MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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 March 18, 2014 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)
                   Jolene Herrera (NMDOT Rep)
                   Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Community Rep)
                   Albert Casillas (proxy - Dona Ana County Rep)
                   Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)
                   Scott Farnham (City of Las Cruces Rep)

MEMBERS ABSENT:   Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)
                   Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla)
                   Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
                   David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)

STAFF PRESENT:    Tom Murphy (MPO)
                   Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO)
                   Orlando Fierro (MPO)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Pearson:  Next order is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda from anybody? Hearing none I'll hear a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Casillas: Motion to approve.

Murphy:  Actually staff has noticed one thing just now. We did election of officer's last meeting. So I move we strike that.

Pearson: Can't do that. I'll listen to....

Coontz:  Second to approve with the amendment

Pearson:  No

Murphy:  I'm not voting
Pearson: You can make the motion to...

Coontz: Motion to approve the agenda with item 2 deleted, no item number 3 deleted.

Herrera: Second

Pearson: Second from Jolene. All those in favor say aye.

All in favor.

Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none, we continue

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (This item was removed from the agenda)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 January 21, 2014

Pearson: Next item is approval of the minutes for January 21, 2014. I had a change that I noticed. On the first page under item 2 – Approval of the Agenda. It said “George Pearson asked for motion to approve...” oh, wait a minute... Election of Officers. “George Pearson opened the floor for nominations”. That’s ... I turned the meeting over to Andrew to run that portion since I was potentially up for nominations. So I’d like to make that change, any other comments on the minutes? I’ll hear a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Kryder: So moved.

Pearson: So moved by Leslie, and a second?

Casillas: I’ll second that.

Pearson: All in the favor of approving the minutes as amended, Aye

All in favor.

Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none that item is approved. The next item is Public Comment.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments
The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E100110</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>NM 28 MP 0.0-30.4</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amendment will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

Pearson: We have no public presence, so we will move on to the next item, Action Items. We have a TIP amendment. Tom?

Murphy: Staff is requesting a recommendation of approval to the Policy Committee for the TIP placed in your packet. This is a project on New Mexico 28 from mile post zero (0), to mile post 30.4. It’s a pavement preservation project. I will yield to Ms. Herrera if there are any other details that DOT would like to illuminate.

Herrera: Just, I received an email this morning from George asking about whether this was gonna be a full width pavement preservation project because it is New Mexico Bike Route 1 and yes it definitely is, that’s been made very clear that we need to make sure that it goes all the way from shoulder to shoulder, so yes.

Pearson: Okay with that I can heartily approve the project.

Murphy: So it’s inclusive of the shoulders?

Herrera: Yes, it’s the entire width of the road.

Pearson: Any other comments or questions on this TIP amendment?

Pearson: I’ll hear a motion to approve the TIP amendment as presented.

Casillas: I move to approve the amendment as presented

Pearson: And a second?

Coontz: I second it.

Pearson: Hearing a motion and second, all in favor of approving the TIP amendment, aye.

All in favor.

Pearson: Any opposed, hearing none that passes.

Pearson: Now we have some discussion items.
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planner Position Discussion

Whereas, The MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, CITY OF LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, and TOWN OF MESILLA have all adopted Complete Streets policies recognizing the need to consider vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes when planning for and implementing transportation infrastructure, and

Whereas, the CITY OF LAS CRUCES has been recognized as a Bronze Level Bicycle Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists, and will need to reapply for continuing recognition by July 2015, and

Whereas, the League of American Bicyclists guidelines for Bronze Level Bicycle Friendly Community designation suggests one bike program staff person for each 77,000 of population, and

Whereas, the CITY OF LAS CRUCES has recently crossed the 100,000 population mark, included in the DOÑA ANA COUNTY population of about 215,000, and

Whereas, the MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Policy Committee recognizes the importance of bicycles as a viable mode of transportation, its importance for public health, and as an economic force both locally and through tourism,

Therefore, let it be resolved that, the MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION Policy Committee recommends that each member entity (CITY OF LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, and TOWN OF MESILLA) designate a staff member to be the bicycle/pedestrian contact.

Pearson: The next discussion items, a request from the Policy Committee regarding bike/ped resolution.

Murphy: At this Committee’s direction, we took to the Policy Committee a proposed resolution and discussed the importance of requesting our member governments designate a point of contact for bicycle and pedestrian issues, within their government. That was apart from the MPO, as many people have become aware, or made aware that FHWA is very hesitant about MPO staff, in particularly MPO funds, doing work on what’s more of a local, rather than a regional level so; therefore, the need to have an individual in the local governments to kind of be the go to person as far as bicycle and pedestrian projects. We have included the language proposed for the resolution within the action or the discussion sheet within your packet. And I guess I would like to have a discussion, if there are any other changes, before we take it back to Policy Committee for the Policy Committee to vote on it.
Pearson: So the Policy Committee had this in front of them and they sent it back to us, essentially, right? Did they have any questions or concerns that we should be looking at?

Murphy: They didn't necessarily, Jolene do you have any recollection of ...

Herrera: Yeah, they did have some concerns. They wanted to know exactly what... basically they wanted a job description or a description of what tasks this person would be responsible for. So it's my understanding that they wanted that so that they could, first of all, pick the person best suited for the position. But then also not overload somebody that's already on staff. So that was, I don't think they had any problems with the language here in the resolutions, but I just remember them specifically wanting like a list of duties that this person would be responsible for.

Murphy: And we were working on, we were working on the list of duties, things to kind of include making sure that the priority is listed in the transportation plan. Move to the next level to either get on the ICIP or the CIP, depending upon the jurisdiction. And also basically just be kind of a coordinator for all activities bicycle. They didn't have a problem with the language. We took it to them as a discussion item. They didn't say return it to the BPAC for changes and then a revote. They just wanted to add, have some added information on it. So we brought it back to this Committee as a discussion item rather than a re-action item.

