



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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 **July 15, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org).

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. May 20, 2014 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Every Biker Counts Report Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Renewal Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.3. BPAC Annual Report Discussion _____ **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**

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

3 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory
4 Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held
5 May 20, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government
6 Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
9 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT Rep)
10 Albert Casillas (proxy - Dona Ana County Rep)
11 Scott Farnham (City of Las Cruces Rep)
12 Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
13 Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla)
14

15 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)
16 David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)
17 Sean Higgins
18 Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Community Rep)
19 Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)
20

21 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO)
22 Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO)
23 Andrew Wray (MPO)
24

25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Aaron Chavarria, NMDOT
26

27 **1. CALL TO ORDER**
28

29 Meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.
30

31 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
32

33 Pearson: First order is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda?
34

35 Murphy: None from staff.
36

37 Pearson: Hearing none, I'll hear a motion to approve the agenda as presented.
38

39 Casillas: Motion to approve the minutes.
40

41 Leisher: Second that motion.
42

43 Pearson: Motion and a second to approve the minutes as presented.
44

45 All in favor.
46

1 Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none, that passes.

2
3 Murphy: I believe, in point, that was an approval for the, motion approval of the agenda.

4
5 Pearson: Yes.

6
7 Murphy: Ok. I believe I heard someone say it was the approval of the minutes.

8
9 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

10
11 **3.1 March 18, 2014**

12
13 Pearson: Ok. The next item is the approval of the minutes for March 18, 2014. I guess
14 we can call for a motion to approve.

15
16 Casillas: Motion to approve the minutes of March 18, 2014.

17
18 Pearson: Ok and is there a second?

19
20 Herrera: I second.

21
22 Pearson: Okay, any discussion on the minutes? Any changes from anybody? Not
23 hearing any changes, go ahead and vote, or no discussion, we'll vote. All in
24 favor, aye.

25
26 All in favor.

27
28 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

29
30 Pearson: The next item is an action item, 5.1 Amendment to the 2014-2019
31 Transportation Improvement Program. Oh, I know what we should have done
32 also; we should have gone through a roll call in order to identify everybody
33 that's here, which I always forget to do, so why don't we just go around, why
34 don't we just start with staff, Tom, and go around and identify everybody so
35 that everybody knows who is here.

36
37 Murphy: Tom Murphy, Mesilla Valley MPO

38
39 Wray: Andrew Wray, Mesilla Valley MPO

40
41 Siddiqui: Chowdhury Siddiqui, Mesilla Valley MPO

42
43 Casillas: Albert Casillas, Dona Ana County

44
45 Leisher: Mark Leisher, Dona Ana County Citizen

Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Town of Mesilla.

Pearson: George Pearson, Chair, City of Las Cruces Citizen Representative

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, New Mexico DOT

Pearson: Now we'll go on to the action item.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00100	2014	NMDOT	I-25 Missouri Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction/Widening & Addition of Auxiliary Lane	Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8
G100030	2015 & 2016	Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs Roads	Unpaved Section of Both Roadways	Road Reconstruction – Pave unpaved sections	\$610,000 in FY2014 for design, \$5,950,000 in FY2015 for construction, \$3,220,000 in FY2016 for construction
LC00140	2017	US 70	Intersection with 17 th St.	New Traffic Signals and intersection improvements	New Project
LC00210	2014 & 2015	Goathill Rd	At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (east of Dona Ana Rd, north of Las Cruces)	Design and Install new lights and gates at crossing	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$220,000 in FY2015 for construction
LC00220	2014 & 2015	NM 226	At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (west of intersection with Berino Rd)	Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$290,000 in FY2015 for construction

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

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have TIP amendments that are, oh wait, no; we have five TIP amendments that are on the list. I do want to take this opportunity to announce, I know I sent it out on the email, but I also want to state, as well, on the record, that historically, we had always been able to

1 attach TIP reports to the committee packets. Going forward in the future, that
2 will no longer be able to be the case, due to some database structure issues,
3 as far as how NMDOT up in Santa Fe wants to have the database exports
4 sent to them. We're unable to create a TIP report in that particular format at
5 this time. So for the foreseeable future, the TIP reports that you have been
6 accustomed to seeing will no longer be appended to the packet. What we do
7 have in lieu of that is a spreadsheet, which is immediately after the discussion
8 page for this item. This contains most of the information, all of the vital
9 information for the project. The discovery that we'll be unable to append the
10 TIP reports was, did not leave us any sort of time in between that discovery
11 and the need to get the packet distributed, so we will probably try to play
12 around with the spreadsheet a little bit to see if we can get a little bit more of
13 the information that used to be on the TIP reports onto the spreadsheet but it
14 does have the essential information. I do want to make note of the fact that
15 these are out-of-cycle TIP amendments. I requested NMDOT staff to provide
16 a written justification of the out-of-cycle nature of these amendments and
17 that's on the page following the spreadsheet. I will stand now for any
18 questions.
19

20 Pearson: Okay, just to interrupt for a moment, we have a new Committee member that's
21 arrived, so if you could just identify yourself?
22

23 Farnham: Scott Farnham, City of Las Cruces.
24

25 Pearson: Thank you, so are we on to talking about the individual items or do we still
26 have some overview?
27

28 Wray: Actually, that was it. I can speak about the individual items to some extent, if
29 you wish for me to.
30

31 Pearson: So the change in the Missouri bridge project, that doesn't change any monies,
32 it just changes the size of the project?
33

34 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair.
35

36 Pearson: The Baylor Canyon, Dripping Springs Road project, that's actually later on our
37 agenda as a discussion item.
38

39 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair, that is due to a request from a part of the Committee to hear
40 some more about the overall design.
41

42 Pearson: Ok, so at this point just discuss the funding for this?
43

44 Wray: Yes, that was my intent.
45

46 Pearson: So, can you, do we have information on where this funding came from, and ...

1
2 Wray: It's a Central Federal Lands project, beyond that I would have to defer to Ms.
3 Herrera. I believe that's it, that it's just a Central Fed....
4
5 Pearson: Magic money that's appearing.
6
7 Wray: Yeah.
8
9 Pearson: What part? Also there were some New Mexico State Capital Improvement
10 monies, that's also part of this?
11
12 Herrera: No, it hasn't been added to TIP, actually Dona Ana County will need to do that,
13 add that to the TIP.
14
15 Pearson: So that'll be another amendment as part of this to add those funds.
16
17 Herrera: Probably, that's totally separate because that funding doesn't go through
18 NMDOT at all. So until they request that from the MPO, which if they haven't,
19 you should probably make a note to do that because they need to put that in
20 with this.
21
22 Pearson: So this is entirely federal funds.
23
24 Herrera: One hundred percent federal.
25
26 Pearson: Okay, the other question I had on the traffic signal, the City of Las Cruces,
27 there was some discussion of a traffic signal at Amador and Melendres and
28 the cost there was somewhere in the order of \$400,000 and this cost is
29 \$700,000. Is that; is there, why would there be such a difference? Is it just
30 because of the different requirements for the federal highway or is there some
31 other reason?
32
33 Herrera: There's probably some other reason, to be honest. All the recent signal
34 projects that we've done in the recent couple of years have been around
35 \$750,000, so honestly I think the City's estimate is probably a bit low.
36
37 Pearson: Okay, do you turn over the management to the City then or does NMDOT
38 retain management of the traffic signals?
39
40 Herrera: No, they maintain our signals for us within the city.
41
42 Pearson: So it should be using the same kind of technology.
43
44 Herrera: Right.
45

1 Pearson: And it's gonna go and be integrated, whatever plan it is that's gonna control all
2 the traffic signals?
3

4 Herrera: Yeah. Originally when we first started this project, we had it programmed at
5 \$350,000 and when we moved it from kind of the planning stages into the TIP,
6 that's when a specific request to bump up the funding because that just, it
7 wasn't gonna be enough.
8

9 Pearson: Okay, so maybe the City's gonna find out that it's much more expensive by the
10 time they....
11

12 Herrera: Maybe.
13

14 Pearson: And then you had a couple of railroad projects. If only we could get the
15 railroad crossing at the Outfall Channel Multi-use Path, but anyways.
16

17 Herrera: Well, actually the railroad section has recently been putting out a call for
18 projects each year. So that's a time to request these, so I'm not sure if
19 somebody requested these particular ones or so they do a call for projects for
20 some of the local crossings and then they also have lists of crossings that
21 need to be upgraded. So I think these ones were on the rail sections list but
22 then there's also a time where local governments are able to put in requests.
23

24 Pearson: So try to find out how to make sure that we're on that list at least.
25

26 Herrera: Yes.
27

28 Pearson: Good ole railroad might decide to deny it; if we're on the list we can show that
29 it's a safety concern.
30

31 Herrera: Right. Well and the funding that they're using for these is safety funding. It's a
32 separate set aside out of the big HSIP Program that goes specifically for rail
33 highway crossings and so it wouldn't be competing with all of the other safety
34 projects in the State. It's its own pot of money.
35

36 Murphy: Would a rail trail crossing be eligible for rail highway monies?
37

38 Herrera: I don't know. That's something to look into. I'm sure if it's not; that we can
39 probably find a way to get it funded because it's still is a safety concern if it's
40 not rideable. I'll ask.
41

42 Pearson: Any other Committee members have questions or discussion? Okay, I guess
43 we haven't, I lost track of where we are. Did I call for a motion on this?
44

45 Wray: No, Mr. Chair you did not.
46

1 Pearson: So I call for a motion to approve this item?

2
3 Leisher: I move that we approve the TIP as it stands?

4
5 Pearson: And a second?

6
7 Casillas: Second.

8
9 Pearson: We have a motion and a second, all in favor aye.

10
11 All in favor.

12
13 Pearson: The next item is a discussion item for the Unified Planning Work Program

14 15 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

16 17 **6.1 Unified Planning Work Program Discussion**

18
19 The UPWP is a biannual document that outlines transportation planning activities to be
20 conducted by MPO Staff as well as processes that MPO Staff will participate in, but not
21 oversee. The UPWP also includes a budget, allocation of staff time and money toward
22 accomplishing the tasks. The UPWP must be in compliance with the Metropolitan
23 Transportation Plan.

24
25 Tom Murphy gave a presentation.

