



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://mesillavalleympo.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 **August 16, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana 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 listed above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana del Valle de Mesilla: 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. July 19, 2016 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. MTP Trails Plan Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. U.S. 70 Shoulder Widening over San Agustín Pass (LC00240) _____ **NMDOT Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
 - 6.1. MPO Staff Update _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 6.2. Local Projects update _____ **CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff**
 - 6.3. NMDOT Projects update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

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
6 held July 19, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County
7 Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
10 James Langell - proxy Ashleigh Curry (Mesilla Citizen Rep)
11 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
12 Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
13 James Nunez (City of Las Cruces Rep)
14 Blake Stogner - proxy Gabriel Rochelle (Bicycle Com. Rep.)
15 Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County)
16 David Shearer (NMSU - Environmental Safety)
17 Lance Shepan (Mesilla Marshall's Department)
18

19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Andrew Bencomo (Ped. Community Rep) (arrived 5:06)
20

21 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO)
22 Michael McAdams (MPO)
23 Zach Taraschi (MPO)
24 Marcus Lopez (MPO)
25

26 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Stephen Howie (EBID)
27 Ron Johnson (Zia Engineering)
28 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
29

30 **1. CALL TO ORDER (5:00 p.m.)**
31

32 Pearson: It's about 5:00 so I'll call the Mesilla Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
33 Advisory Committee to order for July 19th. As part of that we'll just go
34 through and have everybody introduce themselves. We'll start with Mark.
35

36 Leisher: Mark Leisher, Dona Ana County Representative, Citizens' Rep.
37

38 Billings: Maggie Billings, Bicycle Community Representative.
39

40 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.
41

42 Shepan: Lance Shepan, Town of Mesilla.
43

44 Stogner: Blake Stogner, I'm proxy for Gabriel Rochelle.
45

46 Shearer: David Shearer, NMSU Rep.

1
2 Nunez: James Nunez, City of Las Cruces.
3
4 Paz: Samuel Paz, Dona Ana County.
5
6 Langell: Jim Langell, proxy for Ashleigh Curry.
7
8 Pearson: Okay.
9

10 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

11
12 Pearson: Next is Approval of the Agenda. Do we have any comments on the agenda?
13 If not I'll hear a motion to accept the agenda as presented.
14
15 Nunez: I'll make a motion.
16
17 Shearer: Second.
18
19 Pearson: Okay. So there's, James and then, so we have a motion and a second. All
20 in favor, "aye."
21

22 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

23
24 Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none, those are approved.
25

26 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

27
28 **3.1 May 17, 2016**
29

30 Pearson: Next we have Approval of the Minutes. Do we have any discussion for the
31 minutes? Hearing none, I'll hear a motion to accept the minutes as
32 presented.
33
34 Shepan: I'll make a motion.
35
36 Pearson: And a second?
37
38 Shearer: *(Inaudible)*
39
40 Pearson: We have a motion and a second for the minutes as presented. All in favor,
41 "aye."
42

43 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

44
45 Pearson: Any opposed? So that passes.
46

1 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

2
3 Pearson: Next we have an opportunity for public comment. Doesn't look like we have
4 any public here though, do we or ...

5
6 **6.1 Crash Data Discussion**

7
8 Pearson: So move on to the next item, Action Items. We have a TIP amendment.

9
10 McAdams: I would like to switch the items a little bit and have the crash report first and
11 then we'll discuss the TIP, the TIP amendment and the multi-use trail. And
12 Marcus Lopez who is a Co-Op of ours, of ours will explain the crash data.
13 Okay.

14
15 Pearson: Okay. So we're doing next item 6.1. right now.

16
17 McAdams: Yes, correct.

18
19 **MARCUS LOPEZ GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.**

20
21 Nunez: Which scope did, excuse me Mr., Mr. Chair. Did you include the pedestrian
22 fatality at NMSU?

23
24 Lopez: Yeah, I believe that was the one.

25
26 Nunez: Okay. So you, and my point is, is that you took how much of the region?
27 Did you take Dona Ana and the city and ...

28
29 Lopez: It was the ...

30
31 Nunez: The University?

