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 21, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. in the Doña Ana Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the Mesilla Valley MPO website.

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers listed above. Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana del Valle de Mesilla: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).

1. CALL TO ORDER ___________________________________________________________ Chair
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA ____________________________________________________ Chair
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES _____________________________________________________ Chair
   3.1. May 19, 2015 ___________________________________________________________________
4. PUBLIC COMMENT __________________________________________________________ Chair
5. ACTION ITEMS ____________________________________________________________________
   5.1. Recomend Approval of Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program ________________________________ MPO Staff
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS __________________________________________________________________
   6.1. Presentation on the Valley Drive Improvement Project __________ MPO Staff
   6.2. Presentation on the University Avenue Study Corridor __________ MPO Staff
7. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS _____________________________________________
   7.1. MPO Staff Update: SRTP update, Missouri Study Corridor Update ___ MPO Staff
   7.2. Local Projects update _________________ CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff
   7.3. NMDOT Projects update _________________ NMDOT Staff
8. PUBLIC COMMENT ____________________________________________________________ Chair
9. ADJOURNMENT ________________________________________________________________ Chair
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                    Sharon Nebbia (MPO)  

OTHERS PRESENT:    Marc South  
                    Armando Morales  
                    Andrew Bencomo  
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1. CALL TO ORDER  

   Pearson: Advisory Committee at right about 5:00 p.m. First have to call to order.  

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA  

   Pearson: Next order of business is the Approval of the Agenda.  

   Murphy: Mr. Chair. Staff would like to request a change. We’d like to add a, after the Action Items a Discussion Item for presentation by New Mexico Department of Transportation, the New Mexico Statewide Transportation Plan.
Pearson: Okay. So I'd like to hear a motion with that amendment to approve the agenda as ...

Curry: I motion to approve the agenda.

Pearson: Ashleigh Curry.

Herrera: I second.

Pearson: We have a motion and second. All in favor “aye.”

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed “nay.” That passes. I guess the part of the call to order actually I should've gotten through and done roll call and identified everybody. We have a new member?

Murphy: Yeah. Yes. We have a new member, Duane Bentley who's appointed by the Policy Committee last, at their meeting last week.

Bentley: How y'all doing?

Pearson: And you're representing?

Bentley: BPAC, I guess. The pedestrians and the cyclists of Las Cruces.

Pearson: All right. Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair. He, is the bicycle community representative replacing Leslie Kryder.

Pearson: Okay. Why don't we just go through the members and do I guess a roll call, identify everybody?

Murphy: Okay. What do you think, me start on the right. Everybody state their name and the, the organization you’re affiliated with.


Nunez: James Nunez, City of Las Cruces.

Bentley: Duane Bentley, the pedestrians of Las Cruces and also I work with NMSU as a student advisor.
Shearer:  David Shearer, Environmental Health and Safety at NMSU, representing NMSU.

Curry:  Ashleigh Curry representing the Town of Mesilla as a citizen.

Herrera:  Jolene Herrera, New Mexico Department of Transportation.

Leisher:  Mark Leisher, citizens of Dona Ana County.

Pearson:  And George Pearson, City of Las Cruces Citizen Representative.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 April 21, 2015

Pearson:  Approval of the minutes is the next order of business. Any comments on the minutes? Any discussion? There a motion to approve as presented?

Herrera:  Move to approve.

Shearer:  Second.

Pearson:  I have a motion and second. All in favor of approving the minutes, “aye.”

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson:  Any opposed?

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson:  Next we have an opportunity for public comment. This is one of two public comments available, one at the beginning and one at the end of the meeting if anybody from the public wish to address us. Seeing none.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Recommend Approval to the Policy Committee of Transport 2040, Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

Pearson:  We’ll move on to our Action Items; 5.1, Recommended Approval of the Policy Committee of Transport 2040.

Wray:  Thank you Mr. Chair. It is time again for the MPO to approve a new TIP. Sorry. I thought it was TIP first.

Murphy:  I, I thought he was just jumping in to save me work. Okay.
Wray: I thought it was time for the TIP.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. We're here before you today to ask for a recommendation to the Policy Committee for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. We've, as longtime members of this Committee know we've been working on this update for the past 18-plus months and we're finally getting to the, to the point we have the, we've gone through final public meetings, public comment period, and now we're asking for a recommendation. Before staff does that, Michael McAdams has a presentation for the, for the Committee particular the newer members of the Committee to kind of illustrate what the Metropolitan Transportation Plan is about.