26
27 Pearson: The previous or I guess the existing UPWP has a section. In the committee it
28 says that this Committee would do an annual report and so that's what caused
29 my questions and as far as content, I think it can be just some basic metrics.
30 How many trail miles do we have? How many, well probably just some
31 information, a little background too, how many miles of roadway do we have in
32 the MPO, and probably divided between the City and the County and the Town of
33 Mesilla, maybe even NMDOT responsible roadways but something that gives
34 some indication of the overall scope of how many roadways there are and then
35 the scope of how many are marked with bicycle lanes and how many are
36 marked, designated, marked as "Share The Road" facilities, and just do linear
37 miles on that kind of thing. I think for the bike lanes we do, so one mile that's on
38 both sides would be two miles of bike lanes because we have some examples
39 where we only have bike lanes on one side of the road and I think the "Share The
40 Road" are probably, well maybe the other half would be the "Share The Road"
41 type facility then, so that would give us, that would give us some basic metrics
42 and then as we continue year to year we can build on that as we see we're
43 making progress. We've got the TAP projects that will be coming online; the
44 second year is branch trail behind the dam.

1 Leisher: Mr. Chair, I have an additional suggestion to go along with that and that is to
2 include a facilities map, a small facilities map to give a general idea of where the
3 facilities exist.
4

5 Pearson: What I found very useful, the other things to include would be some of the
6 counting that we've done. You've done the counting on the multi-use paths. As
7 part of that you had included a map that outlined the city showing where those
8 are. I found that very useful and if we had, if we could have maps like that, that
9 showed the other bicycle facilities too, I think that would be wonderful. I don't
10 know how easy that type of information is available or if that can be ...
11

12 Murphy: I think we can gather that information. I know we did much of that for our public
13 input, public involvement for the MTP, so a lot of that is existing, it would just be
14 updating with the most recent data. I guess the next pertinent question would
15 be would we want to do that report on calendar year basis or on a fiscal year
16 basis, just so I can put my little X in my little box here.
17

18 Pearson: I think it would be whatever is easier for staff to manage.
19

20 Murphy: Okay, I will discuss it with staff and when we come back for approval of this at
21 your next meeting, we'll let you know what staff perceives as the best way to do
22 that.
23

24 Pearson: This shouldn't be something that causes a lot of staff time but it should be
25 something that I think, all the information is basically around, it just needs to be
26 gathered in one spot and if we have it gathered in one spot associated with our
27 Committee, it's the work that we're doing and then maybe any other work that we
28 might have done. I think January a year ago we talked about goals for the
29 Committee. One of the goals was going through the TAP spending process and
30 we completed that. We talked about the work groups that we had on the
31 suggested best practices for the Transportation Plan for bicycle lane markings
32 and I think what we finally decided that we will continue that work, but it will be
33 part of the next revision of the Transportation Plan. So if we had, just this is a
34 bullet item of things that we've done, that would be part of that report.
35

36 Murphy: I could see both of those melded into the report, accomplishments and then
37 goals for the following year and keep that going. So I think we can certainly work
38 that into the work program. Any more question on that particular report or should
39 we move on?
40

41 Pearson: How easy it is to get crash data for bike/ped? Is that something that we can pull
42 in to be part of this?
43

44 Murphy: Yes, we get that data. We get it from all the law enforcement agencies that send
45 their data to UNM Traffic Safety Bureau. They're on contract with that and then
46 we get that, they geocode it, put it in the GIS, we get that back and then....

1
2 Pearson: I remember seeing the charts that were done that showed the high incident areas
3 and that's generated from the same data.
4
5 Murphy: That is the same data. We get that data.
6
7 Pearson: That kind of information would be helpful.
8
9 Murphy: We get that kind of data on a yearly basis and we have that actually listed in the
10 UPWP as one of the work items that we do. Under 4.2 we have the development
11 of the annual crash report. Under Safety Analysis and Planning and that's the
12 work item with that. We do process pedestrian, bicycle and pedestrian separate,
13 but there's no reason we could not reuse that work to put into the BPAC report as
14 well.
15
16 Pearson: Having it all in one place, I think is beneficial, than trying to scatter. You know if I
17 want to find out about the crash data, oh its bike/ped, so I have to go over here
18 and look in the general stuff, so you know, that would be great.
19
20 Murphy: Then administration finishes up with staff and board trainings that we'd like to
21 accomplish through the next year. We're currently are developing lists of board
22 trainings to conduct (*inaudible*), MPO process, get Committee members familiar
23 with it. Jolene, for example, will be giving a presentation to the various boards on
24 the NMDOT's Policies and Procedure Manual, which they are in the process of
25 finalizing their first amendment. Once that's done she'll come around and give
26 everybody training. Task 2 revolves around the Transportation Improvement
27 Program or the TIP. You can see the various timelines for that. The TIP gets
28 developed on the two year cycle. We'll be doing call for project in October and
29 then eventually get through adoption of it the following April. You can see on,
30 under 2.1 the timeline for that. Task 3, general
31
32 Pearson: Question. Does that include the TAP?
33
34 Murphy: The TAP is a distinct funding source but it does go onto the TIP. So much of that
35 will be done in conjunction, that's probably a good point that hasn't been brought
36 up yet, that that needs to be its own separate item in here.
37
38 Herrera: I don't really think it needs to be separate because our goal is to work it into the
39 process that we already have through the MPOs and the RTPOs. So we don't
40 want a special process for TAP. We want it to be a call for projects for all
41 projects, so TAP projects included, and then roadway, bridge, whatever other
42 project. So we're not doing two separate processes. There will be different
43 criteria for scoring the TAP stuff and that's something that we're still kind of
44 working out but as far as timelines, we want it to be all on the same moving
45 forward.
46

1 Murphy: I probably misspoke a little bit. I was thinking that it would be a separate row in
2 this column where we typically call for projects. We'd have a TAP call for
3 projects so that we can have the calendar visible to everyone.
4

5 Herrera: That makes more sense. I thought you meant like its own separate ...
6

7 Murphy: I understand that's what it sounded like and I thank you for jumping in there. No,
8 I just want it as a separate row in there so we can have the timeline in there.
9

10 Pearson: Because it's a separate set of activities that we'd go through.
11

12 Murphy: Right and it definitely does take staff and committee time, so I think it needs to be
13 represented within the work program. That going on to Task 3, General
14 Development Data Analysis, this is, again, the general task is common to all
15 MPOs. This is where we track our traffic counting and reporting. Within this
16 we're including our non-motorized counting to include the trail counters that were
17 deployed, I think we're up to, I think we have nine or ten individual counters that
18 we're deploying around the region on a rotating basis. We also acquired a video
19 camera that we can record not only motorized, but non-motorized traffic as well,
20 that we'll be integrating into the process. We do population numbers. We're part
21 of the State data center that works upward through the Census to compile the
22 numbers state-wide. We maintain a travel demand model. At this point it's
23 geared to transit and motor and automobile modeling, but we're always hoping
24 that the breakthroughs will come and we might be able to do some non-
25 motorized work as well.
26

27 Pearson: I have another question that kind of goes back to the annual report. The census,
28 you mentioned the Census Bureau, they do an annual community something...
29

30 Murphy: American Community Survey.
31

32 Pearson: That includes modes of travel too, for commuting, that includes the non-
33 motorized share. Maybe we should include those numbers as part of that report
34 too, because....
35

36 Murphy: Right. I think, I think that's gonna be something that's probably gonna shake out
37 as we develop our performance measures and I think all the bike and ped
38 performance measures will need to end up in that report. But from a greater,
39 global planning standpoint, we need to pick our performance measures and
40 report on them. I think the Census is the most widely acknowledged expert or
41 source on these numbers so we'll definitely be using those. I think, I see where
42 mode share is going to be certainly something that is probably gonna end up as
43 something that we track, as well. This section also handles our development
44 review. We, for a local governments, we review subdivision and special use and
45 other kind of land use applications that they receive, so that will help make, help
46 make sure that the transportation plan is being implemented. Task 4

1 Transportation Planning, this is where we'll put MTP update. As you know the
2 MTP update is due next June, so that's going to be a very, a very busy time for
3 staff, probably though, take up a lot of staff time through April and then it's
4 reviews and going through the committees, but up until that point that will be one
5 of our major work products and then in FY16 we'll probably not be updating the
6 plan anymore. We have Safe Routes to School under this. We're continuing to
7 pledge MPO staff support, staff participation in the Safe Routes to School
8 Coalition. Originally, I believe I've gotten our quarterly meetings correctly in here,
9 and the various Walk-N-Roll and Bike to Work weeks. I think I got the calendars
10 right, but if you want, Ashleigh, you want to send me an email.

11

12 Curry: Sure. I think its monthly meetings, not quarterly, if you're talking about the
13 coalition.

14

15 Murphy: Okay.

16

17 Curry: And that's just August through May. We don't meet in June and July. So those
18 dates will be re-established in August. We have our next one on Thursday this
19 week.

20

21 Murphy: Thank you very much. We would be working with, through the ITS update, and I
22 need to finalize the calendar on that. State's updating its state-wide ITS
23 architecture. It will be updated, with that on a regional architecture will be
24 updated as well. Land Use Transportation Integration, I think this is where we're
25 gonna be working on getting the metrics together for our performance measures,
26 especially through the mobility zones that are called out in Transport 2040. Task
27 5 are special tasks and/or miscellaneous activities. These are really the big
28 participation events that we want to call special attention to. We're part of the
29 regional leadership consortium that the County's gotten through a health, HUD,
30 Health and Urban Development, HUD? I can't remember.

31

32 Curry: Housing.

33

34 Murphy: Housing and Urban Development, they got the \$2M grant and we're part of that
35 consortium and we'll continue to participate in that. We'll be wrapping up our
36 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan. I think you'll be seeing the
37 final draft of that plan next month. We got two corridors, Phase A Corridor
38 Studies that we're in the process of negotiating price on. We expect that that
39 bulk of that work will be happening in FY15 and we're also working on getting
40 bids for a short range transit plan update. The appendices.