Kryder: Mr. Chairman, I've solicited some ideas from people, could throw some ideas out for what this position could do, if you're looking for that.

Pearson: Certainly. I mean that's what they asked for so....

Kryder: They could be promoting development of trails along ditches. Teaching bicycle safety; I don't know how exactly how this one would be done but stopping drivers from talking trash about bike riders and forwarding work for the bike friendly community status that we will be talking about and perhaps promoting a bike share program.

Murphy: The talking trash comment could probably be reworded to more than educational program.

Kryder: For drivers.

Murphy: For drivers and also for bicyclists.

Pearson: Promoting respect amongst different users.

Kryder: There you go.
Pearson: Any other Committee members have any comments? Okay, well this was more or less my idea to begin with so I did some thinking on this and a little bit of research. One of the comments that I got back, maybe from Andrew, was that, is Commissioner Garrett the chair of the Policy Committee now?

Murphy: Yes.

Pearson: Okay. So Chair Garrett wanted a concise summary of what to expect for this person. The most concise summary that I could come up with would be that this person for each of the entities would be a single point of contact for all bike/ped issues and that becomes important because otherwise, if somebody, even within the staff or within the public comes, they don't know who to go to. If you designate a single point of contact that gives a focal point for someplace to go. In addition to that I think the initial thought is that we would, that each entity could find some existing employees, so it wouldn't be, we're not trying to burden the entities with another expenditure at this point. We're just trying to focus what this task is that happens in our community and then this person could, would essentially be a point person for, not only the public, but especially for the rest of the employees in the City. Currently or in the past there was a bicycle friendly task force that was put together. Andy, of course, was kind of leading that, which has been determined is not appropriate for that position and Andy has since moved away from that position in any case. And I think Andy had been associated so closely with bike/ped issues that without Andy there, there is nobody associated with bike/ped issues. So designating it as a position means that there will be some consistency so that maybe, maybe all they're doing is calling the meetings for the bike friendly task force but it also allows for proper succession when there is a change in personnel so that task stills exists, not depending upon some individual and past that, I also did a search on the internet for job description for bike/ped coordinator and I've pulled up five different job descriptions. There's a lot of consistency in them. I found one for Albuquerque. It starts coordinating all on street bike/ped issues, develop bike lane and route evaluation study; bike/ped auto safety campaign; update, print, distribute bike/ped map. It also included that they would report to the Transportation Division Manager. As to whom that person reports to is gonna depend on what's the best fit for the entity. In the City it might be in the Community Development Department rather than the Transportation Department. That's up to the entity to decide. Brownsville, Texas lists: technical expert for bike/ped issues; work across departments, which follows with one of my points that I had created; bike/ped data collection; MPO might be able to cover some of those if we have some bike counts. I guess we've had discussion on doing bike/ped data collection.

Murphy: MPO is certainly appropriate for data collection. And if you check this upcoming newsletter, you'll see some of that.
Pearson: Develop, update, promote bike/ped programs and plans; administrate and implement guidelines for bicycle parking. I mean parking is an important issue, I think, in the City. When they put in the new Walmart out there, they put in the wrong bike parking furniture, whatever you want to call it. And it shouldn’t be up to me, which I did. Go into City Planning Department and say “Hey, they’ve got the wrong stuff out there. They need to fix that.” That should have been done at the planning stage, where somebody could have said to whoever’s building it, that here are the bike parking that you can have. So there’s clearly some misinformation, or when those plans go through, they say oh, bike parking we can do whatever we want. But that’s not true in the City. The other ones, the only other addition that I saw, in Milwaukee they included ADA compliance. And the City of Las Cruces has some ADA issues. I think they have an ADA compliance officer but I think that most of those issues, there was a time when that was very, a big political football. And they had a separate, they hired a separate ADA position. And I think that they’ve addressed enough issues now that that’s fallen into a more routine aspect that it could fall within that area. Gainesville includes visits and prevents safety programs at local school systems. Which is something that we’re trying to work with, with the Safe Routes to School, in Las Cruces, with the school district. So those are all the issues that I have identified that hopefully will be concise enough that staff can present that to the Policy Committee in answer to their questions.

Herrera: Mr. Chair some of those things might be appropriate, more appropriate for the MPO to handle. For instance, prioritizing facilities, because we want to do that regionally, not just entity specific. And then, I think distributing and coming up with the maps and those kinds of things, I mean that’s what the MPO kind of does. And I think, taking a regional approach is much better than specific entities.

Pearson: Yeah, there might be something where the MPO comes up with the map, and then it’s up to the City to publicly distribute, I don’t know. That’s beyond my pay grade.

Murphy: I think some of those duties, can follow under the purview of the MPO. You know, if the hope is to add these duties to an existing person, then we don’t want to give them a full time job duty list. So I think if we be selective about being the single point of contact, that’s probably, that’s probably going to be the major thing to hit.

Pearson: Right, yeah, I think that’s really what, at this time, I think after they are in a position, and they work six months or a year, they’ll find out that they will have to budget a separate half time, whatever, position. But that’s still to be learned. So right now it’s just important that we have a single point of contact for both the public and for staff for the entities.
Herrera: Mr. Chair, I did mention that at the Policy Committee meeting when they kind of asked what the purpose of the position would be. And they basically said a single point of contact. So, I mean I don’t know how much clear we can be.

Murphy: Right, and we really, somebody, somebody to take the plans that the MPO develops through this committee and actually move them to the, to the technical staff that implements them, and again, eventually gets them built.

Pearson: Because the City’s been working, fairly well I think, on the engineering side. I think the miss might be with the public, and communication with the public. And maybe communication, like with the bicycle friendly community application. Somebody in the City has to take the lead on that one, so that would be, so might be a task that’s assigned to that person. So have we beaten this one? So it’s over?

