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 March 17, 2015 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 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. January 20, 2015 _________________________________________
4. PUBLIC COMMENT __________________________________________ Chair
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS _________________________________________
   5.1. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update ____________________ MPO Staff
   5.2. Short Range Transit Plan Update ___________________________ MPO Staff
   5.3. Bicycle Suitability Map __________________________________ MPO Staff
6. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS __________________________
   6.1. Local Projects update ________________________ CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff
   6.2. NMDOT Projects update __________________________ NMDOT Staff
7. PUBLIC COMMENT __________________________________________ Chair
8. ADJOURNMENT____________________________________________ Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held January 20, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep) Leslie Kryder, Vice Chair (Bicycle Community Rep) Scott Farnham (City of Las Cruces Rep) David Shearer (NMSU - Environmental Safety) Jolene Herrera (NMDOT Rep) Albert Casillas (DAC Citizen Rep)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla Staff) Karen Rishel (Bicycling Community Bicycle Rep) Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Committee Rep)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (MPO) Andrew Wray (MPO) Michael McAdams (MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT: Jennifer Kleitz, Recording Secretary, EMTS-DA

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pearson: It’s like 5:23 p.m. on January 20th. So we’ll call to order the Mesilla Valley MPO Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Pearson: Item number two is approval of the agenda. Do I have a, a motion to approve?

Shearer: I move to approve the agenda.

Kryder: Second

Pearson: All in favor of approving the agenda, say “aye.”

All Approved.

Pearson: Any opposed?
3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Pearson: Next is election of officers. Since I’m currently Chair, I’ll just turn it over to Tom to run electing the Chair.

Murphy: Okay. At this point, I’d like to take, are there any, anybody wish to offer them self or another fellow committee member up to be Chair for the upcoming calendar year?

Kryder: George does a wonderful job.

Shearer: Our current Chair does a good job.

Murphy: So is that a nomination and a second?

Kryder: Yes.

Murphy: So nomination from Leslie of George, and second from David. Do you refuse the nomination?

Pearson: No.

Murphy: Okay. Are there any others that wish to be, wish to nominate someone, or? Seeing none, I’ll close the floor for nominations. Since we have one candidate, offer it up via acclimation. All in favor?

All approved.

Murphy: Any opposed say “no.” Seeing none George Pearson selected Chair again for the 2015. We’ll do the same process for the Vice-Chair. Anybody like to make, make a nomination?

Herrera: I’d like to nominate Ashleigh Curry as Vice-Chair.

Murphy: Okay so Jolene nominates Ashleigh. Do we have …

Shearer: Second the nomination.

Murphy: Okay second by David Shearer. Any other nominations? Seeing none, close the floor. Again one, one candidate so I’ll offer it up for acclimation. All in favor say “yes.”

All approved.

Murphy: Any opposed say “no.”
Pearson: That’ll learn her.

Murphy: None opposed so.

Herrera: Well she’s pretty much always here so it’s a good backup I think.

Murphy: Your officers for the year are George Pearson and Ashleigh Curry. And I’ll turn it back over to you Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Thank you.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 October 21, 2014

Pearson: Next item then is item four, approval of minutes. Any discussion on the minutes that were presented in the packet? Hearing none I’ll hear a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Shearer: I’ll move to approve the minutes as presented.

Pearson: David Shearer moves.

Farnham: I’ll second.

Pearson: And we have a second.

Farnham: Scott.

Pearson: Scott.

Farnham: Farnham.

Pearson: Farnham. All in favor “aye”.

All approved.

Pearson: Any opposed?

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: On to the next item five, is public comment. We have no members of the public unfortunately, so we’ll move on to the action items.
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Amendments to the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program

Pearson: We have a TIP amendment. We'll turn it over to MPO staff.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. NMDOT has requested this TIP amendment, but MPO staff does not have the information, so I now turn it over to Ms. Herrera.

Herrera: Thank you. I'm passing out a handout which is the information. It's just two changes. They're pretty minor. Well I think they're minor. You all might not think they're minor. So I'll let those go around and then I'll talk about them.