41

42 Pearson: I have question about, in this area, what about participation in the State Long
43 Range Plan?

44

45 Murphy: That goes back under Task 1, subtask, I can't believe I dropped it. Under the
46 current UPWP there's a column for State and Federal coordination. I'm not

1 believing that that's dropped, but it's a good catch and I'll certainly have to re-add
2 that into there. That's right; I get to blame Dave Pinella, don't I? This was
3 authored by the Albuquerque MPO, so I will take the blame on some things but
4 others I may have to pass on to them. The Appendices, Appendix A still
5 finalizing the budget stuff. The Appendix B, we already got the comment that we
6 needed to actually change the name to the Mesilla Valley MPO on the graphic,
7 it's an old graphic. Appendix C is the latest update on our FHWA review.
8 Appendix D is our traffic count segments. Actually Appendix D is the approval
9 resolution. Appendix E is the Traffic Count Segments. That concludes staff
10 presentation on this. I will entertain any questions.
11
12 Pearson: On the traffic cycles, do you have dates; you do everything in like three years.
13
14 Murphy: We do everything in three years. We have them listed on whether they're Cycle
15 1, 2 or 3. I think we're in Cycle 1 actually this year. So next calendar year we'll
16 be going into Cycle 2 and then Cycle 3.
17
18 Pearson: It might be useful to know when that's done. You know just some date. Maybe
19 just at the beginning, comment at the beginning of the appendix maybe, that
20 Cycle 1 is three years.
21
22 Murphy: I know in the old UPWP, under, what would be under task 3.1, I would say in the
23 narrative there, the cycle that we're on, but probably Mr. Pinella didn't put that. I
24 can add it into there.
25
26 Pearson: What does the TIMS number mean?
27
28 Murphy: TIMS number is a unique identifier number from the NM Department of
29 Transportation, kind of like when you do an access database and then there's a
30 unique identifier associated with it. It's basically that. It may as well be randomly
31 assigned. The number has no other meaning to the rest of that roadway, other
32 than as a....
33
34 Pearson: You might just put some indication of what that means, just so that somebody
35 comes along and doesn't have to ask the question a thousand times.
36
37 Leisher: I assume it refers to a record (inaudible).
38
39 Murphy: Yes, it's so that they can go backward through time and look up the various data
40 associated with that roadway.
41
42 Pearson: So where they are missing, is that just outside the City?
43
44 Murphy: Where they are missing, they have not been assigned.
45
46 Leisher: I just want to ask one question, does anybody think that (inaudible).

1
2 Murphy: I was just saying it might be better to remove the TIMS number off of that chart.
3 As far as keeping the actual counts, since we publish the traffic count map each
4 year I'd rather that be the kind of the official publication of that data.
5
6 Pearson: It might be worthwhile then to just put a pointer to where you keep that count
7 data so you can say here are the segments, go find the data wherever.
8
9 Murphy: I probably need to think through the usefulness of that chart, it was kind of
10 something that was requested from someone in Santa Fe and since that section
11 knows exactly what everything is, I didn't put a lot of thought into people in the
12 real world using it.
13
14 Leisher: Maybe we should just keep the TIMS (inaudible) versus those weren't, those that
15 weren't.
16
17 Murphy: They are all counted. The lack of TIMS number is something that will be
18 straightened out by DOT as they correct their information and they'll be able to
19 assign a TIMS number to all the segments.
20
21 Leisher: Okay.
22
23 Pearson: Yeah, it sounds like the TIMS number is just confusing unless you're the guy in
24 Santa Fe.
25
26 Murphy: Right, I think it's essentially trying to publish the roadway social security number
27 and it, you know, it probably doesn't give a lot of information out to the general
28 public.
29
30 Pearson: To me, having these segments isn't that worthwhile because even if you had
31 them, if you're counting everything inside the MPO, that's enough information.
32
33 Murphy: We count all the major thoroughfares and it might be interesting to some people
34 to see how those segments are broken up.
35
36 Pearson: Can you tell that on the count?
37
38 Murphy: You can't really tell it on the map where the segments begin and end.
39
40 Pearson: Okay, cause you just have numbers in there?
41
42 Murphy: Mmm, hmm.
43
44 Pearson: Okay.
45

1 Herrera: Mr. Chair, if I can just add a little bit more to that. That section specifically was
2 requested by NMDOT because we hadn't typically been asking the MPOs to
3 report on traffic counts so basically they were doing traffic counts and reporting
4 that to our traffic section but then, like as the liaison for the MPO, I wasn't really
5 in the loop on that and so that's a way to kind of close the loop so that everybody
6 knows and we thought if we just put it in the UPWP then the general public
7 knows what everybody is doing too, so that's kind of why that's in there.
8

9 Pearson: Okay, the only other comment is some formatting where you've got upper case
10 for some and mixed case for other street names in the first column. Any other
11 comments on this? Okay, so let's move on to the next item, the Dripping Springs
12 Road Project.
13

14 **6.2 Dripping Springs Road Report Discussion**

15
16 George Pearson requested a report be made to the BPAC regarding possible bike
17 improvements along Dripping Springs Road.
18

19 Pearson: So it was brought to my attention, I hadn't heard about it, and then showed up on
20 the TIP.
21

22 Wray: Mr. Chair, there is very little that staff can say about this project, at this point. It's
23 our understanding that the design work has yet to be done. There's nothing
24 available for public review. We've gotten this question from a number of
25 members of the cycling community and that's the extent of the answer that I'm
26 able to give at this time. I don't know if Ms. Herrera has any more information
27 than that but I kind of doubt it.
28

29 Herrera: Yeah, this project is being run out of Central Federal Lands, which is a division of
30 the Federal Highway Administration, and so it doesn't go through NMDOT at all.
31 We don't have any control over the design. I can say that they still are required
32 by the federal regulations to have public input meetings and stuff, it's just I don't
33 know when those will be.
34

35 Pearson: So who is actually doing the design work for this road?
36

37 Herrera: Central Federal Lands.
38

39 Pearson: So where are they?
40

41 Herrera: They are all over the place but really the award, they are working with Dona Ana
42 County on it. Somebody at the County maybe should have some information.
43

44 Casillas: (Inaudible)
45

1 Herrera: I do have a contact with Central Federal Lands, who's supposed to be in charge
2 of this region, unfortunately when I ran out of the office I didn't bring that with me
3 but I did make a note to send that to Tom so that he can distribute that contact
4 information to the Committee. So for now we kind of have just been funneling
5 everything through him. His name is Tom and he's with Central Federal Lands.
6

7 Pearson: Because I think over the years we've kind of gotten used to the process through
8 NMDOT that we've got a chance and we know how the designer, generally we
9 can see the designs before they're built and this one is, now we're back in the
10 dark ages, where it's built and then we have to complain about it. I don't want
11 that to happen.
12

13 Herrera: I don't think that's their intention, it's just that they haven't really announced when
14 the public input process will start and how that will go but, but just know that they
15 are required by federal law just like we are with our projects that they do that.
16

17 Pearson: So when they do their public announcements is that gonna go through your office
18 also? You'll see the press announcements for that?
19

20 Herrera: I would hope so, yeah. I mean we should be involved somehow; I'm just not
21 exactly sure how.
22

23 Leisher: I've been approached by some people looking to buy houses in the area and
24 they've told me directly that it's dependent on whether that's gonna get paved or
25 not and whether it's gonna have bike facilities on it or not.
26

27 Herrera: Well, I did make it clear and I can't remember who at the County was at a
28 meeting where we kind of discussed this a little bit and I did make it clear to him
29 that it is on the MPO's bicycle facilities map as, I think, a Tier 1. Something that
30 is really important for the region and so that's been made clear I think by
31 everyone from DOT and then from the County as well.
32

33 Casillas: I was just gonna comment that with Engineering, I've been talking with Albert ???
34 and Angie Guerrero, she's the Grants Administrator, and I know they're planning
35 on having a presentation for this Committee, it just wasn't ready. I don't know if it
36 was funding or design issue, I don't know what the issue was but they did
37 mention that once they were ready to start having public meetings they would let
38 us know. That's what I recall and this was months back.
39

40 Murphy: Yeah, Albert if you could contact them and say whenever they're ready to get on
41 this Committee's agenda, we will accommodate them.
42

43 Pearson: The microphone up there that should be active, right?
44

45 Casillas: Yeah, it should be.
46

1 Bardwell: Beth Bardwell, just a citizen, and I have an interest in Dripping Springs/Baylor
2 Canyon Road project. So my question is, it's not necessarily based on
3 information I know, it's just pure speculation. I'm just looking, trying to get my
4 information by asking this question. So my understanding was those funds for
5 paving of Baylor Canyon Road and Dripping Springs came through BLM as part
6 of a federal pot of money to provide greater access to recreational areas? So
7 that's what I heard, I haven't confirmed it, so I'm kind of framing it as a question,
8 but that's what I've heard and so I'm wondering if that is the pot of funding, if
9 there are requirements that come with that pot of funding that would mandate
10 there be multi-modal associated with construction of that road so it may not be an
11 option. That's my question. So I'll just, I'll put it out there, I don't know the
12 answer, maybe you do or maybe it's something we can look at closer.
13

14 Herrera: I guess I don't have a specific answer for you but I can say that the Central
15 Federal Lands projects typically are to provide access to recreational areas so
16 that part definitely is true. I'm not sure about the process going through the BLM
17 but I do know that that part of your statement is true. As far as certain
18 requirements that go along with that funding, I can't say that I've ever seen them
19 outside of what's written into the Code of Federal Regulations for all the rest of
20 the federal money that we deal with, but because this does have to come through
21 the MPO and the public process, just like any other federal project, I would say
22 that we're probably definitely gonna have time to give public input and everyone
23 knows that that's a really important route for cyclists.
24

25 Bardwell: Thank you.

26

27 Murphy: In fact further, we're gonna have the TIP amendment through our Technical
28 Advisory Committee, here on the first Thursday of June, and we do have a
29 representative from the, from BLM on our Board and so they're likely to have
30 some insight on that as well. If you can all make it, we can be sure to ask but
31 we'll be, again, in this room first Thursday of the month 4:00 p.m. and BLM
32 should be at that meeting.
33

34 Pearson: So Dona Ana County's gonna be the lead agency? Is that correct?

35

36 Casillas: I know they were; I don't know who is the lead agency but I know they were they
37 were on it.
38

39 Pearson: Because if it's Dona Ana County, they've passed the Complete Streets
40 Resolution, so presumably they'd have to use Complete Streets design for that
41 roadway.
42

43 Wray: Mr. Chair, I do not remember, off the top of my head, who's listed as the lead
44 agency, that is I'm just now noticing one of the pieces of information that's left off
45 of the spreadsheet. I can send out an email tomorrow with who's currently listed.
46 That doesn't necessarily mean, um, but that's just, be relaying the information