McAdams: Thank you Tom and welcome for the new members and I would like to discuss the Transportation 2040 update and you can see it on your screen as we go along.

Michael McAdams gave his presentation.

Bentley: I'm, I'm going to cut you off right there. For your metro, or Metropolitan Transportation Plan ...

McAdams: Yes.

Bentley: Are you, are you incorporating any like pedestrian walk ways?

McAdams: Of course, yeah.

Bentley: Or sidewalks like that?

McAdams: Absolutely. Absolutely. This is a really, if you look at the shift from transportation planning, it was really toward roads and transit and pedestrian and bicycles, oh!

Bentley: And, and that's the thing is we'd like to shift ...

McAdams: Exactly.

Bentley: Kind of away from roads.

McAdams: Exactly. I don't think, you see the plan and you see if you, hopefully you can download the plan too, you see this is where we're going.

Bentley: Okay.
Michael McAdams continued his presentation.

Bentley: I think immigration rates are dropping.

Pearson: If, if you can wait until the, if we can let staff do the presentation.

McAdams: It doesn’t matter, yeah.

Pearson: We’ll have a section for comments later.

McAdams: I can, I can take it either way.

Michael McAdams continued his presentation.

Bentley: Are there going to be any more plans to, to improve the nightlife here in Las Cruces?

McAdams: Well that’s not really, that’s not really a purview of, of perhaps transportation but it is kind of halfway in relationship. If you can get people that are, if you look at entertainment, restaurants, housing together, I think that one of the aims of development downtown is to have that integrated multiuse.

Bentley: The college city.

McAdams: And, and also the thing is livability is connected to this too. If you have pedestrian areas, if you have people that, like restaurants and cafes and bookstores and shops you can walk to, that’s part of livability and really if you’re looking at most communities, a lot of people go to areas particularly in Colorado. It’s not because there’s resources there. It’s not because there’s, you know iron ore, whatever, that’s old. They’re going for quality of life.

Bentley: Right.

McAdams: And I think that’s what Las Crucens are really going to. They, they know that we have, we’re, we’re not a manufacturing country, we’ll never be again and also that developing things for, where, why do people go to Seattle? It’s certainly not for the weather. It’s really, you know it’s, it’s for the environment and for the atmosphere that’s created for the millenials and we know millenials they don’t want, they don’t want to have cars anymore, they don’t want to be in suburbs, they want to be in walk-able exciting areas so I think that yeah this is related and definitely but I think that transportation (inaudible) but again after 50 years of really automobile domination it’s going to be a long while before really see livable communities I think. But any, any questions you have you’re willing to,
more than willing to talk to us. We’d love to talk to you about issues in the transportation plan.

Curry: I’m just looking at figure 6-6a. Is that prioritized in any way?

McAdams: 6-6 ...

Curry: It’s the main sheet that.

Shearer: The handout.

Curry: The handout.

McAdams: Okay, the handout. I’m, well we, they’re not really a priority, those aren’t in order as far as I know. There’s not, you know I said “This is number one.” No, I think they’re, they’re just, “Here’s a group of projects we would like to do.” And I think those are in the transportation planning process. They, they’re, they are set in priority by the need and by interest I think. Some will, some we know will, will jump up faster you know and if you look at that priorities list some are already almost in process. The Valley Road project is pretty much ready to go. Missouri we know is already gone. It is pretty much in process. Other things are going to come up like the Triviz and University interchange. Some will come up closer and then others will be farther back in the, in the five-year process. And, and once you get beyond the five-year process, 21 to 40 the midyear to, to the long-range then it becomes even more fuzzy so I think it’s, well I don’t think it’s the rule of the MPO staff or even the, well the, it’s really the Policy Committee responsibility to prioritize, put in priority the different projects and again transportation planning is not a, is not a step by step. It’s a, often as things needs arise too. You know ...

Curry: Thank you. Could I just ask one more question to tag onto that?

McAdams: Sure.

Curry: So these have already been studied and planned and this is for implementation?

McAdams: Yeah. No, no, no. These are, these are just, “plan” meaning these should be considered for study.

Curry: Okay.

