruces so all the trails that are on here that are within the City of Las
9 Cruces are acceptable even if they're only planned, they're acceptable.
10 The ones outside the City limits are nothing more than a plan, they are not
11 a trail, and they're nothing more than a plan, and in fact there's no
12 agreement between EBID and the County, not much future for a plan
13 maybe too, so, I mean for an agreement, so the trails outside the City
14 limits are nothing more than just a future hope, or a future plan, and not
15 something that should be included in an inventory of trails. Then again,
16 specifically, if there are gonna be trails on the EBID property, outside of
17 the City limits, they will be, have to be licensed to the Dona Ana County, to
18 the County itself, and so they shouldn't be marked as an EBID trail. It
19 could be clarified maybe that it's Dona Ana County trail on EBID property,
20 but they won't be an EBID trail, and then again, I would say a key issue for
21 trails is that there, there needs to be agreements in place for the property
22 owners of the trails, with the owner and the maintenance agency for the
23 trails. I would recommend that to be key issue, is that these agreements
24 need to be in place before there's trails. That's all I have unless there's
25 any questions.

26
27 Bartholomew: Any other questions on that point?

28
29 Westin: I'll just make a comment. Thank you Zack. We'll update that map and I'll
30 send it to you, just to make sure you feel comfortable before we put it in
31 the next draft. I'll coordinate directly with him.

32
33 Marmolejo: I concur with EBID on this matter. The County and EBID are looking at a
34 possible MOU for trails on EBID property managed by the County, but I
35 would definitely put us in on that, on that conversation if you would please.

36
37 Westin: Absolutely.

38
39 Marmolejo: Because I would imagine that you could possibly remove a lot of the
40 proposed trails on EBID, I would consider that, at least keep us in the loop
41 on that if you would, please.

42
43 Westin: Absolutely.

44
45 Bartholomew: Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, I guess thank you. This
46 will be brought forward next month, is that correct Tom?

1
2 Westin: Thank you.
3
4 Murphy: That's correct.
5
6 Westin: Will we get their comments in time to integrate them?
7
8 Murphy: We ask, probably give, maybe a two week window to get comments back,
9 if we'd like to get that in the final draft version.
10
11 Westin: And I'm happy to take those comments any way that works for you. If you
12 want to do them electronically on the PDF version, that's fine. If you want
13 to give a hard copy to Tom, I'll have someone from my Las Cruces office
14 pick it up and get it to me. If you want to email me comments, really I
15 don't know Tom, if you're okay with that, but I'm really flexible about taking
16 your comments anyway that makes it the easiest way for you to comment.
17
18 Bartholomew: I don't know, did you have your email in this document somewhere?
19
20 Westin: I'll give you a card. I'll give everyone a card.
21
22 Murphy: And anyone can contact me for Denise's email as well.
23
24 Bartholomew: Okay, thank you Tom. Okay.
25
26 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**
27
28 Bartholomew: Looks like the next item is, first of all, are there any comments from the
29 Committee? Any. I know Jolene, sometimes you've made updates on the
30 DOT projects. Did you want to do anything on that today?
31
32 Herrera: I can if anybody has specific questions. I didn't bring the printout with me
33 but I'll be more than happy to either wing it or get the answers and
34 distribute them tomorrow.
35
36 Bartholomew: I'd be curious to know when is the North Main work going to be.
37
38 Herrera: So that project was let in January. It's probably gonna start in June. We
39 don't have an exact date yet, but it'll likely be in June. We're coordinating
40 with the City right now on that project. There's gonna be extensive utility
41 work done and I think that's gonna come first.
42
43 Bartholomew: And is it gonna be what like a 12, 14 month project or a year?
44
45 Herrera: We really don't know. That's part of the coordination that's ongoing, is I
46 think kind of once we get more of a feel of how we're gonna coordinate the

1 utilities with the City, then we'll have a schedule. But like with all of our big
2 projects we'll have monthly meetings during construction to kind of update
3 everybody on how the process is going, and address any issues.
4

5 Bartholomew: Okay and then also I know one that will affect us is the Missouri bridge
6 project too, which will be happening at the same time, I assume, as North
7 Main.
8

9 Herrera: That one will actually let in October so this fall. It likely won't start until
10 maybe late 2014, early 2015. And again, I'm not sure on the amount of
11 time for that. I haven't seen any projections on that yet.
12

13 Bartholomew: Okay thank you. Mr. Altamirano?
14

15 Altamirano: Mr. Chair, we, the School District met with Bridgette Spedaleri yesterday
16 and because of the North Main project and, we had a little discussion, and
17 I know that they were setting dates for the public hearing. Just off the top
18 of my head, I don't remember my notes there but it appears that it is
19 gonna be at least a year and there are only gonna be certain intersections
20 that are gonna be open. The reason I'm bringing it up and more so for
21 you as well, is because of the buses, whether or not we can get in, make
22 left or right turns back on to Main Street. We've already discussed some
23 of that with Bridgette and the engineer, I can't remember his name. So it
24 is gonna be interesting during that period of time and I think it is gonna
25 create some real nice congestion.
26

27 Herrera: And that's definitely something that will be coordinated with Roadrunner
28 Transit, as well as the School District. We do our best to try to
29 accommodate everything during construction. It's just not always
30 possible.
31

32 Bartholomew: Thank you. Any other committee comments at this time? If not I'll move
33 on to staff comments.
34

35 Wray: The other sheet that we handed out to you before the meeting, MPO staff
36 has to offer an apology to this Committee. Do to some oversight this was
37 supposed to be an action item for you tonight, it was not advertised so on
38 the agenda. Due to the nature of the TIP timetables, we're unable to wait
39 to give the TAC another opportunity to vote on this. We'll need to go
40 ahead and bring this to the Policy Committee next week. This particular
41 project is a new project in the TIP. Its pavement preservation for the
42 length of NM28 and this will also be coordinated with the El Paso MPO.
43 So if you have any comments or questions you can ask them now or if you
44 wish to comment next Wednesday at 1:00 p.m. at the Policy Committee
45 meeting you can do so then.
46

1 Bartholomew: Any questions or comments on this item?
2
3 Gwynne: Just one question. The pavement preservation is that basically crack
4 sealing, is that what we're talking about?
5
6 Wray: I would have to defer to Ms. Herrera, I don't know exactly what they're
7 going to be doing.
8
9 Herrera: Right now what we're discussing, the maintenance folks are kind of
10 handling that. They're looking at chip seal.
11
12 Gwynne: Thank you.
13
14 Bartholomew: Any other questions? Thank you Andrew. Any other staff comments at
15 this time?
16

17 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

18
19 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

20
21 Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

22
23 Harold Love motioned to adjourn.

24 Greg Walke seconds the motion.

25
26
27 
Chair