1 that I was told. But I can send out an email with what I have. Ms. Herrera says
2 it's Central Federal Lands so that's probably all we have.
3
4 Pearson: So still a mystery.
5
6 Herrera: Right, these kind of projects because we're required by the Code of Federal
7 Regulations to include their TIP into our STIP without changing it. They pretty
8 much just provide us with a list of projects and we put them in our STIP and if we
9 have to go through an MPO to do that, we do. So really, they don't give us a
10 whole lot of information other than kind of what you see on that spreadsheet
11 there.
12
13 Pearson: But at least it served as notice to us that this project's happening. So now we're
14 aware of it and can watch out for more notice and make sure that we insert
15 ourselves as much as possible into that design.
16
17 Herrera: Right. I mean we will be asking the questions and by "we" I mean NMDOT
18 because we want to know as well what's happening with it.
19
20 Leisher: Maybe we should ask the NSA.
21
22 Pearson: Well, if we can be kept updated on that as much as possible I think everybody on
23 the Committee would appreciate that, so anymore comments on this item? Then
24 let's go on to the next one, the San Augustine Pass Safety Report.
25
26 **6.3 San Augustine Pass Road Safety Audit Discussion**
27
28 Occam Consulting Engineers recently released a revised draft of their San Augustine Pass
29 Road Safety Audit. This item is to discuss that report.
30
31 Wray: Mr. Chair, this is kind of an awkward moment because Mr. Murphy has stepped
32 out and he was the one who was going to speak about this. I am not aware of all
33 that Tom wanted to say. I am, well here he comes, I'll just let him....
34
35 Murphy: Sorry, did I leave at an inopportune time?
36
37 Wray: Very much so.
38
39 Pearson: We're ready for the
40
41 Murphy: Okay. I guess we had the, we were requested to put this on. The safety report
42 was released and I don't know what else to say. It was developed by Safety
43 section of NMDOT in Santa Fe, through their consultant, and I do know that
44 there's been some back and forth about some of the recommendations in the
45 report. It was changed from a second draft or it was re-drafted to put in all
46 possible measures in there. Concurrently with this study going on, or

1 coincidentally, with this study going on, District 1 had done, you know, had done
2 a repaving project on US 70, which is completed and completely separate from
3 the road safety audit process. I do know that the District 1 did where they could
4 under the constraints of the State's procurement process and Federal rules of
5 adjusting contracts and prices, they did implement some measures contained in
6 this report. But the whole intent of it is to come back with this report as a whole
7 and seek some safety funding to implement the recommendations on a more
8 global scale. I apologize, I didn't realize I was presenting on this one.
9

10 Leisher: Can I interrupt quickly with a question? Tom, has this been modified to reflect
11 the repaving changes that have, that are occurring.
12

13 Murphy: I don't, I don't think this reflects the changes that were, the differences from the
14 repaving. I don't think that that really changes any of the, any of the
15 recommendations going forward. Andrew reminded me to point out one
16 important thing that this, for the most part, takes place outside the MPO
17 boundaries. So I do feel a little bit hesitant saying too much on it since it's really
18 outside of our area. But since it is such an important route for people living in
19 this area, we will have it on our, we will discuss it at our meetings and have it on
20 our agendas.
21

22 Pearson: One of the recommendations was on guardrails and rumble strips and friendly
23 guard rails and some part of that might have been handled with that repaving
24 project, do you know anything, any details on that?
25

26 Murphy: I believe that that exceeded the ability for them to change order within the
27 project. The repaving is distinctly different from guardrail work so that was not
28 something that was permissible under the contract that was just recently
29 completed.
30

31 Pearson: Okay, but what about the rumble strips. Could they have left the rumble strips
32 out?
33

34 Murphy: That I don't know.
35

36 Herrera: Can I ask for clarification, left them out where?
37

38 Pearson: In front of the guardrails, the rumble strip, the indentations in the.....
39

40 Herrera: Right. You mean did we?
41

42 Pearson: Were they left out in front of the guardrails?
43

44 Herrera: Unfortunately, no.
45

46 Pearson: Oh.

1
2 Herrera: There are areas where we did leave the rumble strips out, where the shoulder is
3 fairly narrow. Where the shoulder is wide, they were put in.
4
5 Pearson: Right in front of the guardrails is a constriction point, of course.
6
7 Herrera: Right.
8
9 Pearson: Especially the downhill segment, if you're on a bicycle you can end up going 35
10 40 miles an hour and if there's debris they only have like three feet or something
11 to travel in between the guard rail and the rumble strip and if there's debris there,
12 there's gonna be a crash.
13
14 Herrera: And that's definitely something that was acknowledged, I think, in this safety
15 report and something that if we are able to get safety funding for this project, we'll
16 look at widening shoulders where we can and then where there's guardrail, we'll
17 be upgrading it to the current standards and then removing rumble strips out from
18 in front of it. The areas where there isn't guardrail, we definitely have to put
19 rumble strips in, it's part of NMDOT standards that we do that.
20
21 Pearson: That's not the problem. It's where there's guardrail and rumble strip.
22
23 Herrera: But there are some areas that have rumble strips and still very narrow shoulders
24 right now, without guardrail, and so we do know that that's an issue as well. So
25 in places like that we'll be trying to widen the shoulder as much as we can.
26
27 Pearson: And that repaving project didn't extend as far as to where the, Dr. Fronczek's
28 crash was, is that correct?
29
30 Herrera: No, it did, it went a little past that. It went, basically, to the Aguirre Springs turn
31 off there.
32
33 Pearson: Okay, well that crash was further...
34
35 Herrera: A little bit passed that.
36
37 Chavarria: It went to the third (inaudible)
38
39 Herrera: To the end of the climbing lane?
40
41 Chavarria: Yeah.
42
43 Herrera: Okay, so I guess it went, I can picture it in my head.
44
45 Chavarria: If you're going westbound where the climbing lane ends, that's where (inaudible)
46

1 Herrera: Yeah, so I believe, I'm trying to picture where the little, the bike is on the hill.
2
3 Pearson: That was not the crash location.
4
5 Herrera: Okay, it was further down from that.
6
7 Pearson: It was down where there were three lanes and where there was, there's
8 essentially no shoulder there so the jersey barrier and then there was the partial
9 paving issues.
10
11 Herrera: Right.
12
13 Pearson: So hopefully they would have gone all the way to the jersey barrier, that repaving
14 project, so, right?
15
16 Herrera: You mean the concrete wall barrier or the guardrail?
17
18 Pearson: The concrete barrier that's on the shoulder side.
19
20 Herrera: So that's kind of up, further up in the pass and yes the paving does go all the way
21 to the edge of the barrier.
22
23 Leisher: Oh, on the westbound side?
24
25 Pearson: Ok, so this completed now and it's available and so it's a resource for when we
26 get some safety funding available which will be pursued, I guess, right?
27
28 Herrera: Yes. There is safety funding available, there's an open call for projects. They're
29 doing it year around now. They meet quarterly to pick projects for safety funding.
30 The next meeting of that committee will be held August 2nd, so District 1 will be
31 submitting a safety application for that cycle.
32
33 Pearson: Ok.
34
35 Herrera: And we're trying to secure the funding and get it out on the road as soon as
36 possible.
37
38 Leisher: Just one question for you, Jolene. Has Ryan Blickem requested an update on
39 this from you recently? Has he contacted you yet?
40
41 Herrera: Yes, I've actually been contacted by several members of Zia Velo. I think he's
42 one of them. Yeah and he requested an update, also Trina Witter requested and
43 then Mr. Kurt Austin.
44
45 Leisher: Good.
46

1 Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, I have a question. Has this report been finalized? I was
2 under the impression it was, okay, still open. Where is it available for, where is a
3 final copy available.
4

5 Unknown: Inaudible
6

7 Wray: If you could send that around please, that would be most appreciated because
8 the last copy I had still seemed to be open for comment.
9

10 Herrera: That's a good question and actually I'll check with the HSIP program, I guess
11 administrator, and see if there's a place where we post these online. If we don't,
12 that seems like a really idea.
13

14 Pearson: Any other comments on this item? So Local Projects Updates?
15

16 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

17

18 **7.1 Local Projects update**

19

20 Casillas: Our chair and Jess Williams, they were working together in order to bring in front
21 of the Board of County Commissioners a proclamation to declare May Bike
22 Month. It occurred on May 13, so that's, they're declaring this month as Bike
23 Month. Also, if you're out there biking and you happen to come up across an
24 illegal dump or somebody who is doing illegal dumping, the County has just
25 developed an app that you can download. If you go to the app store, type in
26 Dona Ana County, and you should be able to download a, it's called a "No
27 Throw" app and basically what you do with your smart phone or your android,
28 you take a picture of what's happening out there and it sends a picture, your GPS
29 coordinates to our Codes Enforcement Office and they'll go out there and check
30 it out.
31

32 Curry: What's the app called?
33

34 Casillas: No Throw. It should be free, I think. That's it.
35

36 Murphy: I want the whole Committee to know, on behalf of the City of Las Cruces, the
37 Safe Routes to School infrastructure project was, the bid and contract were
38 approved by the Las Cruces City Council this past Monday. So that work at the
39 10 area schools, 12 area schools, will be beginning very shortly in the next
40 couple of weeks. So we will have ADA improvements on sidewalks in the vicinity
41 of the Tier 1 schools from the Action Plan.
42

43 Pearson: We should also be sure to thank NMDOT that we got double our original
44 allocation. They spent \$500,000 on this project. Thank City Staff for bringing it
45 in at exactly \$500,000 and spending every last cent which I'm sure is a very
46 difficult thing. I can't imagine.

1
2 Murphy: We got it close enough and then the contingency was able to.... A lot of hard
3 work all around from many quarters and so I'd like to thank everybody who was
4 involved in that.
5
6 Pearson: And that was 100% funded by Safe Routes to School.
7
8 Leisher: I just had one question, is there any update on what's going on with old Country
9 Club, any progress updates?
10
11 Murphy: They were scheduled to be before the City's Development Review Committee
12 tomorrow morning at 9:00 but they had to, they asked for a postponement. I'm
13 not sure to what date that was postponed. We do have the, they did turn in a
14 traffic impact analysis for it. I know Andrew has begun looking at it. I have not
15 yet looked at it myself, but
16
17 Leisher: Ok.
18
19 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Leisher, it's my understanding that meeting is postponed to June
20 4.
21
22 Pearson: So part of that discussion is still making sure that the bicycle facility on Madrid
23 travels through that project connecting both ends of Madrid where it currently
24 goes?
25
26 Murphy: Right, now they're concerning themselves with the 30 acre portion that's more
27 towards the intersection of Camino del Rex and US 70, that they're expecting to
28 develop first. I know that our comments have been basically to make sure that
29 the, that the bike lanes are installed connecting up to Camino del Rex, which
30 eventually turns into Camino Real as it turns behind Albertson's, which is a well-
31 used bicycle facility and then also, due to the fact that US 70 is also State Bike
32 Route 7, so we have been getting, and the developer agreed to institute the bike
33 lanes in those instances.
34
35 Pearson: Okay, so the part that would impact the current, along Madrid, that's gonna be a
36 separate phase, probably, of that project.
37
38 Murphy: Yes. That's not currently under discussion.
39
40 Pearson: Any other Committee member comments? May is National Bike month. We've
41 still got a couple of events to come. Tomorrow is the Ride of Silence in Mesilla,
42 gathering at 6:15 for a ride that will leave the Mesilla Plaza at 6:30. The Ride of
43 Silence is an international event, the third Wednesday of the month of May, so
44 there are literally hundreds of participants, hundreds of events throughout the
45 country and the world to commemorate cyclists that have been lost through
46 fatality or injured in crashes. There's gonna be a Bicycle Basics class on