McAdams: Some are further, some are further along on the way and getting into it, none of the, none of them on the TIP. The TIP is really after study has been done, if it’s a major roadway and ...
Murphy: Michael, Michael if I, if I may jump in. Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. These, these are all projects that did come about through the public process for developing the MTP. Some of them such as the I-10 mill and overlay and the Valley Drive are already programmed within the Transportation Improvement Program. Others such as the, you know such as the Hadley bike boulevard are, need some further, further study and, and are you know more processing. The North Main/Lohman/ITS corridor is likewise. So what this does is this represents a list of the projects and the best we could estimate the cost for them through the first five years of the plan. As far as assigning any kind of priority to them, this list has, has, it does not infer any sort of priority. That comes later through the, through the TIP process when funding is, is identified for ...

Pearson: So the ones that have dollar amounts, those are not all on the TIP. Some of these are just estimates of ...

Murphy: That is correct Mr. Chair. Yes.

Pearson: Like the corridor, the two corridor studies, those are, that’s just imaginary money at this point.

Murphy: Yeah ...

Pearson: The West Mesa and like Sonoma.

Murphy: Yeah, some of, some of it’s, I think the West Mesa corridor study is based on the, a solid estimate for the, it’s what’s going to be requested in the TIP. The, the study area for Sonoma Ranch is more loose and it hasn’t, hasn’t been scoped out yet.

Pearson: But those haven’t come through the TIP process yet.

Murphy: That’s correct.

Pearson: But some of the others certainly have, Valley Drive and North Main. Those are, some of those are committed.

Murphy: Right. Some, some of those are, you know particularly of the projects that are, you know going to happen in FY16 and FY17, those are pretty, pretty firm. When we get a little further, further out there’s less certainty.

Pearson: So can, maybe Jolene can remind me. How far out is the Triviz/University intersection?
Herrera: Mr. Chair that is programmed in Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019 so we’re looking at probably construction in 2020 if we can imagine out that far.

Pearson: Any other Committee members have comments? Okay. I looked through the, the document that you posted, the draft plan and I have a couple comments on that. On pages four and seven, four I think is, I’m just looking at my notes so I don’t have the plan in front of me. You had a list of acronyms. ISTEA included, preceded whatever the other act was and on page seven where you talked about the, the history of the transportation bills, there wasn’t any mentioned a SAFETEA-LU but I don’t remember how that, seems like SAFETEA-LU is one of those in the ...

Murphy: The, the ...

Pearson: Succession of bills that came through.

Murphy: Yeah, SAFETEA-LU is a succession. We did, we did get, get all your comments Mr. Chair and the, the latest electronic iteration on the website we, we did, I’d say, I’d say we made 90% of the recommended changes that, that you had done.

Pearson: Right. I did see that.

Murphy: We do have the, you know the, the table of contents, the table of acronyms in that so I, I do believe we’ve hit the majority of, of your concerns there.

Pearson: And I noticed on page 51 there’s something that says “moved from the green infrastructure section.” That kind of looked like just an editing comment left over. I wonder if that was in, left over.

Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair. That would be a, an editing from the previous iteration of Transport 2040 where we had a green infrastructure section within, within our ...

Pearson: All right but that, that’s not really intended to be in the document, I suspect.

Murphy: You’re right, yeah. Right and, let’s see we can certainly make ...

Pearson: So that ...

Murphy: Make that edit if we’ve not done so already.
Pearson: And just as a, for prettiness on page 75 you have a, a table with some dollar amounts on it. If, you have the, the dollars are all center-aligned. I think it'd make much more readable to right-align the dollar amounts.

Murphy: Okay.

Pearson: And the only other kind of substantial one and it may have been that I didn't get that far before, starting on page 77 the heading is “Federal Transportation Bill” but then it seems the discussion is about state funding opportunities so I wonder if you could clarify that for me.

Murphy: I think we should probably change that to “Transportation Funding,” that header because it is a, it is a mix of both federal and state and private discussion within that paragraph.

Pearson: Any other Committee members have any comments?

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I had a couple of questions. On the public comment portion, in what ways do you do public comment and I apologize, I’m new to the, to the whole Committee so I’m working my way into this. In what ways do you have public comment and, and how do you track that public comment?