Okay if everybody has a copy, the first change is to a project, well they're both projects on I-10; LC00150, the change on that one is highlighted in red. We request to amend the project total up to $12 million. We're now at 90% in the project development process and that's the current estimate is at $12 million. And then the second change is pretty minor. We had the, the termini listed as 146 to 164 to reflect the Texas state line, but the Texas state line is actually at mile post 164.3. So we would like to request that the end mile post be changed to 164.3. And those are the only two changes. Are there any questions?

Pearson: And the funding's for the first item is secured and all in order?

Herrera: Yes. Yes.

Pearson: Any other questions or discussion? Is there a motion to approve the TIP amendments as presented?

Kryder: Move to approve.

Shearer: Second.

Pearson: Motion to approve and a second. All in favor "aye."

All approved.

Pearson: Any opposed?
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 MTP Update: Discussion of Bicycle Priorities Plan

7.2 MTP Update: Discussion of Pedestrian Priorities Plan

7.3 MTP Update: Discussion of Trail Plan

Pearson: So that moves us through to the discussion items.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. MPO staff is in the, the midst of getting our, finalizing the draft document for the MTP update. We’ve been working on the maps. We've been working on the motorized maps through the Technical Advisory Committee and we wanted to have this committee look at the non-motorized section of the maps. Just to give kind of a brief update, the MTP update is due July at the latest. We are still shooting for a June approval which means we'd like to come back with a you know a draft, a draft plan here in the next few weeks, next time you meet, and just kind of let, let the, let the, I guess the focus of the transportation plan is, staff is really going to be looking at a no new, no, no roadway expansion MTP for the end, for the end years one through five. That said, we'll you know be recommending that you know there, there be non-motorized improvements, public transit improvements, ITS improvements on existing, on existing roadways, but we’re not recommending any building of, of new roadway facilities, primarily for the reason that one of the things found you know in the public process, what we mostly heard out on the county is that people would like their existing local streets paved, which are you know the county has I forget the, the lane miles of dirt roads, but they do have substantial amount of dirt roads. Within the city they just floated some revenue bonds for, for some pavement rehabilitation in the, on existing facilities. So I think, I think what the major point of this is, is that we’re, as a region we’re lagging behind in maintenance. We’re not different from any other region in the United States, and it would be, I think be a wise policy choice for us to stand up and say we need to concentrate on maintenance, get the existing system you know get the existing system improved and that follows quite, that follows along very well with the language coming out of congress of where they want to have it but I think we’re just going, I think it just needs to be stated a little more firmly in a, MPOs Transportation Plan.

So with letting you know that, what I see as the focus and we’ve spoken with the, we’ve been speaking with the Policy Committee on that and in fact at their meeting last week, they did ask us to present a map with removal of the future roadways on that. Not sure we still, I think we still want to keep some, some of those on there for preservation, right-of-way preservation purposes, but you can see where they’re going as, as kind of maybe make a, an aggressive policy statement but I will leave that
up to the policy makers to do that. In the interim, what we want to get from this committee is for you to review the Transport 2040 maps on the trail priorities, the pedestrian priorities, and the in-road bicycle facility map. What we’re specifically looking for is which projects you think need to be included in you know, in some list of, some listing of priorities. What should be done in years one through five? What should be done six through ten? And then 11 out through 20. Keep in mind that improvements of existing infrastructure are going to be, looked upon more favor, well these, these committees decide but I imagine it would be an easier sell to have improvements upon existing facilities, rather than the construction of brand new facilities. And with that I would ask for a recess to allow everyone to look at the maps and we can come back to the tables with what, what you view as the priorities off each of those maps. Thank you.

Pearson: Okay so I ask for a motion to temporarily adjourn or recess whichever.

Herrera: So moved, whichever.

Pearson: Is moved from, motion from Jolene. And a second?

Farnham: Second.

Pearson: Scott. All in favor of a temporary adjournment, “aye.”

All approved.

MEETING RECESSED FOR 43 MINUTES.

Pearson: It’s 6:16 p.m., I’ll call us back to order for discussion of our discussion, looking at the maps.