1 Saturday at Peace Lutheran Church at eight o'clock in the morning and then the
2 following Wednesday, May 28th at noon at City Hall will be the Mayor's
3 Downtown Bike Ride. So everybody that's at City Hall should be able to bring
4 their bike and come out and participate, right? And we're gonna see the Mayor
5 on a bike, he promised, and I'm gonna bring the bike for him and that's all I have.
6 Now we get our special NMDOT projects update.
7

8 **7.2 NMDOT Projects update**

9

10 Herrera: I, of course, didn't bring that with me. I do have a couple of things, I guess that I
11 can update on and then, if there are any questions about specific projects, we
12 can go over that. Our District 1 PIO sent out a public notice Monday, I believe,
13 about the upcoming public meetings for the NM 28 chip seal project that will be
14 happening. There's one this Thursday at 6:00 p.m. at the Solano yard, NMDOT
15 Solano yard. Andrew sent it out yesterday, was it or Monday?
16

17 Wray: Yes, I sent it out, press release from NMDOT. It was probably late in the day, not
18 far from five yesterday, but there was a press release sent out yesterday.
19

20 Herrera: Okay, so there's that one and then there will another meeting held next Thursday
21 on, I believe, it's the 29th in La Mesa. Just to let everybody know what the
22 process is gonna be because there will be lane closures and a pilot car process
23 and we want to give everyone a heads-up on what the delays will be and what
24 they should expect through construction.
25

26 Pearson: Okay
27

28 Herrera: So there's that and then also you've maybe seen the message boards if you've
29 been heading on 70 kind of up the hill, we're gonna start the concrete wall barrier
30 that goes from the interchange there at 25 and 70, all the way to where the cable
31 barrier starts, on May 27. So that's next Monday.
32

33 Pearson: On US 70?
34

35 Herrera: On US 70.
36

37 Pearson: Oh, that's to do the
38

39 Herrera: The concrete wall barrier, where the median is, so we'll be ripping that out,
40 paving and then concrete wall barrier all the way through there. So the last that I
41 checked with the project manager, they were supposed to have abbreviated
42 hours to avoid rush hour so they'll have abbreviated hours during the week and
43 working probably the full day on weekends, but we'll have monthly meetings and
44 updates and stuff on that project and then, you all also probably know the North
45 Main project is underway.
46

1 Pearson: Your phone probably rings continuously on that one.
2
3 Herrera: Mine doesn't but I'm sure somebody's phone rings continuously on that one. It's
4 gonna be a long project. The City is also upgrading utilities at the same time so
5 expect to see construction out there probably for the next year. So that's, it's
6 gonna be a long project.
7
8 Curry: Jolene, do you happen to know about how long the Highway 28 project's gonna
9 take? What's the duration of that?
10
11 Herrera: Sure, actually I have the press release right with me somewhere. I believe it's a
12 month. It's gonna be a really short project. We want to get it done as soon as
13 possible. Let me find my paperwork.
14
15 Murphy: Starts June 16 and scheduled to start on June 16 at mile marker zero (0) and
16 work North, they're gonna do it in four mile intervals but the, I don't believe that
17 they have an end date on the press release.
18
19 Herrera: There isn't but the project manager I spoke to him on Friday and he said that the
20 work would take a month.
21
22 Pearson: On NM 28 project, of course, is important, it's NM Bike Route 1 and also Viva
23 Dona Ana project has issued their draft report on bicycle infrastructure. Have
24 you seen that?
25
26 Herrera: I have.
27
28 Pearson: Okay and so their recommendation is to do a full bicycle facility from state line to
29 Las Cruces which, of course, this project won't impact. Some part of the project
30 maybe a third to a quarter, the shoulders might be wide enough, but maybe we
31 can have you consider putting bike lanes or at least doing the shoulder lane lines
32 as if they were bike lanes, like at intersections, put dotted lines up to the
33 intersection, things like that. This gives us an opportunity to implement some
34 part of that Viva Dona Ana Plan free, essentially. So I wonder if we can follow-
35 up, see how, if that's possible.
36
37 Herrera: Yea, it never hurts to ask. I don't think that it's too late to change striping plans
38 right now just because we haven't even started the paving they have but the
39 striping obviously comes after that, so we might have some time to do that.
40
41 Pearson: Cause especially through Mesilla there's already a shoulder. It's essentially a
42 bicycle lane, it's not marked as a bicycle lane, but if it's striped like a bicycle lane,
43 even if there's no money for signage, if the striping's done right, I think that will
44 improve safety.
45

1 Herrera: Okay. Yeah, we can certainly look into that. Also these are the kind of
2 comments that we want to hear at the public meetings too. We're having the
3 public meetings to let everybody know what's happening, but then also to get
4 some input because I did have a comment at the El Paso MPO meeting from a
5 cyclist who was concerned about kind of what we were doing there, which is
6 what spurred having the public meetings. I can say that we do realize that State
7 Bike Route 1 we will be paving full-width. Unfortunately we are not looking at
8 widening shoulders or anything like that with this project. It's specifically a
9 pavement project but it will be all the way to where the shoulder stops however
10 wide that may be.
11
12 Pearson: Right. To implement Viva Dona Ana Plan, I don't remember what the dollar
13 amounts that are associated with that but I'm sure there's, it's probably in the
14 millions, if there's right-of-way involved.
15
16 Herrera: There is right-of-way involved. Aaron and I actually drove that entire segment of
17 road, I guess it's been six months or so, looking specifically at right-of-way issues
18 and we would have to purchase a lot of right-of-way and there's also headwalls
19 for the channels and stuff that are encroaching. It would be a really expensive
20 project. Not out of the question but for NMDOT right now too expensive.
21
22 Pearson: It may not be an NMDOT, it may not be NMDOT monies, if they show up with
23 money some place and do that someday it would be wonderful. I mean that's, of
24 course, we want perfection. We do what we can and try to meet as close as we
25 can with monies available.
26
27 Leisher: Should we get ahold of our congressional representatives and start lobbying for
28 money?
29
30 Herrera: That would be great.
31
32 Curry: Another question, more from the biking community that somebody had asked
33 once, is it possible to have community members donate money to sort of buy a
34 sign that says this is a bike road or something like. If so, would NMDOT be able
35 to put those in and what is the cost for a sign. That's sort of a random question.
36
37 Herrera: You know I'm not really the expert on that but we do have somebody who is. I
38 can get you his contact information. It's actually Harold Love. You've probably
39 all met him at some point in time, so Harold Love would be the one to contact on
40 that.
41
42 Curry: Great, thanks
43
44 Herrera: That's kind of all that I had. Avenida de Mesilla's on time, as far as I know,
45 everything's okay. I believe construction should be ending sometime this fall. I

1 don't have a specific date but if there are any specific questions I can write them
2 down and get answers for you.
3

4 Pearson: The other project that's still down the pipe someplace but is Valley Drive from
5 Picacho to Avenida de Mesilla?
6

7 Herrera: Yes.
8

9 Pearson: That's probably, it hasn't even gone into the design phase yet, I don't think.
10

11 Herrera: No. it hasn't. We were just in the process of selecting a consultant to do that
12 project a couple of weeks ago. I think they're in negotiation now for that.
13

14 Pearson: But it seems like there's right-of-way there, so maybe something that might work
15 is even protected bike lanes on there. We've had fatalities inside the NMDOT
16 portion and in City portion. It's a high speed road, so maybe protected bike lanes
17 is an option to look at. It'd be nice to know if that's included as part of the design
18 thought process at least.
19

20 Herrera: It is. We have asked the consultant to look at every possibility for cyclists and
21 pedestrians as well, because we have so much right-of-way there. So there will
22 be some sort of bike facility on the road, we're just not exactly sure what. So
23 we'll see what the consultant comes up with and then ...
24

25 Pearson: Ok. How far down the road, when should we start looking for those public input
26 meetings?
27

28 Herrera: Probably soon. I'm not exactly sure when. It depends on how long it takes to go
29 through negotiations but I would imagine within the year. I mean maybe within
30 the summer even. We'll definitely keep the MPO and this Committee involved in
31 that.
32

33 Curry: If so, a part of that from Hadley and I can't think of what the next road north is but
34 before Picacho, it's part of a Safe Routes To School mapped route from
35 McArthur Elementary on Valley, so if we can just keep that in mind and I don't
36 know if Safe Routes To School can be involved somehow, in just making sure
37 that it's considered a pedestrian path.
38

39 Herrera: Ok. Yeah, sure.
40

41 Curry: Thank you.
42

43 Herrera: We have to have or the consultant will have public input meetings but then we'll
44 also have stakeholder meetings. So I'll make sure that this Committee is
45 included and then I'll mention Safe Routes To School as a stakeholder as well.
46

1 Pearson: Any other questions on NMDOT Projects Update

2

3

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

5

6 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

7

8 Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

9

10 Mark Leisher motioned to adjourn.

11 Albert Casillas seconds the motion.

12 All in favor.

13

14

15 _____
Chair



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 15, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 Every Bicyclist Counts Report Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Copy of the Every Bicyclist Counts Report

DISCUSSION:

In May 2014, the League of American Bicyclists released the results of a data tracking project in a report titled Every Bicyclist Counts.

This item is to discuss that report.



BICYCLIST SAFETY MUST BE A PRIORITY

*Findings from a year of fatality tracking
— and the urgent need for better data*

MAY 2014



CONTENT

» BACKGROUND	3
» INTRODUCTION	4
» FINDINGS	6
» MOVING TOWARD PERFORMANCE MEASURES	14
» CONCLUSION	17
» RESOURCES	18

REPORT AUTHORS

KEN MCLEOD is the League of American Bicyclists' legal specialist, working predominantly with the Advocacy Advance program, a partnership of the League and the Alliance for Biking & Walking.

LIZ MURPHY is the League of American Bicyclists' communications manager.

BACKGROUND

A terrible string of fatal bike crashes in the Tampa Area in late 2011 and early 2012 left the local bike community reeling.

As they shared each awful tragedy with us, we too felt frustrated and powerless. We also realized how little we really knew about the circumstances of serious crashes between bikes and cars, and how woefully inadequate (and late) the available data was at the national level.

For a 12-month period, we set about the grim task of tracking and documenting every fatal traffic crash involving a bicyclist captured by relevant internet search terms. We also wanted to offer a place to remember the victims and raise the hope that their deaths would at least inform efforts to prevent such tragedies in the future.