Murphy: I guess that segways us in Bicycle Community Friendly Community Certification?

7.2 City of Las Cruces Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Discussion

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

The BPAC requested an ongoing Discussion Item to discuss the process for renewing the certification.

Pearson: So we’re on the next item, the Bicycle Friendly Community Certification item.

Murphy: And I think this was discovered at the BPAC meeting, that this calendar year we’re not due to, the committee’s not due to apply and, but the committee wanted it to remain on the agenda, so that it can have continued discussion. We’ve talked with Santa Fe MPO and learned some things about what, or Andrew has learned some things about some of their involvement in Santa Fe’s recent League certification, that we’ll be able to pass on to, whoever, from the City, gets charged with shepherding this application.

Pearson: I guess the main point we’ve got to try to figure out is who in the City is gonna do that, and how can that happen? We’ve still got about a year to go before the deadline, but at the rate things are going, that year is going to go real fast.

Murphy: Yes, and we have had, on a staff level, discussion I think with members of the Parks and Recreation Department, the Public Works Department, Transportation, Community Development and the Sustainability Office. So several City staff people, that are aware of this upcoming, this upcoming application, and we should be able to have, the information should be ready to be populated once that person’s identified.
Pearson: So we don’t really have much more from this committee to say about this, at this point.

Murphy: Right. I think just, just keeping this committee up, up to speed on what’s happening behind the scenes.

Kryder: Mr. Chairman, we had mentioned, I think at the last meeting that we weren’t at all clear on what was the criteria for moving, from say a Bronze to a Silver level. And this takes a little bit of study, but it’s actually a pretty good indicator. They’re saying that there is no set standard that they use. It’s, I guess considered on a case by case basis. However, they have summarized here, more or less, where the Silver level cities are at. And I think that gives us some good indicators as to what to shoot for, in terms of moving us to the next level. There was also a comment on their website, to the effect that getting a Bronze level designation, a Bronze level community may, in fact, not seem particularly friendly to cyclists, which would fit with my experience trying to cycle around here. So I’m definitely for trying to move to the next level.

Pearson: So this info graphic is from the League of American Bicyclists and it has a lot of good information on it. Have we been able to share this with the City staff, whoever we’re talking, MPO is talking to?

Murphy: I have not seen this particular graphic before.

Pearson: I had sent it to Andrew, who past it around

Murphy: Ok. He may have, just to update you on him, MPO activities, we’re tracking crashes, not only automobile crashes, but bicycle and pedestrian crashes as well. Through MAP 21, we’ll be developing performance measures, and key among those are safety performance measurers and, I envision that we will have separate goals, by mode. We’re not going to concentrate just on one mode, when evaluating the performance of our MPO area. As far as ridership, we’ve also gotten on board, and I know we’ve made the report to this committee, the trail counters, so we’re tracking, we’re continuously tracking the use on the, on the multi-use trails. We recently purchased six more of those counters, so we’ll pretty much have them on most, pretty much all of the different routes at all times. So we’ll have a much better idea of the overall usage of those facilities. It’s becoming, it’s becoming part of, it’s getting integrated into our traffic count program. So we’re, you know I think that will probably help with our evaluation from the League, is that we’re integrating bicycles as an integral part of the, of our activities.

Pearson: So Map…, I have a couple of questions for you. MAP21 requires performance standards, performance measures for transportation for automobiles I believe, but not for, not the multi-modal aspects. And that was called out because there
is currently a senate and house bill in place, to require, to add those performance
measurers for the multi-modal aspects. And, so will the MPO do those multi-
modal ones anyways?

Murphy: The national goals are really, the language, the language out of congress really
doesn't say automobiles only. I think that is just because for sixty years, that's
what's mostly been concerned with, so that's the data that people have been
collecting, and that's most easily available. But I think, as we make our data
collections more inclusive, we'll have those in order to do it. I haven't had a
really good chance to study it, but FHWA, or I should say USDOT released the first
rule making last week, on the performance measures. They really centered
around reducing crashes and reducing crashes per VMT. We have opportunity
to comment into that. That's really not multi-modal measures. I thinking we'll be
making those comments. As far as from the attitude itself, the, once the rule
making is finalized, NMDOT will have one year in which to delineate their
performance measurers out of those, and then after that, the MPO will have six
months. So we're, a minimum of 18 months out from this. But I anticipate
NMDOT to mention the multi-modal aspect. That's in their mission statement,
that's in their current long range plan, is being a multi-modal agency. So I expect
that. Additionally, I think their strong sentiment on our policy committee that we
do have performance measures that encompass each of the modes. So I think,
barring a whole self-change of leadership at that level, I see our MPO developing
performance measures for each mode.

Pearson: That's wonderful. The other question, you were talking about the multi-use trails,
didn't the City open up a new one off of Sonoma Ranch someplace? Is that
true? And if you're doing counts on there? When you presented the counts
before, you had a nice little map that showed the multi-use trails, and all the
segments. So if that's been opened up, I would love to see that added to that
map, and hopefully the new counts on there.

Murphy: If it is indeed opened up, we will, we will go out to count it.

Pearson: I'm not exactly sure where it is. I've heard it's like Sonoma, Sonoma Ranch,
Sonoma Springs, or a connection between Sonoma Ranch and Roadrunner.
Someplace in there.

Murphy: I'll have to check on that... I'm not familiar with that specific....

Pearson: I think that's the trail that was, that used RTP funds. A Recreational Trail
Program funds that the City had.

Murphy: That may, is it along an arroyo?

Pearson: I think so.
Murphy: Okay, I think we’ve heard of that, and Orlando’s nodding to me yes we are planning on counting that.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, Chowdhury and Tom, I think Chowdhury that you told me that the counters do pedestrians and cyclists. They don’t differentiate between the two?