Murphy: Okay. All right. Staff will also go over what you wrote on the maps, but just to kind of point by point of what we’ve discussed as priorities to go into the MTP: 1) Hadley Bike Boulevard; and these are in order that I’ve written them down, no other importance given to them, Boutz bike lanes, El Paseo complete streets; restripe, restriping of intersections; University from 478 to NM 28 as a, for motorized, non-motorized travelers; For pedestrian priority areas as we identify those, we identify what the priorities mean; do they have a minimum you know for example a minimum six foot of sidewalk, acceptance of lower car, automobile level of service, things of that nature. And we actually have a narrative on the plan so that, so that people who are putting together projects will have, have that to reference. Sidewalk needs assessment for outlying areas of Mesilla and sidewalk needs assessment for the MPO area in general. Another particular area of interest around Z-trans stops, also a sidewalk
assessment. Pedestrian crossings across University led to a discussion whether to really make that crash, crash analysis as far as where to concentrate on crossing improvements. Rerouting of state bike route 7 off of the US 70 main line on to, on to potentially more, more friendly route for non-motorized trail. And then the Rio Grande Trail connecting to, to Sunland, southward to Sunland Park and then I think ultimately northward to, to Albuquerque is, is a statewide aspiration and we need to have that reflected on, on our MTP.

So those are the priority projects and what else I can also, that you’ve written on to the maps, and then we’ll, we’ll include that into, into the draft MTP, and then assign priorities; probably year bands or you know or ultimately if any of these are unpalatable to you, you can work to have them taken, stricken from the list as well.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I just wanted to add on the, obviously you can’t really see it but that there were some notes made on the actual map too about where some of the in-road bicycle systems should be filled in.

Murphy: Right. That’s why, staff will go over the maps and make sure we catch everything.

Herrera: Okay. Thanks.

Murphy: And we’ll call, call all of you up if we can’t interpret something.

Pearson: This is the bicycle pedestrian trail. Transit, does the transit fit into the MTP at all, or? And what I’m really asking about is how transit interacts with pedestrian bicycles. Because as I, I’ve noticed driving past the, the transfer station, central transfer station during the day, I see bikes parked there. So are people using that to park their bike and then use transit? And how, I mean all transit users are ultimately pedestrians.

Murphy: We, we do, we do work closely with Roadrunner Transit there. Roadrunner Transit’s on the Technical Advisory Committee. Also the MPO attends the Transit Advisory Board meetings as well. I think a lot, you know when I, when I talked about the pedestrian priority plan earlier I have them focus areas of downtown; one along the, Lohman, from Telshor to Sonoma Ranch area was, was precisely in response to Roadrunner thinking of relocating their transfer facilities in the, on the east side of town. So I think those are, those go a long way to developing what our pedestrian priorities corridors are. Just to let, to let you know that this, it’s also a focus for the other committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, since Roadrunner sits on that one.

Pearson: But is transit part of the MTP?
Murphy: Yes, yes.

Pearson: So that’s just …

Murphy: Trans …

Pearson: Action.

Murphy: Well I mean, we’re we have a multi-modal, we have a multi-modal document. We have a transit priority plan.

Pearson: So once we see the draft, we’ll see how that interacts.

Murphy: Right. But, yeah we don’t discuss that (inaudible) map in detail here because we have, we have Roadrunner and the RTD on the, on the TAC.

Pearson: And then the plan, are we talking anything about metrics? Because that’s something we kind of focused.

Murphy: Right.

Pearson: We determine, still I think it, even the national levels as to what this means.

Murphy: I got, I got forwarded a FHWA document over the, Friday I think it was. That, that kind of touched on some of that and I think there’s a lot that we can, we can glean into that as far as assembling our own metrics. I think we’ve been, we’ve been thinking about that and this will lead, led into the annual report that this committee has been, been requesting of us that we, we gave an outline to back in October at your last meeting. What we want to do is you know meld the annual report into the work document of the MPO which puts out how we are doing on each of the performance measures and we’ll definitely have non-motorized sections as far as what those performance indicators are. So those are, those are foremost on the list. We’re not, I haven’t gotten all the way through that FHWA document, but I, I, I’m hoping to get some direction and we’ll be able to put, put out something that anticipates what they ultimately tell us we’re going to have to do so that we don’t have to redo work. But performance measures is a major part of this MTP.