The result was the Every Bicyclist Counts initiative: everybicyclistcounts.org

We owe a huge debt of gratitude to Elizabeth Kiker for compiling much of this data and to the Ride of Silence and Ghost Bike programs that offer so much comfort to the friends and families of bicyclists killed on the road -- and a vital outlet for the outrage felt by everyone that rides a bike when they hear of these needless deaths.

Over the course of the project we documented 628 fatal bike crashes, a high percentage of the official number of such fatalities recorded by the authorities.

We wanted to explore how and why these crashes were happening, how they were reported, what was done as

a result of the crashes, if blame was assigned, how the motorists were treated, and whether or not there were any consequences for their actions if they were deemed to be at fault in any way.

The results are sobering, eye-opening, and critically helpful in informing the current debate about the need for a non-motorized traffic safety performance measure.

We learned, for example, that a much higher percentage of fatal crashes than expected were “hit from behind” incidents -- that’s important to know for our education program. Not surprisingly, high-speed urban and suburban arterial streets with no provisions for bicyclists are over-represented locations -- that’s good information to share with our Bicycle Friendly Community partners.

Overwhelmingly, however, we were struck by the lack of information, the lack of action, and the lack of a sense of outrage over these deaths, even in communi-

ties where this kind of tragedy is relatively common.

That’s critical to know as we work with Congress and the federal agencies to specifically focus on these fatalities through a non-motorized safety performance measure that significantly improves accountability and data collection processes for the future.

Otherwise, we will have to keep reporting a totally unacceptable and unnecessary death toll on our nation’s roadways.

Andy Clarke
President, League of American Bicyclists

The results are sobering, eye-opening, and critically helpful in informing the current debate about the need for a non-motorized traffic safety performance measure.

INTRODUCTION

In 2013, after one year of tracking, the League of American Bicyclists completed its Every Bicyclist Counts initiative.

This year, the U.S. Department of Transportation will decide how it will hold states accountable for public safety on our nation's roadways. The League strongly believes that the Federal Highway Administration needs to set a national performance measure for safety that includes non-motorized safety.

Based on our experience with Every Bicyclists Counts, there is a clear role for the USDOT and state DOTs in reducing the number of bicyclist fatalities and improving our understanding of the risks bicyclists face.

As it stands, the vast majority of national data on traffic fatalities comes from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) maintained by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

Data reported by FARS is the best currently available at the national level, but it's limited in the amount of information it provides and leaves much to be desired in the timeliness of its data releases.

As March 2014 the most current data available in the online FARS data tables is from 2011. Information from 2012 is available in the much less user-friendly FARS Query System.

In creating our Every Bicyclist Counts data collection we consciously modeled our data on what is collected as part of FARS, but also added data elements in the hope of learning more about fatalities — and ultimately how they might be prevented.

From February 2011 to February 2013 we proactively gathered information for Every Bicyclist Counts from monitoring media and public outreach. We captured 628 fatalities overall and 552 in 2012 alone. In 2012, FARS reported 726 bicyclist deaths.

While we were not able to capture all fatalities in 2012, or over the longer time period of the Every Bicyclist Counts initiative our data is largely consistent with FARS where both data sources have comparable data.

Our Every Bicyclist Counts dataset is limited to fatalities and depended upon public sources and input. The majority of the information captured by Every Bicyclist Counts came from newspaper reports (56% of all reported sources), TV reports (25%) and blogs (19%).

Through these sources we collected information on 76% of the bicyclist fatalities reported in FARS in 2012. Since the Every Bicyclist Counts dataset is limited to fatalities it does not contain any information on injuries, near-misses, or general exposure to risks.

EVERY BICYCLIST COUNTS

In capturing and reporting data on 552 fatalities in 2012, we wanted to explore how and why these crashes were happening, how they were reported, what was done as a result, if blame was assigned, how the motorists were treated, and whether there were any consequences for their actions. We also aimed to provide a opportunity for friends and families to memorialize their lost loved ones.

Steven Kane

Age 57 Riverhead, NY November 01 2012

Comments: 16

Source The Middle Island man police say struck and killed a bicyclist on Middle Country Road in Calverton Thursday afternoon admitted to police he was on methadone at the time of the crash, according to prosecutors. William Slatton, 30, was arraigned this morning in Riverhead Justice Court on charges of driving under the influence of drugs, aggravated unlicensed operation of a motor vehicle and four counts of endangering the welfare of a child. Slatton pleaded not guilty to all counts and was remanded to the Suffolk County Correctional Facility in lieu of \$50,000 cash bail after his arraignment. Slatton described himself as the stay-at-home dad of the four young children who were passengers in his 2005 Toyota Camry when, according to police, he veered into oncoming traffic and onto the shoulder of the opposite lane, where his car struck cyclist Steven Kane, 57. Kane was pronounced dead at the scene of the crash. See prior story. Slatton, who has prior felony and misdemeanor convictions, is currently on probation, prosecutors told Riverhead Town Justice Allen Smith. He also failed to appear in court three times, the assistant district attorney said. His record prompted the court to set bail at \$50,000 cash, \$100,000 bond. The case against Slatton will be reviewed by the felony division, which may bring additional charges, prosecutors said. Kane, of Brightwaters, was an engineer at Brookhaven National Laboratory. A bicycle racing enthusiast, Kane brought his bike to work and rode every day during his lunch hour, said coworker George Goode, BNL assistant director for for environment, safety and health. Kane was a nationally ranked racer in his age group, married and a new grandfather, Goode said.



Collision Data

Crash time: Afternoon

Closest Intersection:

Land use: Suburban

Road type: Urban Arterial

Where on the road the collision happened: Road

Collision type: Head on

Driver Data

Vehicle type: Automobile

If truck: Unknown

At crash time driver was: Alcohol/Drugs, Suspended or Revoked License

Sources

Source: News Report

Type: Newspaper

Pos/Neg: Neutral

Link if Website: <http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Bicyclist-struck-and-killed-in-Suffolk-County-4002229.php>

Source: News Report

Type: Newspaper

Pos/Neg: Neutral

Link if Website: <http://www.riverheadlocal.com/breaking-news/7484-da-driver-in-fatal-crash-admitted-to-methadone-use->

Legal Status

Legal status: Misdemeanor

Against: Against Driver

Civil Suit filed?:

Settled?:

In favor of:

Type of Charge: charges of driving under the influence of drugs, aggravated unlicensed operation of a motor vehicle and four counts of endangering the welfare of a child

ANGELA LEVINE

November 03 2012

I worked for Steve as a temp for a few months a few years ago. My office was directly across from his. He was great to work for. Every day was entertainment to hear him interact with people. He was intelligent, droll, and vibrant. Then I procured a different position in the same department as Steve. He was a vital asset to our department. No one can ever replace him. He devoted his professional life to making Brookhaven National Laboratory a safer place to work. This is just so wrong that he has been taken from us.

Diana Stegall

November 04 2012

I knew Steve through our work together with the American Society of Safety Professionals - and he was a true safety professional. Very smart and sharp of wit. His introductions at board dinners are legendary. Many tried, but none succeeded in having the room laughing as hard as he did. He will be sorely missed.

Arn M. Heggers

November 05 2012

Steve and I were roommates for a time at the Coast Guard Academy. He was a great friend, probably more rebellious his freshman year than the Administration or upper class fully appreciated, but he had a passion for life. He was scheduled for a race in Maine and we were going to get together when he came up.... We never know when that day will come, so doing what we love and maintaining relationships is so important. He will be missed. My thoughts and prayers go out to Barbara, his children and grand daughters.

Jeff Moller

November 05 2012

I was a classmate and friend of Steve's at the US Coast Guard Academy. Steve was tough, smart, friendly, loyal and so funny. Always had a twinkle in his eye and something witty to say. He will be sorely missed by his CGA classmates.

FINDINGS

The findings presented are based on the totality of the information we collected and not limited to only those fatalities reported in the February 2011 to February 2013 timeframe of the Every Bicyclist Counts initiative. Several fatalities were reported outside that timeframe and they are included in the data examined for this report.

Common Collision Types

Through Every Bicyclist Counts, we were able to find out significantly more about fatal bicycle crashes than is publicly available in FARS. This reinforces the idea that better data collection and reporting is possible and should reaffirm the commitment of NHTSA to improve FARS reporting.

In 2012, FARS experimented with providing data based upon the Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT), but abandoned that effort in the hope to resume it in 2015 or 2016 when it reports data from 2014. The crash typology used in our initiative does not exactly match that of PBCAT, but it is broadly similar.

For example, the most common collision type in our Every Bicyclist Counts data is a rear end collision. Approximately 40% of fatalities in our data with reported collision types were rear end collisions. This is higher than what was found in the 2010 FARS release that included PBCAT-based crash types (27% of fatal crashes with reported collision types), although the crash type “motorist overtaking bicyclist” was the most common collision type in that data as well.

In many instances, it may be difficult for bicyclists alone to prevent fatal collisions. Safe cycling practices, proper lane control and equipment, and sensitivity to roadway conditions and context can help mitigate risks.

Investments in infrastructure, education, and other department of transportation activities can also have a profound impact on the safety of our roadways and help prevent the particularly problematic “motorist overtaking bicyclist” collision type.

Motorist and Bicyclist Behavior

There are two major ways to create safer roads: behavior changes by people using the roadways and engineering changes by the people creating and maintaining them. Every Bicyclist Counts gave us important data on current behaviors of motorists and bicyclists involved in fatal collisions.

TABLE 1

COLLISION TYPE	#	%
REAR END	194	40%
T-HIT	46	10%
HEAD ON	40	8%
NONE	33	7%
RIGHT HOOK	30	6%
DRIVER FAILURE TO YIELD	29	6%
OTHER	22	5%
SIDESWIPE	17	4%
CYCLIST FAILURE TO YIELD	10	2%
UNKNOWN	146	N/A

Source: League of American Bicyclists, Every Bicyclist Counts

FREDRICK JOHN MARTINEZ

Killed March 19, 2013. Age 51. Flagler Beach, Fl.



The oldest of six kids born and raised in Queens, NY, Freddy joined the Navy right out of high school at age 18 and served for six years traveling the world while on duty. His sister, Tami, described him as the definition of a “free spirit.” Always on the move, he attended 15 NFL Super Bowls, countless concerts and traveled the country. “We were all jealous of his lifestyle,” Tami said. “So carefree.” He had finally put down roots a in Flagler Beach, Fla., when he was tragically killed while riding his Avalon seven-speed bike home from the bank on the afternoon of March 19, 2013. A man driving a work van along the four-lane roadway said he sneezed suddenly, causing him to veer into the bike lane in which Freddy was riding. He was 51. The Navy veteran also left behind his parents, five siblings and a 26-year-old daughter. “The only comfort we take is that he did live his life to the fullest,” his sister said.