Murphy: That’s correct. Their infrareds. They’re infrared counts that just count capture the warm body moving past it. Thought that this is a beginning of data collection, and it was cost prohibitive to go up to technology that purports to make that differentiation, but hasn’t proven itself.

Herrera: And that’s okay, because that’s what some of the other MPOs in the State are doing to, just because of the cost, and the new technology changing. But I’m wondering if there is some kind of analysis or some kind of assumption that could be made from Mode share. And I’m kind of wondering if really that’s something the State should make assumptions on. I think it would be different per areas, so I’m not sure if it would be appropriate at the State level, but if the MPO could look into that. Because I know for El Paso MPO, I have to do their CMAP reporting into the Federal system. And so they came up with the formula for mode share. So they do like a one percent (1%) cyclist mode share or something like that.

Murphy: I think there’s a couple of ways we can go about it. We can look to the American Community survey, and do a mode share assumption though that. We could also probably deploy some strategic spot counters to have a human out there to see what the split is. And then I’ve also become aware of the video technology, is also coming down in price, and that’s one thing that I was, we’re entertaining purchasing, but I hadn’t talked with it about, with my NMDOT rep on paying for it yet. Essentially, it’s a video traffic counter. It’s got applications, not only could it do vehicle counts on dangerous sections, where we do not have, we do not have the space to really tie down, or for instance we don’t count the road segment of Spruce between Triviz and Telshor, one because queueing vehicles really don’t, it’s unreliable because of the queueing vehicles and we don’t get accurate counts off the pneumatic tubes. And additionally there’s no safe place to secure the box on that. So a chance where a video counter would do. This video counter would also be useful for turning count movements at intersections. It’s fairly inexpensive piece of equipment, the drawback is its proprietary software to actually analyze the video stream. But they have recently changed their business practice, where you now own the video stream, and if you wanted to, you could have somebody sit down and watch the film.

Pearson: And that’s the obvious...

Murphy: And, right, which we, which wasn’t available two years ago. So we would do that, and with the case of a mode split count, it would be fairly simple to have a student intern sit and watch, and watch it at 16 times the speed, and slow it down when there is something to see. So we are looking to, looking into the purchase
of that, once I make sure I won’t get my thumbnails pulled out, spending that
much.

Pearson: The Missouri I-25 project might be a candidate for that. I don’t know if, it seems
like the traffic signals would be involved in that, on Missouri. Anything that we
can capture along Triviz, which would include the trail that might be a good
candidate.

Murphy: There are many applications for that, but it would be, it would be something we
have in our, in our truck of tools, and would be able to deploy, and would have
usefulness for bicycle and pedestrian issues as well.

Pearson: Do we have any other comments?

Kryder: Yes. I just wanted to ask... they’ve got five or six different categories on this
chart. And one way to approach this, if we’re working toward moving to a Silver
designation, would be to pick several of these, maybe one or two from each
category, to focus on or to recommend to our member entity designated people.
So for instance, under “Enforcement”, which is to the far left, the first one is “A
Law Enforcement/Bicycling Liaison”. At the Silver level they saying that you
would definitely have something like that. Then under “Education”, one that
looked like perhaps some low hanging fruit, was the “Annual Offering of Adult
Bicycling Skills Classes”. Moving from one to at least two per year, at the Silver
level. It seems like it out to be doable. Under “Engineering”, the middle one,
“Total Bicycle Network Mileage, To Total Road Network Mileage at about 30%”
might be something that we can move toward, or recommend member entities
more toward. Under “Evaluation”, it says “One bike program staff person per so
many citizens”. This might be useful as we talk to the member entities. For
instance if we’ve got about 100,000 people in Las Cruces....

Pearson: That’s in our resolution remember.

Kryder: .....We’ve got about 100,000 people in Las Cruces, so that would be basically, a
¾ time bicycle liaison, is what they recommend. Then under “Encouragement”
the middle one is “An active bicycle advisory committee”. Perhaps we’re already
there on that one. And then “Tracking”, staff was talking about the key
outcomes, which I guess we’re already doing. So those might be, or if we, as a
group, feel that different ones would be the appropriate one to target. But we
could, as a group, perhaps, recommend which ones to go after.

Pearson: On the Education item, I could speak directly to that. As a qualified person that
teaches these classes. We have had very little success at actually marketing the
classes. We’ve got a group of LCIs in Las Cruces, who would be more than
happy to teach these. It’s a matter of gathering the students together. We’ve
been teaching Bicycle Basics, which is a lower level course than what they’re
talking about probably; which is the Traffic Skills 101. We've tried to teach that once a year, and we've had varying degrees of success.

Kryder: Is the issue the marketing, do you think?

Pearson: I think that's mainly the issue. So something, tying that in with law enforcement, a traffic diversion type of thing. If we increase the enforcement for some of the cyclists that are running red lights, or soft signs. If they got diverted to our traffic skills, then we can kill two birds with one stone essentially. So that involves cooperation, not only with Las Cruces City government, with the Administrative side of the Police Department, but also with the court system. And I don't know, the court system hasn't been approach, as far as I know. And it's a matter, it has to be interest of some three parties in order to bring that together at least. The Educators, which finding the right time to do that. We could probably figure out doing a class once every other month. The Law Enforcement, who actually write the citations, and the court system that says they would agree to, which would be the chief judge, the municipal judge probably, agreeing to divert the, those people to a class instead of $100.00 ticket or something. Maybe do a $50 class for those people, but not criminal citation. But that's all good discussion that needs to be brought forward as part of the Bicycle Friendly Community.

Pearson: On to street treatment discussion.

7.3 Street Treatment Discussion

At their January meeting, the BPAC requested information regarding street treatments on Valley Drive and Melendres Street.

Siddiqui: Following up with the committee’s interest, MPO staff spoke with the ?? Department of the City. And what we got from them, is that as of now they don’t have any upcoming projects coming up. However, if there is a street rehabilitation project, specifically pavement rehabilitation, they would happy to, it would be more convenient for them to mark bicycle striping for example, with that layover project. These are the things that I was told.