7.4 MTP Update: Annual Report

Pearson: So mentioning the annual report is that pretty much … do you have anything else to say about the annual report?

Murphy: That, that’s it. We’re going to be rolling it into our performance metrics.
Pearson: Oh and one other thing that was mentioned is, is talking about the best practices at doing intersections. Is that on your list?

Murphy: I think it …

Pearson: Section on designs that are needed? Best practices.

Murphy: I wrote it as re-striping intersections. And these are just my notes to remind me.

Herrera: Mr. Chair?

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: Can I make a comment about measuring things? I'm not sure if this is the exact committee to bring it up in but while I'm thinking about it, I wonder if there's a way that we can write into the MTP something about measuring how successful public participation, I guess your plan how successful it is and the different types of outreach that you're doing, how successful those are? Because I think that you guys have had some pretty good feedback I guess.

Pearson: Yeah I think there's also a gap from knowledgeable people at the Dripping Springs, Baylor Canyon public meeting. The public there didn't seem to know what the MPO was.

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: Which is probably typical of much of the public.

Herrera: Yeah probably. But that would be interesting I think to look at and it's just something that I've been hearing other state DOTs are looking into doing and other MPOs. I guess other areas of the country are looking at how they can measure their performance in that area. And it might be asking a lot at this late stage in the game but I'm just wondering if maybe you can, can think about that a little.

Murphy: I, I think, I think we do have some, some feedback loops in the public participation plan. Although having, having been in this you know, in this line of work for a while, I think you get the, the more satisfied the public is the less you see them. You don't see them, you don't see them unless you make them angry.

Herrera: That's, that's true and at the DOT we can attest to that as well.
Pearson: So any more discussion on the MTP?

Murphy: No.

7.5 BFC Renewal Process Update

Pearson: Okay, let’s have a quick update then on 7.5 the BFC Renewal Process. I’d ask for this just to mostly make the committee aware (inaudible).

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a statement here from Ms. Carol McCall who is the City of Las Cruces Representative. I’m going to read that into the record. She says that in mid-December there were the three Bicycle Friendly Community work groups: Enforcement, Engineering, and Education/Encouragement. These groups met for the 2015 BFC application. Ms. McCall is in the process of transferring that information into application format. She expects to have this task completed before the end of January. She will then, excuse me, she will then distribute the revised data sheets to the groups for further completion. There is still some information that needs to be gathered at this time but she does not elaborate in the statement as to the nature of that information. And that’s what I have.

Pearson: The only other thing that you didn’t say is, I believe she intends to meet the February 11th application deadline, make the application this cycle.

Wray: I have no idea about that.

Pearson: That’s what she indicated to me, so whether that’s, and that was sometime after, not long after the, the education meeting so. That’s the information that we have available.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

8.1 Local Projects update


Farnham: Okay. Maybe just a couple of projects. One is the trail connection from Picacho to the Outfalls Channel, that’s the La…

Pearson: La Llorona?

Farnham: La Llorona. It should probably go out this spring for construction. Safe walk to schools; it’s been making progress at the various intersections for the ADA ramps. The one that’s currently in design is El Paseo from University on up to Main. That’s it.
Pearson: In the city I had noticed one place on Solano at Idaho; Solano has, that's
the road diet there with the bike lane and then at Idaho going both
directions it's treated the same. There's a right turn only lane and a
sharrow was added to the left side of the right turn only lane.

Farnham: What was added?

Pearson: A sharrow.

Farnham: Okay.

Pearson: A sharrow indicates that that's the positioning for the bicyclist. And my
thought is, I, I question that particular intersection because the lane is so
narrow there isn't really room for a bicycle and a car to share that lane
where the car can make that right turn only motion. I would have
expected the sharrow to be in the through lane and then, because then
once you get through the intersection the bicycle goes back into the bike
lane and cars go through. So I wonder if I can find out more about that.

Farnham: I can definitely bring it up, talk to our engineers and find out what's
happening on that, and what's. You know more?

Murphy: I don't know anything directly on the sharrow, on which lane it is, but on a
larger note as we were working with the City on, on giving them some,
some statistic, excuse me it's getting late, on the Idaho road diet west of
El Paseo we've, we were told that their intention east you know from El
Paseo to Solano, when that comes up in the re-pavement schedule that
that would be receiving the road diet treatment as well.