32
33 Lopez: Entire Dona Ana.

34
35 Nunez: I didn't hear you, I'm sorry.

36
37 Lopez: Yeah. It was the entire Dona Ana study area. So basically wherever you
38 saw a signalized intersection within the MPO boundary, we basically looked
39 at all the data from crashes that occur at those points.

40
41 Herrera: Mr. Chair.

42
43 Pearson: Yes.

44
45 Herrera: So did you guys just get the, the crash data from NMDOT or did you actually
46 look at the crash reports also?

1
2 Lopez: Within the crash data they were included with reports that police had filed
3 including you know what day it happened, what time, what type of crash it
4 was, who the reporting agency was. So it was included with a whole bunch
5 of information that was included there but for the sake of the project we only
6 included relevant information that we thought might portray a crash analysis
7 better.
8
9 Herrera: I'm just wondering because if you go back to the slide on well pedestrians
10 and bike crashes there's a pretty long bar next to "None" for the reason.
11
12 Lopez: That's all on part ...
13
14 Herrera: Or the factor.
15
16 Lopez: Of the police agency reporting it. Either they forgot to fill it out which would
17 be "None" or "N/A" or it's just, there was no contributing factor.
18
19 Herrera: Okay. Thank you.
20
21 Pearson: So the ...
22
23 Lopez: Any more?
24
25 Pearson: Crash times you have fairly large groupings, like from 6 a.m. to 12 p.m. Can
26 you granulize that any, can you show you know from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m., 8
27 a.m. to 10 a.m.?
28
29 Lopez: We can go a little deeper into it. It's just that given that there were a limited
30 amount of occurrences that occurred within the three years, being 23
31 sometimes there was like two that occurred at 6, one that occurred at 7, one
32 occurred that at, one that occurred at 8, two occurred at 9.
33
34 Pearson: Cause what would be more interesting is, is, are these school kids, is it
35 school crossing incidents ...
36
37 Lopez: Yeah, I mean that's ...
38
39 Pearson: Or is it something else?
40
41 Lopez: That's definitely something we can look into for in a further study if we want
42 to dig a little deeper into looking at pedestrians specifically involved we can
43 even extend it back, I think ten more years is what we have data on
44 regarding pedestrian-involved crashes. So it can be made into a larger
45 study given the opportunity.
46

1 Pearson: So the crash reports, this is, I guess NMDOT gets all the uniform crash,
2 accident reports or whatever the, anytime there's an incident, the cop shows
3 up, they fill out a report that goes to NMDOT, and that's where you drew
4 that information from?
5
6 Lopez: Yes.
7
8 Pearson: So you should've been, so you did get that from on campus and ...
9
10 Lopez: Yeah. As long as ...
11
12 Pearson: All the MPO area.
13
14 Lopez: It was reported by a police agency whether it be campus PD or ...
15
16 Pearson: So you tried to ...
17
18 Lopez: State Police, Las Cruces.
19
20 Pearson: Do the MPO area so ...
21
22 Lopez: Yeah.
23
24 Pearson: Further south. You didn't just stop at Main and Union. You also collected
25 down to Berino.
26
27 Lopez: Yeah. Yeah, any place that there was a signalized intersection within the
28 MPO area it got data associated with it.
29
30 Pearson: Oh, so this is only signalized.
31
32 Lopez: Yes. Yes. The data does exist for non-signalized intersections, for any
33 points that occurred whether it be on segments or in parking lots. But for
34 the sake of the, the project itself it was only looking at signalized
35 intersections.
36
37 Pearson: Is that to try to figure out which intersections need improvement ...
38
39 Lopez: Yes.
40
41 Pearson: As opposed to which roadways might need improvement?
42
43 Lopez: Yeah. Yeah, projects can be done that can, we can begin to look at
44 roadways but the scope of this project originally started just looking at
45 intersections to see if there were any contributing factors consistently at
46 particular intersections like at Lohman and Walton if we're looking at why