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. We held three rounds of public involvement meetings. We started in, in late fall, November of 2013. We had some meetings in 2014 and some others in 2015. We provided public comment sheets for people to, to write in and submit their comments on there. Meanwhile we maintained a, a, I guess a dedicated e-mail address that, on our website to, you know for people to e-mail us comments and we’ve, unfortunately we don’t have, have a whole lot of public here tonight, or usually at, at, at, were at many of the meetings but we did provide you know public comment through all of our public meetings, essentially nine meetings a year at the, at the BPAC, 11 meetings a year at the TAC, and ten meetings a year for Policy Committee and whenever we did receive comments we, we’ve scanned those, put those in a folder, kind of used those to help, help drive the writing of, of it and we provided updates to the, you know to the committees, particularly the Policy Committee on, on the nature of the comments that we received. That’s one of the, that’s one of the things that drove us adding the Sonoma Ranch study area into the plan at this late date was based on the public comments that we received during this last round of public involvement.

Bencomo: Okay, and I was just curious. So the, the public comment was allowed at each of the already scheduled meetings, correct? There wasn’t a separate like, “Hey, public. This meeting is specifically for you to give
input on this.” It was integrated as part of the other meetings, is that correct?

Murphy: We did integrate it as part of the other meetings and we had three distinct rounds of public meetings. We held five meetings throughout the area in September of, no in November of ’13. We held, and we went to various, we went to Del Cerro Community Center in Vado, we went to the Dona Ana Community Center up north in Dona Ana. We were at the East Mesa Branch of the Community College, we were at the Farmer’s and, Farmer and Ranch Market, we were at the Branigan Library on a, on a weekend, and then we held another round of public comment I believe it was in September of ’14 where we advertised, had meetings around the MPO area and advised that these meetings are for you to come and comment on our, on our plans, and then we had the final round just last month. We, we, we did limit it to three locations. We were down in Vado, we were downtown Las Cruces, and we were also in the Town of Mesilla where we advertised it, this is exclusively for the public to come and give us their opinions.

Bencomo: Okay.

Pearson: Did you …

Bencomo: Excellent. Yeah. And I just, the, the only reason I asked is having worked for the City previously and we do public meetings like for the budget, things like that, the same three people show up all the time. I’m being sarcastic of course. And so …

Murphy: We have the, we have the same six.

Bencomo: Getting the public comment is, is very difficult and getting out there into the community and, and so in the future I guess if, if it’s, when the next iteration of this is done there’s some great connections with another group that I work with and, and we do the same thing with the health impact assessment for the County’s Comp Plan and, and getting out into the communities and actually getting people to come is the key and so that, I have some great resources for that in the future so thank you Mr. Chair.

Pearson: I wonder if you could characterize how you felt you got the response. Was it light response, medium, did you get a decent response, as much as you expect, did you, did the public outnumber staff is kind of a …

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair of course I, of course I was disappointed in the, in the response. I was, I, although I can’t say that I was overly surprised. We always want to hear more from the public. They’re, I, I would say most, most of the, particularly the early on meetings we were outnumbered by
the public. I think, I think in the last round though there was, there was one meeting where we did outnumber the public. It’s not, not for, not for lack of trying. We also worked with the, the County’s efforts with Viva Dona Ana. In fact we even, you know we even used transportation comments that they received and we incorporated those into our plan as well so to broaden our scope. The Policy Committee Chair and I also appeared on KRWG you know promoting, promoting coming out but for those, you know for those of you that have been involved in, in planning activities for any, any length of time, the only time you manage to get people is when you get them upset and, and then they’re motivated to come in, so we had a mild turnout. It wasn’t, wasn’t surprising but what we did was we, we advertised the opportunity, we provided the opportunities and we advertised them which I think is, is the best that we can do in this realm.

Pearson: Okay. Any other comments?

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I do just have one sort of comment/question. It’s on the very last page and I know that I talked about this with staff, I don’t know whenever the last meeting was that we were all at. It’s that very last section so you did some rearranging of the wording and it sounds a little bit more positive but that very last sentence, I have no idea what that means. It says, “It should be at least as challenging as transit New Starts, maintenance capacity, capability excuse me, should be ensured and all modes should be treated equally.” That just makes, I mean I, I understand parts of it but what, what does that mean?

Murphy: This...

Herrera: Especially the “transit new starts” thing. I mean that just, I don’t know if it’s...

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I’m not sure whether that, that belongs within the context of, of this plan. What the, what the, what the sentiment behind that sentence would be would be that where, where FHWA expansions would be treated the same as FTA New Starts as far as being a competitive process not, you know and basically where the applying entity really bids what the local match is. So I, I, I’ve seen that sentence before and I may have actually written this particular one but I, I don’t see where it belongs into this, into this paragraph.