Herrera: Where is Melendres at.... Is that north or south of Alameda?

Pearson: It’s a north-south street that runs... you know where Mesilla is, in front of the train station? It’s the next one east. So it runs from Main Street to past Picacho essentially. It will jog through the, it stretches from.....

Casillas: EBID?

Murphy: No it's a city street.

Kryder: Yeah, EBID is on Melendres
Murphy: Oh, the office, of yeah. I was thinking irrigation.

Pearson: I think where this came up from Melendres, discussion came up, is that they have the traffic bulb outs on Melendres. And I think the bicyclist community didn’t appreciate that. I don’t think the traveling community does either, but, auto community. Because you can tell by all the tire marks that are on those bulb outs. So I think the discussion came up that we didn’t want that to continue. Were we also talking about Valley as part of this discussion?

Herrera: Well that’s what my interest was in it. Because we do have an upcoming project. The NMDOT has an upcoming project in 2016, from Picacho to Avenida on Valley Drive. We need to go looking at possibly, actually ???? construction, adding sidewalks, curbing gutter, and

Pearson: And that’s, I remember when this committee first formed back in early 90’s, late 80’s, Valley was identified as a study corridor for bicycle facility. And I think we’ve got a large right of way there, so, and we’ve have fatalities, both on the NMDOT controlled portion, and on the City controlled portion. Do we have any information as to if the City has any plans to do something with their half? On the CIP or whatever?

Murphy: I don’t believe it’s a City CIP project. And I will have to check with Streets to see if they have any resurfacing projects on the horizon for south of Avenida de Mesilla. But I can say, I don’t think that there’s any project that’s soon in the pipeline.

Pearson: Cause maybe we should bring it to the City’s attention, that this needs to rise to the level, probably requires a capital improvement to add sidewalks, bicycle facilities and hopefully match with what the State would do. All the way from Picacho to Main Street.

Murphy: That would be excellent. I think when we do the, we are in the cycle for the MTP update. And certainly we, it would be a good thing to add that to one of our lists of priorities. I do believe Valley is listed as a Tier I, for bicycle facility in the current plan. But, to my memory that’s, that specific project is not called out as one of the top priorities. And perhaps that should change through this update.

Pearson: And we might even have enough right of way to put a segregated lane there, instead of just a lane, like, I can’t think of an example off hand, right now for some reason. But just, well Picacho for example, where it’s essentially a shoulder. Maybe there’s enough right of way, where we can put a four foot....

Murphy: Protected......

Pearson: .... Four foot protected area, and then the bicycle lane, and then a sidewalk.
Murphy: That could be an interesting demonstration project, and is included in some of
the treatments, in the proposed, some of the proposed standards that the City is
evaluating, or thinking of adopting.

Pearson: National Bike Senate Secretary Fox mentioned that they’re doing the Tiger
Grants again. I don’t know if that’s an appropriate project for Tiger Grant. I don’t
know how, if that’s NMDOT application, or

Murphy: Tiger Grants pretty much are minimum ten million dollar ($10,000,000.00)
projects.

Pearson: Oh, we can spend that.

Murphy: I know we can spend that.

Herrera: The Tiger Grants are really large kind of, I don’t know how to explain it. It’s
they’re just the really big projects that. That’s probably, I mean, the City if
welcomed to apply, but there is a lot of effort that goes into the applications, for
something that probably isn’t gonna...

Pearson: So it’s something that Albuquerque should have done for the Paseo del Norte,
where there’s been...

Herrera: Yeah

Pearson: ...problems with bicycle facilities up there?

Murphy: And the City’s current focus, if they do go down the route of the Tiger Grants, I
understand, they’ll be looking at City wide ITS implementation, and certainly
some, bicycles could probably be benefited in something of that nature as well. I
know Mr. Roman, from the City is looking at possibly, putting together an
application along those lines.

Herrera: And just further on Tiger Grants, the DOTs can apply for them, but it’s a
separate, I mean it’s separate from the entities. So the local governments don’t
have to go through the DOT. We all just apply to the same pot of funding, and
then they award. However the DOT’s don’t have priority over local governments
at all. We’re just all in the same pot. So I think it’s a good opportunity for some
local governments to get a lot of money.

Pearson: Ok, I wasn’t aware of the scale of the Tiger Grant.

Herrera: Yeah. They’re really for larger projects. And if I can just talk a little bit more
about Valley Drive, just because this is, it’s an important project. We’ve set aside
quite a bit of money for it. I think it’s eleven million dollars ($11,000,000.00), so
we want to get it right. But we just had an RFP got out and, we should be awarding to a consultant, probably here in the next few weeks. And they’ll be having stakeholder meetings. And I think it's very important to have somebody from this committee, besides me, go to those meetings and be a voice for the cycling community. Because you did mention that by you Mr. Chair, but they're specifically looking at the best treatments for cyclists. They don't already have it in their heads, just an on-road bike lane. They're gonna study that. And we do have a lot of right of way there, so we can do a number of things.

Pearson: Okay, so maybe you should identify this committee as a stakeholder, and then we can decide as a committee who besides you should attend?

Herrera: Yes. Cause I'll be there, but it's better if they hear from community members.

Kryder: Would they be day time meetings, or evening meetings?

Herrera: Mostly evening meetings. We normally have the stakeholder meetings, or try to, when more people can attend.

Pearson: So there wouldn't be a restriction if Leslie and I both wanted to go. That should be fine?

Herrera: No.

Pearson: No?

Herrera: Ok fine, we don’t....

Murphy: I think she meant no restriction.

Herrera: If you’re a stakeholder, you’re a stakeholder. I don’t think we put a number on how many people that is. {too low, unintelligible}

Pearson: Okay any other discussion on this item?