1 rear-ends keep on occurring at that one point. Is it because of the left-hand
2 turn lane or, or something else just to ...
3
4 Pearson: Because the fatality that I recall, pedestrian fatality was on Telshor so that
5 wouldn't have been part of this data then. Is that, is in the middle of ...
6
7 Lopez: If it didn't occur at a signalized intersection, it wouldn't be.
8
9 Pearson: Right. Do you have speed limit data as part of this?
10
11 Lopez: We have speed limit data we're, for our traffic count programs but they were
12 not associated with this project.
13
14 Pearson: Cause I guess what would be important to me would be the non-signalized
15 intersections probably on rural, on roadways if somebody's going, if it's, well
16 unmarked roadways in the urban area the speed limit is 30 miles an hour.
17 And a pedestrian crash at 30 miles an hour there's probably a, a 70% ...
18
19 Lopez: Yeah.
20
21 Pearson: Chance of a fatality. Reduce that, well at 20 mile I think it's a 90% chance
22 of surviving the crash.
23
24 Lopez: Yeah.
25
26 Pearson: So being able to evaluate speed as part of the contributing factors ...
27
28 Lopez: Yeah.
29
30 Pearson: Could also be important.
31
32 Lopez: Yeah. I mean if we look at the contributing factors data that's in the, that's
33 in the complete spreadsheet of the project itself, which was too big to
34 include in it there are factors that do include excessive speed as a cause of
35 fatality, injury, property damage.
36
37 Pearson: So now that you've done the report what are you going to do with it?
38
39 Lopez: That's up to the scope of the higher-ups of the MPO. I think Michael
40 McAdams can (*inaudible*) on this.
41
42 McAdams: This is directed toward looking at more quantification and performance
43 measures so we're going to do this. We're also looking at things like bus
44 ridership as well and so crashes is an important segment of looking at how
45 well our, our road facilities are working. We can extend the, the study to
46 corridor but corridor analysis is different from intersections. Intersections

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

41
42 Pearson: Right. For vehicle crashes probably the intersection's the greatest
43 incidence.

44
45 McAdams: Probably the greatest, yes. Yeah.

46

1 Pearson: But for pedestrian/bicycle that's specially where the, I think looking at all the
2 crash data might be worthwhile. The jaywalking that happens on University
3 Avenue, that happens between intersections so ...
4
5 McAdams: It had ...
6
7 Pearson: It sounds like that would fall outside of this study.
8
9 McAdams: Well you know there's several other corridors like that, Solano which I go up
10 and down every day, you see people ...
11
12 Pearson: El Paseo.
13
14 McAdams: El Paseo, you see people jaywalking and I think El Paseo and Solano
15 should be looked at further but I think that's more of a City issue and they
16 are trying to direct some of, it, they're trying to address some of this in their
17 El Paseo study so.
18
19 Pearson: Right. But you're collecting the data for them to be able to look at this, right?
20
21 McAdams: Yeah. We're, what we're doing is we're, as the MPO we, we're not an
22 implementing agency. So we're kind of like, "Here's a warning sign, here's
23 something that can be studied further by the City officials," and truly more
24 traffic engineering type of situation or, and so Soo is doing some of this stuff.
25 He's actually looking at you know collecting stuff before it gets to NMDOT
26 from the, the police you know.
27
28 Pearson: Right.
29
30 Billings: I think that a corridor study would be very good for the City to help
31 understand bicycle streets because we have a couple streets designated in
32 the city like Alameda and El Paseo as a bicycle street that is just dangerous.
33 I noticed that the intersections with Alameda were on the data as some of
34 the highest crash incidences so I, for bicycles so I think that a study on that
35 would help ...
36
37 McAdams: Okay.
38
39 Billings: You know understand where we should put bike streets and where we
40 shouldn't.
41
42 McAdams: Right. I agree.
43
44 Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I could also add some information. So part of collecting data
45 like this is in preparation for setting the targets for ...
46