Pearson: Right. I've seen the sharrow in the right turn only lane but at intersections
that are wide enough where a car can actually get passed, so that's, that's
really the question. This particular intersection may not be a good
candidate for that treatment. But there are other intersections that would
be a good candidate. Even, well probably the issue is because there's a
stop there. On Telshor where there's continuous traffic and right turn only
lanes, that might be a place where you'd put the sharrow in the right turn
only lane, because bicycles don't have to stop so there's less conflict.

Murphy: We'll, we'll check with the, with the traffic, or the Transportation
Department with the City and …

Pearson: Because I don't know what the engineering standards…

Murphy: Find out, find out …
Pearson: Would be for that but.

Murphy: What their thoughts on that are.

Farnham: Was this recent striping?

Pearson: Yes.

Farnham: Okay.

Pearson: It was added …

Farnham: Part of the Cutler?

Pearson: Yeah it must have been done, it was done after the Cutler. It was done at some point after the lane lines but it was done since then.

Farnham: Okay. So you’re …

Murphy: We’ll check, we'll check with Transportation.

Farnham: Okay.

Pearson: Anything for the County?

Casillas: Not at this point. I think at the most what I can do is I can have Engineering come back here and do another presentation on, on the Baylor Canyon and Soledad Road. I know they had the public input meeting. I’m pretty sure they had a lot of information out of there. So I don’t know how they’re incorporating that into their final design.

Pearson: If they’re coming up with some final designs I think we’ve love to hear them.

Casillas: So when they’re ready I’ll make sure they come here.

**8.2 NMDOT Projects update**

Pearson: Any news?

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. Brief update on on-going construction projects. North Main, it says demolition and building of sidewalks and installation of sewer utilities between Chestnut and Gallagher. Placement of storm drain and water line from Madrid intersection to Solano. If you’ve been by there you notice that we have some roads closed off; Madrid, that intersection there is being worked on. That’s City utilities doing some that work. But
everything is on schedule. We should hopefully be done around April or May of this year. So that will be a relief for everybody. The Missouri bridge hasn’t started yet but they did have the preconstruction meeting last week, January 14th. We’re looking at possibly starting construction I believe the end of March is what Trent said last time and we’re looking 320 weather working days, so that project will take about a year. We will be having monthly public meetings to let everybody know as we progress on how traffic’s changing.

Pearson: You’ve got a lot of coordination there with the Fire Department and the local businesses.

Herrera: There’s tons of coordination there and with the University, so we will be keeping the freeway open at all times. There won’t be any time that it’s closed. As far as what’s happening underneath the street on Missouri, I’m not sure because I haven’t been to any of those meetings. But like I said we’ll be having monthly public meetings to let everybody know what’s happening on that.

Murphy: I know that answer. At, at least during the initial design drawings the, they were only anticipated closing Missouri at two different periods, from 12 p.m. to 6 a.m. when the, when the previous, when the bridge the existing bridge…

Herrera: Is torn down.

Murphy: Existing bridge is demolished.

Herrera: That makes a lot of sense. We don’t want people driving under there while we’re tearing the bridge down. And then it’s a little bit outside of this MPO but the Mesquite Vado bridges, if you’ve been through I-10 there, we’re done with Mesquite and we’ve moved on to Vado. So all the travel…

Pearson: So Mesquite is complete?

Herrera: Yeah all the travel lanes are open on I-10 now. The work on Vado is building roundabouts. Where the…

Pearson: So is there a roundabout on Mesquite?

Herrera: No. We just …

Pearson: No.

Herrera: We replaced the bridge on Mesquite and then did some approach work.
Pearson: So it’s Vado that gets the roundabouts.

Herrera: It’s Vado that gets the roundabouts. But all the I-10 travel lanes are open. So the Vado exit is closed though. So if you’re going to be heading that way make sure that you take Mesquite. So that’s everything under construction now in this area. And then just a quick update on things that are upcoming; Valley Drive we have that scheduled in fiscal year 2017, but we are starting the design process now. It has been awarded to Molzen-Corbin. I think I’ve already told you all that. And I just wanted to let you know that the PDE has sent an email to Molzen-Corbin that, George you are the contact for the BPAC and so you should have been invited to a meeting taking place next week.