Pearson: On to the next item, the best practices discussion.

7.4 Best Practices Discussion

Murphy: Approximately a year ago we met at this very table to discuss concerns about doing, implementing or recommending some best practices from this committee to pass on to our agencies, as far as implementing bicycle facilities, specifically cross sections. Within that time period, the City of Las Cruces has been reevaluating their design standards. Essentially a work item that was compelled for them to do when they adopted their complete streets resolution. And staff from various City department have been meeting to identify strategies and ways
to move forward with this. The committee, that committee of staff had their last
meeting this past Friday. What they’ve done, and the center pass out that I sent
around is one chapter of a complete manual that is put out by the Institute of
Transportation Engineers. These are, basically it’s an entire design guideline,
that the, that this employee committee’s going to recommend to the City Council
to adopt in whole, as the design book for City major streets. And I passed it out
so that you can view, particularly they have some recommended practice for
bicycle lane treatments at intersections. The table 10.3 lists those down there. It
covers many of the issues that have been brought to light by this committee.
Hopefully it will be adopted by the City as official policy. Their next steps is
they’re going to have some public outreach meetings. Andy Hume is the staff
member in charge of that outreach. He hasn’t identified any specific meeting
times as of yet, but he has assured me that there will be a round of public input,
and then additionally, the council adoption process offers other opportunities for
public invite. The second handout that I’ve given you is Chapter 8 from a
document called “The Model Design Manual For Living Streets”. That was the
alternate approach that they were looking at. They decided to go with the IT, the
main adoptive one, because it was, it essentially appealed to the engineers
within that working group more. But they decided that they wanted to kind of
move forward with the Living Streets documents when it comes to non-major
thoroughfares, the local streets, and ultimately the minor collectors. They would
like to use this document to guide their designs.

Kryder: So this other one’s for the big streets?

Murphy: The other one is for the big streets, yes. And we can make the entire, the entire
document, they’re searchable on the web, but we can certainly make the
electronic copies of these documents available to you. But they’re a couple
hundred pages each, so I just kind of printed out the highlight.

Pearson: This looks like a lot of the work that we were trying to do.

Murphy: Right. So that work was on going, while you had directed that it be done. It just
happened that the City Council wanted City staff to work on it as well.

Pearson: From our committee perspective, we were talking about maybe adding an
addendum to the Transportation, Transport 2040 Transportation, MPO
Transportation plan right?

Murphy: Yeah, that was the discussion.

Pearson: That’s still appropriate I believe, isn’t it?

Murphy: It certainly could be appropriate, I think from a work level effort. I would rather
see it rolled into the update, which is due next June, at this point. I think that
way, I don’t see any controversy with putting these ideas into the Transportation
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plan. I wouldn’t see the need to have it go through its own distinct amendment process. We just include it in the update.

Pearson: So we can feel good that what we, our meetings did, were productive and gave forth good ideas that are being listened to.

Murphy: Right. And then it will be up to, hopefully, that individual from earlier in the meeting, for them to get implemented from their local agencies.

Herrera: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a discussion that needs to happen. This kind of thing is great for new projects, or is you’re doing major reconstruction. But a lot of the projects that the NMDOT does and probably the City and County, is maintenance work. So they do a lot of chip sealing and that kind of stuff. There aren’t any, really, guidelines for that kind of work. And I think that’s probably where a lot of money gets spent.

Pearson: I think that’s where we’ve complained about previously, where projects, you do a chip sealing and they come back and they put the lanes lines back exactly where they were, when it’s an opportunity to improve the situation. I think I could call out any number of city intersections and NMDOT intersections on that.

Murphy: That’s correct, and I apologize for not anticipating that question. Both of these publications do have extensive chapters on retrofitting. Concerning stuff within the retrofit, or the reconstruction, well reconstruction is kind of big, but the normal maintenance that occurs, such as the chip sealing. So I would like to make the entire document available to you. I think Jolene brings up a very good point. A lot happens on smaller projects. And given the state of federal funding and what our commitments are to maintain what we already have, I don’t see that we’re gonna have a lot of large projects. So where were gonna gain ground is on the smaller projects, when opportunities arise.

Pearson: I can offer a real world example, on my way to this meeting on my bicycle, NM Bike Route 1, NM 28 at the intersection with Boutz, I was in the bike lane, the lane, actually it’s a shoulder at that point, but the lane line goes all the way up to the intersection. And a car came up behind me, had its blinker turned on, so fine, it’s gonna wait, but it decided it wanted to come up beside me, like he was gonna turn in front of me. There’s no clear indication that this was a stupid thing for that driver to do. And that might be something where stopping the lane line back, it discusses even a bus length or something, or going to a dotted dashed line or doing something. Maybe we have some signage where we put in the “yield to bicyclists, begin right turn” kind of thing. That’s something that would never change unless it’s put in somehow, and through a maintenance program.

Herrera: And not just the intersections, but I mean the roads themselves. I was gonna talk about this a little bit later in the updates. The Valley Drive, the chip seal that was done came from the City limits headed North. There’s a drop off in the shoulder.
That's an NMDOT maintenance project. So we made a commitment to not do this anymore, and then we did it again. So obviously we're gonna fix it. We're waiting for the temperatures to warm up. I think it's getting that word to the right people at the right time that makes it happen. So that's something we always talk about implementing all this stuff, and that's fine, but just the basic things like (inaudible) I mean that's a really basic thing that nobody every talks about, except this group.

Pearson: And if we're the only ones talking about it, things happen and then we have to be the bad, then we have to complain about it, which we don't want to be. We want it to be done right the first time.

Herrera: Maybe, sorry Tom, maybe when we're defining kind of the scope for this Point of Contact person, I don't know if we can explicitly say that somehow, but ...

Kryder: Coordinate with Maintenance projects.