Herrera: I think some of that should be in there. The maintenance definitely is a, a point that you’re making a lot in this plan.

Murphy: Yes.
Herrera: So that part makes sense and then obviously all modes should be treated equally. That’s very important so I, maybe just some wordsmithing in that last sentence.

Murphy: Yeah. I, I, I, yeah I think, I think we need to take the reference to the New Starts out there and, and a little bit of wordsmithing. I hope that this Committee can, will, will trust staff to, to make that change. I know, I know you as an individual Committee member will get another crack at this at the Technical Advisory Committee but I think I would need some word, wordsmithing but I still would like to, like to get a, a recommendation this evening.

Pearson: Okay. Actually that last paragraph did stand out to me is like, “Wow. This is a great thing. This is what we should be doing.” So maybe just the wordsmithing and I might’ve skipped the part I didn’t understand that Jolene’s pointing it out. Okay.

Nunez: Mr. Chair. I did enjoy reading through this and so I want to say thanks to your team but I do have one comment, well I have a question first too for Mr. McAdams. On that one slide you had on the, I think it was titled “The Bicycle Boulevards.” The, was that a photo in this region?

McAdams: No it’s from Santa Fe (inaudible).

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair and Mr. Nunez. That is a, a picture from Tucson. I forget the particular street but they have several bike boulevards implemented with, to our neighbor to the west.

Nunez: Okay. Thanks. Yeah, I, I saw that product at the recent New Mexico DOT conference green. So any rate I, I was curious if we had used it in our community is one, one of the reasons I asked. And then also a takeoff of that too I, I’m sure you know I’m pretty new to the City Roads Department is when you, when you all identify some roads that you want to create boulevards kind of what, like they’ve done at NMSU. They’ve closed off a couple of roads for pedestrians and bicycles. You guys just work with the City for that or have you already identified a few? I’m just kind of curious, have you tagged any for potential blockage?

Murphy: We, Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. We have had some preliminary discussions with, with the Transportation Department, particularly traffic engineering within the city. We’ve also used this Committee as far as identifying likely candidates. The road diets that, that have been done have, have really been in close collaboration with traffic engineering.

Nunez: All right, great, thanks. And then I have one more comment too on figure 66-A or (A) that you handed out I was, I know that you have a few blanks
in there. I was just curious how you’re, and I know you’re in a draft form. I
had actually seen the one you handed out in March also, the draft, but I
was curious I, or I thought that maybe you could add an asterisk or some,
some information like in the estimates and then how you hope to use it
cause, you know or say approximate construction value or something in
the, in the other columns there where you’re at.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. I think we can do something like that.

Nunez: And again like I, I think about how I’ve used these in the past to, to push
up to upper management and say, “Okay, you know later we’re going to
plan on using this and we’ll need this amount of money.” And it helps
them finance, or budget for those items, so. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So just a couple of comments. One of them is I like these
concepts with the, the bike boulevards and those type of things and the
traffic comment, I understand the concepts of reducing roadway widths
and things like that. However also there’s that conundrum of now you’re,
public safety-wise, the uniform fire code requires specific roadway widths
and those type of things so trying to, to reconcile both of those together’s
going to be a challenge but I think it can be done. And the second
comment I had was reading the plan, one thing I was very pleased to see
in there, compliments to you guys is there was a kind of a focus of health
in there. It talked about how transportation affects the health of our
communities and people’s livability and you’re using the livability principles
is great so kudos to you guys for, for starting to incorporate those
comments into this type of plan.

Pearson: Any other comments from Committee members? So should we just move
it forward and then staff will take care of comments as comments to
administratively change it? Is that how you (inaudible)

Murphy: Mr. Chair. If, if this Committee’s comfortable with that, that’s how we’d like
to proceed.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I move to approve or to recommend approval to the Policy
Committee with the discussion that’s happened here to be incorporated by
staff.

Pearson: There’s a motion. Is there a second?

Shearer: Second.

Pearson: David Shearer. All in favor, “aye.”

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.
Pearson: Opposed? That passes. Next, now it’s Andrew who’s up.

Murphy: Pardon Mr. Chair. I didn’t get the, who made the second.

Pearson: David Shearer.

Murphy: Oh. Right in front of me. Sorry. Thank you.

5.2 Recommend Approval to the Policy Committee of the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Wray: Mr. Chair. Now it is time to discuss the 2016-2021 TIP.