Among the 238 fatal crashes where an additional factor was reported for the DRIVER, three factors stood out:

- » 101 (42%) of those drivers were reported to be operating their vehicle in a careless or inattentive manner
- » 86 (36%) of those drivers were reported to have committed hit and runs
- » 28 (12%) of those drivers were reported to be under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs

Among the 94 fatal crashes where an additional factor was reported for the CYCLIST, three factors stood out:

- » 22 (23%) of those cyclists were reported to be riding the wrong way upon the roadway
- » 16 (17%) of those cyclists were reported to have failed to yield the right of way
- » 8 (9%) of those cyclists were reported to have been riding upon the sidewalk

In addition to those specific factors many — 46 or 49% — of the reported factors for cyclists were described individually.

Helmet use

Among the fatalities tracked by Every Bicyclist Counts, only 150 of the 633 reported fatalities included information on whether the cyclist was wearing a helmet. In the majority — 83 or 57% — of those fatalities the cyclist was wearing a helmet. This is higher than other data sources that record helmet use have reported.

For 2012, FARS reported that 136 cyclists injured in fatal crashes were wearing helmets, that 485 were not, and that there were 105 instances where use was unknown or not reported. In the past FARS has been criticized for underestimating helmet use, and while our data does not directly show that underestimation continues it does cast doubt on whether FARS data on helmet use is accurate.

Media Reporting

In 100 of the 628 fatal crashes recorded in the Every Bicyclist Counts initiative, the media report of the crash was classified as a negative report.

In many instances the media reports take the perspective of the motorist in a motorist-bicyclist crash, by explaining, for example, how a motorist failed to notice a bicyclist due to sun glare or dark clothing.

Another theme included bicyclists crossing roadways and media reports failing to explain the circumstances of crossing by addressing which vehicle had the right of way and other factors, such as how much time the driver had to react to the bicyclist's movement.

Additional themes in media reporting included:

- » Passive voice that made it unclear how a collision occurred
- » References to the equipment and attire of the bicyclist without educating the public about what the law requires
- » Discussing vehicles not persons
- » Lack of reporting that continued to the final disposition of cases

TRISH CUNNINGHAM

Killed August 21, 2013. Age 50. Annapolis, MD.



Trish Cunningham was a force. The married mom of three coached track and field and cross country athletes at the Annapolis High School (including her son Ben and daughter Avery), and field hockey and lacrosse as part of St. Mary's Recreational League. She also pushed herself athletically, often ranking in her running age group in the region and, in 2013 completed her first duathlon. “She inspired her team, her family, friends, and community to strive for excellence and live up to their potential,” her oldest daughter, Morgan, said. On August 21, 2013, she finished cross country practice and headed out for her usual 15-mile bike ride down Riva Road. As she began to crest a small hill, which is a no passing zone, a motorist fatally struck her from behind. The case was sent to a grand jury and the driver received just four modest traffic citations — for killing the community leader. The driver is now contesting these citations in court. Following her death, the phrase “Run Like Trish (RLT)” gained traction in Annapolis and the high school cross country team wore green “Trish” bracelets throughout the 2013 season. The tragedy also propelled advocacy to enforce Maryland’s 3-foot passing law and cyclists, runners and community members took to Anne Arundel County intersections in September 2013, holding signs that reminded motorists of the law. Trish is survived by her husband; children Morgan, Benjamin and Avery; four sisters and a brother; and her parents. “While the [driver] took her life,” Morgan said, “Trish Cunningham’s inspirational spirit lives on in the Annapolis community.”

Most Fatalities Occur on Urban Arterial Roads

According to FARS data, most bicyclist fatalities — 44% — occur on urban arterial roads.

While on most roadway types fatal crashes are considerably more likely to occur at non-intersection-related locations, urban arterials have a roughly equal number of fatalities that occur at intersection-related and non-intersection-related locations.

In general, fatal collisions are more common at intersection or intersection-related locations in urban areas than in rural areas. Fatal collisions are 3.7 more times more likely to occur at a non-intersection-related location in rural areas than at intersection-related locations.

ROAD TYPE	Non-Intersection	Intersection-related
Rural-Arterial	63	15
Rural-Collector	49	9
Rural-Local	53	21
Urban-Arterial	149	150
Urban-Collector	29	19
Urban-Local	59	62
TOTAL	402	276

Source: NHTSA Fatality Analysis Reporting System 2012

Consequences and Enforcement

Due to the nature of our data collection we don't have perfect information on the result of each crash, how blame was assigned, how motorists were treated, and the consequences (either civil or criminal) for motorists found at fault.

However, we do have a good amount of data on these issues and hopefully it can inform advocates, state DOTs, and the US DOT as they take actions to make our roads safer.

In 285 out of the 633 reported fatal crashes either the obituary or publicly entered data contained a term that indicated a potential enforcement action (e.g. citation, arrest, charge).

Of those 285 crashes:

- » 136 showed evidence of a likely official enforcement action and
- » Final sentences were found for 77

This data is based on public reports and is not exhaustive for the period of time covered by Every Bicyclist Counts or all fatal crashes collected as

part of Every Bicyclist Counts. The statistics that are presented here are meant to give some context to the state of justice for cyclists, but are not necessarily representative. There are a variety of reasons that information may be incomplete and the sample sizes are so low that small reporting differences can have a large impact.

There were four types of charges that frequently occurred:

- » DUI-related charges
- » Hit-and-run-related charges
- » Charges of a variation of negligent or vehicular manslaughter or homicide
- » Charges related to moving violations or careless driving

In 45 cases, multiple major charges were filed against one driver, usually a combination of hit-and-run and/or DUI and manslaughter or homicide. For the statistics shown below some simplification of charges was necessary and cases were grouped into like-sounding charges without accounting for state-to-state variations in language.

AARON COHEN

Killed February 16, 2012. Age 36. Miami, Fla.



In Aaron Cohen's death, there is hope for a better future. The Miami businessman and husband was taken from his loving wife and two children, Aiden and Lily, age one and three years old, when he was the victim of a hit-and-run while on his bike on February 15, 2012. The 36-year-old was passionate about bicycles: He was seemingly always training for his next race or triathlon, said his cousin, Elyse. "Aaron was everyone's favorite something -- he was my favorite cousin," Elyse said. "He was the person who never missed a birthday, always made time for one-on-one activities and made you feel like you were the only person in the room that mattered when he talked to you." On February 15, Aaron and his friend Enda went for a bike ride, as they did most Wednesday mornings. As they rode over a causeway, a car veered into the bike lane and hit both cyclists. The motorist drove off. Enda had a broken ankle, but Aaron was several feet ahead, unmoving. He died in the hospital the next day. The motorist, who according to news reports was driving with a restricted license, turned himself in 12 hours later and ultimately served only 264 days in prison. There is hope. Aaron's family and friends formed a coalition to gather support for a more stringent sentence for hit-and-run drivers. The Aaron Cohen Life Protection Act proposes a minimum mandatory sentence of four years for leaving the scene of an accident in an attempt to ultimately save more lives.

CHARGE	NUMBER	SENTENCES	AVERAGE YEARS OF INCARCERATION
Multiple Major Charges	45	26	7
Homicide or Manslaughter	41	25	5.2
Hit-and-run related	16	4	4.1
Careless driving-related	15	11	.1
DUI-related	12	8	4.1
Murder	4	2	21.5
Assault-related	2	1	12

Source: League of American Bicyclists, Every Bicyclist Counts

Due to lack of reporting or lack of prosecution, we don't know much about the consequences of most crashes that result in bicyclist fatality. Nationally:

- » 45% of fatal cyclist crashes had some indication of a potential enforcement action
- » 21% had evidence of a likely charge
- » 12% resulted in a sentence

When there was evidence of a likely charge, a final sentence was found 57% of the time. But some states were significantly lower, including Louisiana (3 of 8, 38%), South Carolina (1 of 3, 33%), and Texas (4 of 14, 29%).

In most cases where a final sentence was found the sentence was due to either a guilty or no-contest plea. Altogether, 49 of the 77 (64%) sentences found were due to either a guilty or no contest plea. It did not appear that one type of charge was more likely to result in a guilty or no contest plea, with about one-third of charges reported resulting in a plea across the top three charge categories. Plea bargains are common, but tend to trade an assurance of conviction for a lesser sentence. The average incarceration term for those pleas was 6 years, with a low of 30 days.

There were only five reported cases in which a conviction occurred after criminal trial. The average sentence in those cases was 13.2 years, with a low of 7 years in incarceration. Only three cases of acquittals or grand juries refusing to indict a motorist were found.

While a lesser penalty than incarceration, only nine news reports mentioned whether the driver's license was revoked or suspended. In those reports the average suspension was 3.9 years, with a low of six months. Only four licenses were revoked or suspended permanently.

Other notable trends included:

- » Drivers who killed female cyclists were more likely to be punished and more likely to receive longer sentences
- » Drivers who killed bicyclists between the ages of 20 and 30 were more likely to be punished and more likely to receive longer sentences

To ensure justice is served to deceased cyclists, their friends, and their families, we must make sure law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges are trained and equipped to pursue these types of common charges and give appropriate sentences for them. Vulnerable Road User laws can help by making it easier to charge careless driving-related offenses and increasing the sentences available for those offenses and homicide or manslaughter-related offenses.

In most states, enforcement actions are outside of the realm of the state DOT. However, as DOTs attempt to move towards zero road deaths they must eventually confront the role that enforcement plays and do a better job of working with their law enforcement systems.

KYLE KEEFE

Killed September 26, 2012. Age 49. Canon City, Colo.



When Kyle Keefe was 12, he built his very own bicycle. That Fourth of July, in 1976, he rode it in the local parade in Monument, Colo. “He loved biking and the freedom it gave him,” his sister, Erin, said. Riding every day became his “source of tranquility,” she said, and also his main means of exercise. While he preferred getting out on the rougher terrain with his mountain bike, he also rode every day to and from on his daily routine. He was also a gifted musician, often performing for his big family with six siblings and more than 35 cousins. “He had a way of making you feel great and could lift you up from the deepest sorrow,” Erin said. On his daily route on September 25, 2012, on sleepy suburban streets, a motorist turned right into Kyle’s path in Canon City, Colo., killing him. The motorist fled the scene, leaving Kyle on the street. He died a day later in the hospital. The driver was found guilty of leaving the scene of an accident involving death, criminally negligent homicide and careless driving causing death — and was sentenced to only 90 days in jail, five years probation and a one-year suspended license. “Kyle is forever missed by all of his family and friends,” his sister said. “We miss hearing him play his guitar and singing his songs. We miss the love and hugs he freely offered. We miss his smile and his laughter. We miss his eternal youth and playfulness. We miss his encouragement and his beautiful words of wisdom... There was a greatness about him that can never be duplicated.”