Herrera: I mean not just kind of the big projects, but the maintenance ones.

Murphy: And I think also the upcoming performance measures will give us opportunity as well. I think we need to just, citing an example from 15 years ago, 20 years ago NMDOT performance metrics or how they rate how well their engineers are doing operating their shops. We have, you know bridges are famous for being in substandard condition, but I think one of the causes, it's not really discussed much, and why it got to that point was, the folks whose job were to maintain the bridges and the roadways, they were judged on how many miles they did. And it was in, they would look a lot better if they did 90 miles of resurfacing of a road, and then skip the half mile of bridges along that same section. You know they would be able to do twice as much that may and they would look twice as good. Because nobody held them, they were held to that standard, that bridges are the special case and needs to be held up as well. I think the same thing with bicycle facilities. I think we out to find a way, or do our maintenance performance measures that, if you rehab ten miles of roadway, you get your gold star, but if you rehab nine miles of roadway that also have multi-modal facilities including bicycles, pedestrian whatever is appropriate in the context, you get two gold stars. So that we make, not just the absolute number be the king, but what the quality of that work is. And I think that's one of the things I would like us to keep in mind as we move forward. Not only adopting our performance measures, but adopting our MTP. Kind of every discussion that we have.

Pearson: State long range plan. MPO has a section that's gonna go in that. That discussion can happen there also.

Murphy: I've mentioned that to Rosa as well, the idea of giving special credit for the roadways that are designated New Mexico State Bike Racks. Give the
maintenance engineers a little extra credit for maintaining those roadways edge to edge, rather than just driving lanes.

Herrera: And just something that Rose is working, she's just kind of getting the internal EPE committee off the ground now, but one of the first things that she wants to do is create a whole bunch of standards for the DOT. Basically just saying when you do this type of work, you will do this at minimum. So that there's no question. It's just automatic. You pull out the manual, you look what kind of work you're doing, and that's what you do. So I think that's what the districts have said that they want. That's something that she's working on, and I think, at least from our perspective, also the State Long Range Plan will talk about that a lot too. We're changing the mindsets, so it will be good if both the county and city could follow suit.

Murphy: That's all. I email out those electronic documents to the committee, so you can look at them. Check out the section on the retrofitting as well.

Pearson: The next discussion, which is the striping plans discussion

7.5 Striping Plans Discussion

Pearson: So we had some concerns about the Avenida de Mesilla I-10 bridge construction projects. And Jolene shared some striping plans that raised some questions, and we have new striping plans. Do you want to describe what's going on Jolene?

Herrera: So previously we had in the striping plans, just the shoulders, well there wasn't any signage for cyclists. There wasn't any striping on the pavement to dedicate bike lanes, or any of that stuff. So what you see in front of you is the new improved striping plans, which include dedicated bike lanes, and they're on the roadway, but at least there's not ??? and then all the signage to go with that. If you all will take a minute to look at it, I think one of the main areas of concern is on the third page. That intersection where there's a right turn lane. In particular one area. But we have the dashed lines and then the bike lane goes through that too.

Pearson: Previously it was just a shoulder line that went all the way through, which if you were a not very careful cyclist, you might just continue until you were well into the danger area for right turn only vehicles.

Herrera: Right, so that area was of concern. And then on the next page, the other direction, there's another area there that was made a dedicated right turn lane. The contractor has these plans in hand. They're not going to be striping for some time, but...
Pearson: But these are the plans so that's what will happen. These are the kinds of standards I would love to see for our projects.

Herrera: And I think that the development is ?? to the south region design, have recently, this is a current example, have been made more aware of things that they should be doing. So really, this is something that should have been taken care of and considered at the beginning of the project. It wasn't. Luckily, we were able to catch it in time to make these changes, but I think we're kind of changing the mindset, like I said earlier, to where this is going to be a consideration from the start.

Pearson: Just to use the example of Motel Boulevard, the south bound on Motel isn't that friendly. North bound happens to have, has a big, has too much actually. I think that could have been reconfigured, to be much more friendly for both sides. So this is good work, and we are thankful for it.

Herrera: And just so you know, cause one of the concerns that the project development engineer had, with these modifications is, his comment was “Well the bike lane just ends there, with the end of our project.” And so one thing that we've added, heading east, so if you're heading east, Avenida to turn on to Valley. So it ends at Hickory, the project. And where the McDonald's is, this current project. And so one of the things that we did for the Valley Drive project was pick up that little piece. So the bike lane will continue through and then connect to whatever we do on Valley Drive. For a couple years it's gonna be a little bit weird, but once we kind of get that corridor done

Pearson: That whole piece is NMDOT?

Herrera: Yeah. It's yes.

Kryder: This is Valley where?

Herrera: Valley Drive to Avenida de Mesilla. And so it's that little section from Valley to Hickory, to where the McDonald's is, is not part of this project, but it will be part of the Valley Drive project. And the one thing I like that they did is they put the “Wrong Way” signs for cyclists.

Pearson: Yeah, I saw that on the Picacho Plans also. Especially in this part of town, I think it's very important for the so called “invisible cyclist”. The primary cause for wrong way riders.

Herrera: That's all I had unless there were any questions.

Pearson: That's a good example of how the facilities can educate the users. Any other comments? So we're on to Committee and Staff Comments.
8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

8.1 Local Projects update

Murphy: We have some TIP administrative modifications, included in your packet. If anybody has any questions over any of those. And then also, the booklet that was passed around, we had a meeting last week with the consultant and NMDOT who's conducting the Road Safety audit for San Augustine Pass. They made this available for us to pass out to this committee. Just note that this is a draft document. Trent Doolittle and Gabby Apodaca had some serious concerns with some of the content of the document, and they sent it back to the consultant, in order do it. Their primary things were, there was potential solutions that were discussed, at the meetings that were not included in cost estimates. Particularly Mr. Doolittle was adamant that he wanted to see all those within the document, so that this would be a more useful report for District 1, moving forward, in order to implement things. Other than that, I think that that project is moving forward quickly.