1 McAdams: Right.
2
3 Herrera: Performance measures. FHWA did release the safety performance
4 measures and so now NMDOT has a year to set our targets and then the
5 MPOs will also be setting targets as well. So we need data to know what
6 targets we should be setting so we don't set something that's unattainable.
7
8 McAdams: Exactly.
9
10 Herrera: So this definitely helps. I would agree with what the other Members said
11 and I think if there are specific corridors that we know of I guess if we, if we
12 know that there's a corridor where there's a high number of pedestrians or
13 bicycles or crashes then maybe we can ask the MPO to look at those.
14
15 McAdams: I think we'd look at, as far as accident corridors you can clearly see from the
16 diagrams you know North Main here you can see is the major corridors we'd
17 know and those are, but I think that, but core, this is on an intersection,
18 corridor analysis and intersection analysis for crash rates are two different
19 animals to a large degree.
20
21 Herrera: Right. But I think it's important data that the ...
22
23 McAdams: Definitely.
24
25 Herrera: MPO can look at.
26
27 McAdams: Oh yeah. I agree.
28
29 Pearson: Even if it's only the bike/ped portion of it.
30
31 Herrera: Right. And that's kind of what I'm getting at is to get ...
32
33 McAdams: Right.
34
35 Herrera: Away from the vehicle portion of, I mean not take it out completely,
36 obviously but to focus on corridors that maybe this body can help prioritize
37 as far as what we know is important for bikes, bicycle and pedestrians
38 specifically.
39
40 McAdams: Just my two cents, probably expanding to years would make, get more data.
41 We could also say if there's been improvement, if we improved intersection
42 has the pedestrian/bicycle crashes gone down. But I think three years
43 maybe, and I'm just saying that really maybe, may be limited and so
44 expanding the years may give more, will give more data for sure but maybe
45 more causes and look at more data and help us explain some of the reasons
46 you know.

1
2 Pearson: Okay. Any other Member comments?
3
4 Shepan: Mr. Chair. On the, somebody mentioned it earlier about trying to get more
5 data. On the Uniform Crash Report just for example, somebody, it's driver
6 inattention. Nowhere in that report will it say why, was it a cell phone or
7 whatever. You need to look at the traffic citation itself because there it'll
8 say, "Driver was on cell phone," "Driver's picking his nose," whatever. But
9 on the crash report itself it's just a pull-down menus that we check off and if
10 it's driver inattention, it's driver inattention. You know if it's illegal left-hand
11 turn, there's no place for an explanation of what it was because ...
12
13 Pearson: So texting or cell phone is ...
14
15 Shepan: It ...
16
17 Pearson: Is driver in, inattention.
18
19 Shepan: Yes.
20
21 Pearson: So that's really important I think in ...
22
23 Shepan: So, now the, if you look at the bottom of a Uniform Crash Report it'll say if
24 the driver was cited, what he was cited for, and that citation number is there.
25 That citation number can be pulled to get the specifics.
26
27 Pearson: It's, that'll be different for different jurisdictions won't it?
28
29 Shepan: Well here in New Mexico we all use the same, yes.
30
31 Pearson: Okay.
32
33 Shepan: It's just different agency ...
34
35 Pearson: Okay, I wasn't aware of that.
36
37 Shepan: Yeah.
38
39 Pearson: Because at the New Mexico Safety Summit one of, part of the discussion
40 was expanding on the Uniform Crash Report to have probably some of that
41 kind of data.
42
43 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I was, yeah, I was going to, well wait for Mr. Nunez over there
44 but then say that, that that is written into our safety plan at the way higher
45 up level than me obviously, they're trying to work on updating the Uniform
46 Crash Report to include more explanations, something more user-friendly

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

3
4 Pearson: James.