MOVING TOWARD PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Since the passage of the 2012 federal transportation bill — MAP-21 — and its creation of performance measures, we have been working to ensure that bicyclist safety is measured and improved. Every Bicyclist Counts highlights some of the data we believe could make a difference for bicyclist safety — however, states currently do not have an incentive to collect this data because they are not held accountable for the safety of bicyclists.

While we lack ideal data, we can say some things about the performance of different states for bicyclists and give some context to what a performance measure might look like. Even without federal requirements or accountability, states can adopt their own performance measures and make non-motorized safety a priority.

The table below provides insight on fatalities and commuting for the states with the largest populations of regular bicycle commuters in 2012. Although this data lacks any information on the

length and number of trips, which might allow us to know how many miles bicyclists travel, it is the closest proxy that we have to the exposure of bicyclists to risks.

Using existing data, we can look at bicycle safety through either a risk-based or a population-based performance measure. A risk-based performance measure says that 8.6 bicyclists have died for every 10,000 regular bicycle commuters in the United States between 2008 and 2012. Twenty seven states, and Washington D.C., perform better than this national fatality rate. All but one state with a mode share greater than the national average in 2012 — Florida — perform better than the national fatality rate. In addition, seven of the 10 states with the most regular bicycle commuters perform better than average.

A population-based performance measure says that 2.2 bicyclists have died per 1 million people in the United States between 2008 and 2012. Thirty nine states, and Washington, D.C., perform better than this national fatality rate. Four of the states

TABLE: Fatalities and Commuting Rates in the States with the 10 Largest Commuting Populations, 2008-2012

STATE	AV. # OF FATALITIES	SHARE OF NAT'L FATALITIES	AV. # OF BIKE COMMUTERS	FATALITIES PER 10K BIKE COMMUTERS	FATALITIES PER 1M POPULATION
CALIFORNIA	109	16%	169,860	6.4	2.9
FLORIDA	113	17%	51,997	21.7	6.0
NEW YORK	42	6%	44,548	9.4	2.2
OREGON	10	1%	39,517	2.5	2.6
ILLINOIS	25	4%	35,072	7.2	2.0
COLORADO	10	2%	32,578	3.1	2.0
TEXAS	48	7%	29,282	16.5	1.9
WASHINGTON	9	1%	28,304	3.3	1.4
PENNSYLVANIA	14	2%	25,969	5.5	1.1
ARIZONA	21	3%	24,687	8.4	3.2

Source: NHTSA FARS 2008-2012; U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 2012 (5-year estimate)

JOHN MELLO

Killed February 24, 2013. Age 57. McKinleyville, Calif.



John Mello was happiest on his bike, taking rides nearly every day. His daughter, Angie, said that passion for life was evident in his relationships with his children and grandchildren, as well. Father to two and grandfather to four, John “always put his family first,” Angie said. “Anyone could always depend on him for anything at a moment’s notice.” He liked to be active: He took his family out camping or on road trips or out hunting. But on February 24, 2013, that all came to a tragic end. Mello was struck by a vehicle while riding his bike on the shoulder U.S. Highway 101 in McKinleyville, Calif. “Our life will never be the same without him,” Angela said. “He was too young to leave this earth, but our lives are ever so full of memories and good times due to him, and for that I am so grateful for the time we had him. I know he is riding the golden roads now and that we will see him again when it is our time.” His brother Joe, an auto mechanic, constructed a large white cross to memorialize the spot where John was hit. He adorned the 10-foot tall cross with the mangled pieces of what remained of John’s bicycle. A plaque mounted on the cross says simply: “John Mello, Lived to Ride.” Thanks to Angie’s advocacy, the bridge near her father’s death will be designated the John Mello Memorial Bridge.

with a mode share greater than the national average in 2012 perform worse than the national fatality rate. Notably, Oregon looks substantially worse by this measure as it goes from the fourth best performance under the risk-based measure to the eighth worst performance under the population-based measure.

The choice of a performance measure can have a substantial impact. The current Notice of Proposed Rulemaking issued by US DOT in March prefers risk-based performance measures. The US DOT and the state DOTs can find ways to make performance measures that work for bicyclists and other non-motorized road users. They should not hide behind a lack of risk exposure data while not taking steps to solve that lack of data.

Current Efforts to Improve Data

In addition to FARS, states often report their own traffic crash statistics. Since 1998, NHTSA and the Governor's Highway Safety Association (GHSA) have worked to improve crash reporting through Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) guidelines.

A survey of the 10 states with the most regular bicycle commuters did not show much uniformity in how states report crashes. Eight of the 10 states included information on non-fatal injuries, as well as fatalities, but crash typing and analysis of driver and cyclist factors associated with crashes was inconsistent and often lacking.

The GHSA is a partner in FHWA's Road Safety Capacity Building Program, which aims to identify and bridge gaps in the knowledge regarding the public-sector roadway safety workforce. By adopting a performance measure for non-motorized road users, both organizations would have a greater stake in ensuring better crash reporting and analysis of crashes involving non-motorized road users, such as bicyclists.

In our 2013 Bicycle Friendly States survey, 28 states said that they collected data (e.g. traf-

fic tickets issued, prosecutions, or convictions) regarding enforcement of laws related to bicycles, or enforcement actions against motorists based on incidents with bicycles. However, this information can be difficult to come by or incomplete.

Very few states have a single statewide citation repository that meets the criteria called for in the NHTSA Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory. Having data on traffic citations would allow some quantitative analysis of enforcement efforts and perhaps some insight into whether the culture of traffic safety is improving or worsening.

Cyclists Lose When Data Determines Funding

States are currently required to create Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs) as a part of the process of using Highways Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds. Currently, all 10 states with the most regular bicycle commuters included bicyclist safety as an emphasis area in their SHSP.

The creation of a SHSP often included the creation of a performance measure related to reducing fatalities and injuries to bicyclists or specific action steps designed to improve bicyclist safety. A national performance measure would strengthen the commitment of the states to these areas of emphasis.

The HSIP program is data driven. Without better data it's likely that non-motorized road users, including bicyclists, will continue to lose out on this federal funding source. From 2009 to 2013 only 0.4% of available HSIP funds were spent on projects that promoted bicyclist and pedestrian safety — despite the fact that 15% of fatalities during that period were bicyclists and pedestrians and 37 states have the safety of bicyclists and/or pedestrians as an emphasis areas in their Strategic Highway Safety Plans. Right now there is a dramatic gap between stated policy and practical reality and a performance measure, providing accountability for stated policy, is needed to close it.

CONCLUSION

The Every Bicyclist Counts initiative has given us valuable information about when, where, and how fatal bicycle crashes occur. But we still need more data and better reporting to reduce bicyclist injuries and fatalities.

There is much we do not know and will not know without better reporting. A national performance measure would push states that already include bicyclist safety in their Strategic Highway Safety Plans and ensure other states also make bicyclist safety an area of emphasis.

Now is the time to take action.

Right now Congressional staff and US DOT personnel are working on what will be the next federal transportation bill. There is still time to comment on US DOT's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, which currently does not include a performance measure for non-motorized modes of transportation.

- » You can work with the League to ensure non-motorized safety is addressed in the next transportation bill.
- » You can tell government safety organizations, like NHTSA and GHSA, that bicyclists' safety is important and must be part of performance-based approaches to funding decisions.
- » You can work with your state for better understanding of the role enforcement plays in bicyclists' safety.

At the League we're committed to creating a more Bicycle Friendly America. The safety of bicyclists and the accountability of those who injure them are of the utmost importance.

What makes Every Bicyclist Count are the actions that we take to ensure that more bicyclists will not be needlessly lost.

RESOURCES

- » Ride of Silence: <http://www.rideofsilence.org/main.php>
- » Ghost Bikes: <http://ghostbikes.org/>
- » League of American Bicyclist Education Program: <http://bikeleague.org/ridesmart>
- » NHTSA Fatality Analysis Reporting System: <http://www.nhtsa.gov/FARS>
- » Census American Community Survey: <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- » Streetsblog: <http://usa.streetsblog.org/>
- » Share the Road Coalition, Ontario: <http://www.sharetheroad.ca/cycling-health-and-safety-p128276>
- » Road Peace, UK: <http://www.roadpeace.org/rdr/>
- » Cycling Touring Club UK Space for Cycling Campaign: <http://www.ctc.org.uk/news/space-for-cycling-national-campaign-for-better-streets-for-cycling>
- » Vision Zero sites
 - » NYC: <http://www.nyc.gov/html/visionzero/pages/home/home.html>
 - » Sweden: <http://www.visionzeroinitiative.com/>
 - » Transportation Alternatives: <http://transalt.org/issues/enforcement/visionzero>
 - » WalkSF: <http://walksf.org/about/goals-mission/vision-zero/>
 - » SFMTA: <https://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/vision-zero>
- » Toward Zero Deaths sites
 - » FHWA: <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/tzd/>
 - » GHSA: <http://www.ghsa.org/html/TZD/>
 - » National Strategy on Highway Safety: <http://www.towardzerodeaths.org/home.php>
- » The Brad Fund, Tucson: <http://www.scvbac.org/brad.html>
- » CycleHelmets.org Critique of FARS: <http://www.cyclehelmets.org/1174.html>
- » Arizona Bike Law Analysis of FARS: <http://azbikelaw.org/blog/fars-and-pbcat/>
- » North Carolina PBCAT statistics: http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/pbcat_nc/
- » Pedestrian & Bicycle Information Center PBCAT resources: http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/pbcat_nc/
- » NHTSA State Data Information Resources: <http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/stateCatalog/stateData.html>
- » Biking in LA: <http://bikinginla.com/tag/bicycling-fatality/>
- » Right of Way's Killed by Automobile Report: http://www.cars-suck.org/research/kba_text.pdf
- » City-based bicyclist safety reports:
 - » Boston: http://www.cityofboston.gov/news/uploads/16776_49_15_27.pdf
 - » Chicago: <http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/cdot/bike/general/BikeCrashReport2012.pdf>
 - » Minneapolis: <http://www.minneapolismn.gov/www/groups/public/@publicworks/documents/images/wcmsip-102346.pdf>



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 15, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 City of Las Cruces Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

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

This item is to discuss the status of the renewal process.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 15, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.3 BPAC Annual Report Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

This item is a continuation of a related discussion at the May BPAC meeting.