Pearson: I think you're probably talking about potential to do a trail, segregated bike trail through the pass, which may be cost prohibitive, but.

Murphy: It would be cost prohibitive, but Trent didn't want the consultant to make that decision. He wanted that to be an option in there, and then others who have control.

Pearson: The Tiger Grant would.

Murphy: Maybe get a Tiger Grant. We had one comment during Transport 2040 that we lower the Pass. Tiger Grant that. Pass this around for your review and you can contact staff if you have any questions, or wish for us to convey some feedback back to NMDOT or the consultant.

Pearson: So since this is a draft, is there another draft that's gonna come out? Or is there gonna be a final? Or what's the process?

Murphy: I think it was intended that this would be a draft followed by a final, but I think due to the severity of the DOT comments, I think we'll probably see another draft. I'll have to check on that to be certain.

Herrera: We will definitely be seeing another draft. There were just some really blatant things that were commented on at the last draft that were not included in this draft. So those are definitely needing to be put in.

Pearson: So can that draft be shared with this committee when it's available?
Herrera: Yes. Even if you don’t take time to read the whole thing, if you would all just please look at page 9 and beyond. That’s the really important part. The findings and suggestions. So we want feedback on this document. Just because the consultants have never ridden that section of roadway. And maybe some of you have, or know people who have. Would these fixes actually be useful? That’s kind of what we want to get at. And if there’s other things.

Pearson: Any other local updates or NMDOT updates?

Farnham: Mr. Chair I talked with Louis Grijalva, Project Development on one project, it’s a trail project along the Rio Grande from Picacho north up to Outfall Channel. It is a TAP project, it is TAP funding. It is about $450,000.00 and that includes the City Match. This project is to remove the existing gravel surface and it gets replaced with a permeable type of surface pavement.

Pearson: You’re saying the treatment that the Outfall Channel has?

Farnham: Well no, I think the Outfall Channel was just asphalt surfacing. So this supposed to have actual, permeable type pavement design. There’s also other amenities that are included, and that’s benches, dog waste stations, trash cans, along that route. It is still waiting on the agreement between NMDOT and the City. To have project authorization from target dates is August 15. There’s, just on a couple of other projects, Bruins Lane that goes West from Valley, through the high school, Mayfield High School. That is under construction and that does include the bike lanes on both sides. I’m sure Jerry must have probably filled the committee on that one. There is a trail system that goes from Roadrunner to Sonoma, ped, I believe it’s also bike and it’s asphalt paved, that Parks and Rec, Parks, Cathy Matthews was the lead person on that for the department. That’s over by Morningstar. So you got the Las Cruces dam and this is north of Morningstar. It kind of starts at the high school there, and connects Roadrunner to Sonoma.

Pearson: That sounds like the one that I’ve, has that been done, or is that under construction?

Farnham: That’s actually done.

Pearson: That’s the piece that I was thinking about that maybe that the MPO could do the traffic, or the counters on.

Farnham: I’ve walked it several times already, and haven’t ridden my bike there yet, but plan to. And that’s all I have.

Pearson: As far as traffic counts, I was out on the Outfall Channel Sunday and you count Councilor Sorg as one of the riders of that. I saw him on the trail. Any other committee member comments?
8.2 NMDOT Projects update

Jolene Herrera gave updates on San Augustine Pass and the Picacho project.

Pearson: I haven’t been up there. *(discussing San Augustine Pass)*. There was the project reconstruction, or re---something. Has that happened, or is it still under....

Herrera: It’s on going.

Pearson: So there’s work going on out there?

Herrera: Yes there is. And they are doing full-width.

Pearson: Do you know, off hand, when that might be finished?

Herrera: They were moving a lot pretty quick. If you give me just a minute Mr. Chair I’ll look that up. So they have 90 calendar days. It started February 18.

Pearson: Those are work days, so it....

Herrera: It’s calendar days though. They’ll work every day of the week.

Pearson: OK, so sometime in May, by the end of May they probably should be done.

Herrera: Yes.

Pearson: And how is the Picacho project going?

Herrera: That one’s going very well. I drove it today. They’ve got most of the striping done, most of the signing done. They are still working on some structure extensions. But I think they have probably just a few more weeks there.

Pearson: Cause I went out to La Llorona and I saw that there was construction... the barrels were there.

Herrera: Yeah, it’s actually, it’s a really nice project. The striping turned out very good. I saw three cyclists riding today. They were actually using their bike lane.

Pearson: Any other committee member comments? I guess I have a couple. I was gonna talk about the meeting configuration and you’ve already acted on that. Leslie had mentioned that to Tom and I think we’re pretty happy with this. So long as the recording works out, I guess if there’s complaints with that, we have adjust for that, but even we if have, four more committee members, I think we could still fit around this table. And we still have the chairs over here.

Murphy: I think with a little more advanced notice, I think they can accommodate more mics too. I didn’t give Dennis enough advance notice.
Pearson: Okay, well maybe we should just plan on this as a configuration then, and then we can take care of that.

Murphy: Will do.

Pearson: Last meeting we talked about membership and we were talking about the by-laws, and that brought up attendance. Our Town of Mesilla employee member hasn’t been here but once. I wonder if we should ask staff to send a letter the Town of Mesilla asking about that position, or we should just schedule a vote to revoke that position and have it reappointed, at the next meeting. What’s staff suggestion on how we should handle that?

Murphy: Staff’s suggestion would be that, that we can send a letter to Town of Mesilla and advise them that the staff has not attended.

Pearson: Ok, can we do that? Anybody else have any comments?

9. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

10. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Jolene Herrera motioned to adjourn.
Leslie Kryder seconds the motion.
All in favor.

Chair