5
6 Nunez: I, I'm glad you asked George, the, the question how do, how are you going
7 to use this. I've got a couple questions. One of them is, is, is I haven't seen
8 other reports like this. I was curious if there's a section at the end for you
9 to make suggestions his, his, historically or not or you just leave the data
10 like it is and just, this is the presented data. That's one question. May, let
11 me ask if I, before I forget my other thought. Is the, is similar to how the
12 state uses information like this, I'll be honest with you, I'm curious how the
13 City uses it to help like Soo or, or some of the traffic departments to focus
14 on an intersection to see if it does need to be redesigned. And then the
15 third thing that I have written down here is I stated earlier, I asked the
16 question about the fatality on campus that was, I know that one where that
17 fatality occurred and I believe, I don't, I don't, I wasn't there and I didn't read
18 the full report but I believe that the one driver was a distracted and it may
19 have also been early in the morning with the sun coming up or something,
20 and then also the person walking I heard may have been on their cell phone
21 also. I don't know the situation but it wasn't at a signalized intersection. So
22 back to my question, is this just the 23 pedestrian-involved crashes was,
23 would that not have this data in there or would it? Cause it wasn't a
24 signalized intersection that that fatality occurred. So maybe you can ask
25 the last one, answer the last question first and then hopefully you can
26 answer my other two questions.

27
28 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. Trying to an, I guess answer your questions and
29 overall, as Jolene alluded to this is the beginning of us meeting the federal
30 regulations to do performance measures, to specifically to your question of
31 "What is going to be contained in the report coming out of the MPO?" Yes.
32 We would certainly like to do recommendations at the end. Part of that
33 process as far as coming up with recommendations does necessarily
34 involve us presenting to you the initial data cause our committees are, you
35 know we, we get work out of you guys. We get good ideas, we get direction.
36 So this is the beginning of that process and hopefully we will develop
37 something you know like, like you had envisioned. Mr. Lopez started off
38 with the, with the intersections. Certainly as we go on, on through
39 developing this we'll extend that to the, you know to the corridors. We'll look
40 for you know problem spots and then we'll be able to dig down deeper into
41 it you know as, as Mr. Shepan note, noted we do have, you know we do
42 have the citation numbers. Obviously we're not going to be able to look at
43 every single citation but if we identify problem spots that tells us where to
44 go to, to start pulling those so we can see the specific factors, you know
45 what cause, what causes the crashes and then is there anything that we
46 can do from an infrastructure standpoint or recommendation of education

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

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

10
11 Nunez: Right. Thanks. No I like the way that, I know you get, have a lot of
12 information and I like the way you've broken it down into categories. I think
13 they're of some value and I'm glad you mentioned that you will have some
14 suggestions cause I think that, well I'll just state that I didn't know if you were
15 worried, or some people worry about making suggestions cause then you
16 start getting into some legal issues maybe or something but, yeah I don't
17 want to touch on that too much. It, I see you reaction over there.

18
19 Pearson: Any other Committee comments? Okay. So we'll move on to our next item.
20 You wanted to go through the multi-use next, is that ...

21
22 Murphy: Mr. Chair, and I do apologize for coming in late. Did we get to 5.1 on the
23 amendments to the TIP?

24
25 Pearson: No.

26
27 Murphy: Okay. So. Thanks.

28 29 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

30 31 **5.1 Amendment to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program**

32
33 Pearson: So that's, that's you?

34
35 Murphy: Go, you go back in order, yes.

36
37 Pearson: Okay. So we'll go to 5.1 then.

38
39 Murphy: Okay, 5.1 is a amendment to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement
40 Program. Specifically we were requested by RoadRUNNER Transit who
41 was requested by FTA and NMDOT to add a new, a new project onto the
42 TIP that is a result of the reorganization of funding categories at the,
43 at the federal level. So this project would be to account for the rolling stock for,
44 which is purchase of, of new buses. And with that I, I guess stand for any
45 questions.
46

1 Pearson: So it's not really new money, it's just reorganizing?
2
3 Murphy: It's reorganizing. I, I do believe that instead of go, flowing through NMDOT
4 Transit and Rail, RoadRUNNER's now the direct recipient of FTA and then
5 the, the project details are meant to reflect that.
6
7 Pearson: Okay. Any other questions on this?
8
9 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I just have a really minor change. It's, the control number on it
10 actually has another zero. It should be TL00016 but it's so minor.
11
12 Murphy: Thank you. We'll ...
13
14 Pearson: I'll hear a motion to approve the TIP amendment as presented with, with the
15 extra digit.
16
17 Herrera: Move to approve.
18
19 Pearson: Second?
20
21 Shepan: Second.
22
23 Pearson: Okay. We have a motion and a second to approve the TIP amendment. All
24 in favor, "aye."
25