Pearson: Right. There’s a stakeholders meeting on, next Tuesday the 27th?

Herrera: Okay.

Pearson: At 8:30 in the morning over at Best Western or whatever it is. The Columbus Room or something.

Herrera: They didn’t invite me, but as, as long as they invited you.


Herrera: Because I did specifically ask that.

Pearson: I was going to ask because Harold sent a message that that conflicts with the mandatory NMDOT meeting, so are they still going to go? I guess you don’t know if they’re going to continue with that.

Herrera: I don’t know. I haven’t heard.

Pearson: I hadn’t seen any other messages, so I guess the meeting’s still on.

Herrera: Okay. Yeah, I’m not sure. But I just wanted to make sure that, that you’ve been invited. So I don’t know if the rest of the committee remembers but we did say that George would be the point of contact for the BPAC on stakeholder type meetings. And so …

Shearer: Absolutely.

Herrera: So if you’re not able to attend and you want somebody else to go in your place please let us know. And that’s as far as we’ve gotten on that project. And then the last one is the San Augustine Pass and that one’s scheduled for fiscal year 2016, and we’re asking for some design funding
right now from Santa Fe, about $600,000.00 and so we should hopefully have an RFP out for that project in the next four to five months.

Shearer: *(inaudible)* San Augustine Pass from Organ?

Herrera: It’s from Organ to the White Sands Interchange and we’re widening shoulders. We’re moving the concrete wall barrier back and widening the shoulders there to allow safer passage.

Pearson: And taking the rumble strip out from in front of the guard rails.

Herrera: Yes. Well the shoulders should be wide enough to allow for both. And that’s all I have unless there were any questions.

Pearson: You covered everything that I was thinking about.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: So we’ll move on to Public Comment. Any more public comment? No.

10. ADJOURNMENT (6:35 p.m.)

Pearson: Hear a motion to adjourn.

Wray: Unneeded.

Herrera: So moved. Oh yeah. We don’t have a quorum. We don’t have a meeting.

______________________________
Chairperson
AGENDA ITEM:
5.1 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Current draft of the Transport 2040 Update

DISCUSSION:
The Mesilla Valley MPO is in the process of updating the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, called Transport 2040. This item is to introduce the complete draft of the Transport 2040 Update.
AGENDA ITEM:
5.2 Short Range Transit Plan Update

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Short Range Transit Plan Preliminary Summary

DISCUSSION:
The Mesilla Valley MPO Staff is working with a consultant on updating the Short Range Transit Plan. This item is to update the BPAC on the progress made so far.
47% of boarding activity occurs at transfer points
  - MVITT 31%
  - MVM 13%
  - VTP 3%

Several strong segments or stops
  - University Blvd
  - Picacho
  - El Paseo
  - North Main
  - Roadrunner Pkwy
  - Walmart stores
Route Productivity (Riders per Hour)

- Several strong routes
- Longest routes have the lowest weekday productivity
- Routes 50 and 90 drop significantly on Saturday
Speed and Stop Spacing

- Routes 10 and 90 characterized by high-speed corridors
- Fewer stops on Routes 10, 40, and 90 due to land use
## Transfer Activity (Weekday)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concepts

- Shorten Routes 10 and 90 to improve schedule reliability
- Consolidate Routes 20 and 30 to provide 30-minute service
- Streamline Route 80 and operate every 30 minutes
- De-emphasize service at Mesilla Valley Mall
- Consider alternative transfer points east of I-25
- Improve access to Doña Ana Community College East Mesa
  - Extend Route 10 to DACC
  - Incorporate DACC route into regular route network
- Ensure direct access to grocery stores on each route
- Reintroduce Lohman crosstown service
AGENDA ITEM:
5.3 Bicycle Suitability Map Update

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Draft of the Bicycle Suitability Map
A large version of the draft will be available for review at the meeting

DISCUSSION:
Mesilla Valley MPO Staff is in the process of publishing an update to the Bicycle Suitability Map.
This item is to present the draft map to the BPAC.