26 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
27

28 Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none, that passes.
29

30 **5.2 Multi-Use Loop Trail Alternative Selection**

31
32 Pearson: So now we're on to 5.2.
33

34 TOM MURPHY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
35

36 Langell: Which is the Laguna lateral?
37

38 Murphy: The Laguna lateral is the one that is east of NM-28 and it's a, a pink and
39 black dash then it goes down here to approximately Mesilla Elementary
40 School.
41

42 Langell: And, when you, the Laguna lateral is Option What?
43

44 Murphy: The Laguna lateral is Option E.
45

46 Langell: E. Thank you.

1
2 TOM MURPHY CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.
3
4 Pearson: Comments? James.
5
6 Nunez: I'll (*inaudible*) the discussion a little bit and ask a few people's opinions but
7 I know at one time I think the one that you listed, what was it again, the
8 Tortugas E was it? Was that what you mentioned?
9
10 Murphy: The, mentioned like the Laguna lateral.
11
12 Nunez: Laguna, sorry, yeah.
13
14 Murphy: And ...
15
16 Nunez: Laguna E. That one at one time I remember at the very beginnings of the
17 discussions that that one goes by The Bean, right? Is that what some of
18 the people were talking, but it doesn't make the path continuous cause of
19 the congestion at that major corner there. I don't know the intersection. But
20 anyway my point I guess just to drive and give the, yield the floor to some
21 of the people like you all that live there and drive there every day. It's, what,
22 it's nice that, that the, the Mesilla and the, and the EBID I'm really glad that
23 there's discussions to, to consider the paths to go through those regions.
24 So based on all these options available I would kind of defer to some of the
25 people that know that area a little bit better of which one may be the best
26 option at this point. I think, I think it's nice that we have all these options
27 now potentially. So all you have the floor.
28
29 Pearson: Who's next?
30
31 Shepan: (*Inaudible*).
32
33 Pearson: Yeah.
34
35 Shepan: Mr. Chair. Yes, it would be nice to be able to have the trail come off that
36 lateral on 28 and Calle del Norte but like you stated, from Highway 28 west
37 on Calle del Norte for a good quarter of a mile there is no room, and we've
38 already established that. The, the, the residents aren't going to give up any
39 property, neither are the farmers. Personally I think we should stick with
40 what we agreed on the first time.
41
42 Langell: I, could you fill me in on what section you're talking about?
43
44 Shepan: From ...
45
46 Pearson: Highway 28.

1
2 Murphy: Let me, let me get to the map of the close-up on E.
3
4 Langell: Is it where Calle del Norte goes into Highway 28?
5
6 Murphy: It's, yes. It's immediately west of that intersection there ...
7
8 Langell: Sure, and that ...
9
10 Murphy: Right ...
11
12 Langell: And that little section prior to the lateral which is the Mesilla lateral.
13
14 Murphy: We believe, I think it's right beyond Calle de Oeste I, I believe is, is the, that
15 western-most street.
16
17 Langell: But the Mesilla lateral is due west of that intersection.
18
19 Murphy: It is, yes.
20
21 Langell: So it's not necessarily falling into that congested area.
22
23 Murphy: That's, that's correct. West of the lateral I believe we do have, or at least
24 NMDOT which owns that roadway has more right-of-way there than there
25 is pavement.
26
27 Langell: I, I live right near there so it is, I mean it's very wide there. That's, but I do
28 agree as you approach Highway 28 heading east on Calle del Norte it does
29 become somewhat of a funnel and ...
30
31 Shepan: Yes.
32
33 Langell: But this, that's where Andele's is and there's a lot of traffic going in and out
34 of that parking lot onto Calle del Norte. But I, the Mesilla lateral alleviates
35 that type of congestion, if believe, if I understand the Mesilla lateral being
36 Option C. correct?
37
38 Murphy: C and D.
39
40 Herrera: Mr. ...
41
42 Langell: What is ... Where's D coming in?
43
44 Murphy: D, D is the one I have up on the, the difference between C and D is whether
45 it goes down to ...
46