Andrew Wray gave his presentation.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I just, it’s not a question but I just wanted to add a bit of clarification to the US-70 project that Andrew was talking about.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: Yeah, that one is specifically to improve cycling over the Pass, the San Augustin Pass. So that’s the section of 70 cause you know it’s a big road.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: Thank you.

Pearson: Yeah. I had a question on that. It, the monies are split across two years. Is that, can you just explain why that is?

Herrera: Sure. Mr. Chair. We recently, from the project development engineer had a request to set aside some money for some design work through a consultant and so that’s the $350,000 that you see in 2016 and then the construction is in Fiscal Year 2017.

Curry: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. May I have, I have a quick question. I don’t see the Soledad Canyon project, the, the plans that were done. Is that not a TIP project?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. Dona Ana County did not submit that information to us to include on the TIP. I have no further information on it other than that.

Pearson: That doesn’t necessarily have to be on the TIP because of the State and...
Wray: It, if it, if it’s, if it’s not, if it’s utilizing local funding then it doesn’t need to go through ...

Pearson: It’s only federal funding that needs to be on the TIP, is that ...

Wray: Our process. Yes.

Curry: Ms. Herrera is that something that you know about, the Soledad Canyon project and funding?

Herrera: I have heard about it. I have not heard how they are getting their funding. I believe it’s through capital outlay which is state funding so we really don’t have, we’re basically a pass-through vehicle on that but we don’t oversee those projects.

Curry: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: Any other, go ahead.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I had a question about the University interchange, talks about the roadway reconstruction extension and multiuse path. Is that going to, is Triviz going to be extended underneath University? How does that, I don’t have any information. I’m sorry.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. I believe we’re still in the design, or I’m not even sure if we’re to the design phase on that one yet but I believe the, the expressed intention is to put Triviz under, the multiuse path under, but I’ll defer to Ms. Herrera if she has further comments.

Herrera: That is true. We are not quite in the design phase. We had a request from the project development engineer to set aside $2 million in 2016 to start designing that and looking at I guess configurations for it but the intention is to put Triviz and the multiuse path under so it will lead right directly to the university.

Bencomo: Thank you.

Bentley: You guys do take e-mails and concerns and comments from the public, right, I can, and there’s other people that I can like, cause I’m not the only cyclist on the road. There’s other people that would like to contact and ...

Wray: Absolutely.

Bentley: Awesome. Thank you. That’s my only question.
Mr. Chair. I have one question about the Solano-Spitz-Three Crosses project. Why was that put off, out of curiosity, or moved?

Wray: I would have to, I don’t believe it’s been moved at any point but I would have to defer to Ms. Herrera.

Herrera: No, I think you’re referring to Andrew’s comments that it’s in the current TIP and then we’re moving it to the new TIP. It’s just because of the, the fiscal years so our current TIP cuts off at Fiscal Year 2015.

Leisher: Okay.

Herrera: And so since, since it’s, it’s in 2016 it has to be in the new TIP.

Leisher: Oh, okay. Thanks.

Pearson: Okay. Any other comments? I’ll hear a motion to approve the TIP as a, as a, approved, as ...

Herrera: Proposed.

Pearson: Proposed. As presented.

Nunez: I’ll make a motion.

Pearson: And the second?

Bentley: I’ll second it.

Pearson: And we have a motion and a second from, seconds from Mr. Bentley. All in favor, “aye.”

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? And that passes.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS (added per agenda vote under approval of agenda)

6.1 NMDOT UPDATE

Pearson: We’re on to our discussion item now and our NMDOT representative will do a presentation for us.

Murphy: And, okay, there’s, she doesn’t have to step around if she doesn’t like, want to.
Herrera: It’s up to the Committee, would you like me down here?

Pearson: Absolutely.

Leisher: We want to get the full effect.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Jolene Herrera gave her presentation.

Pearson: Okay. Could you talk a little bit about how the safety plan relates to this plan? Are they at the same level?

Herrera: Well Mr. Chair this plan is going to be sort of like the highest level plan.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: So every other plan that we have is incorporated into this plan but that, this one rules I guess you could say.

Pearson: Okay. So are there other, what other plans are at the level of, that the safety plan would be at then?

Herrera: The freight plan.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: It’s a part of this one as well but it is also its own standalone so that one is similar to the safety plan. We have elements of freight all throughout the long-range plan but really if you’re looking for freight that would be the resource just like if you’re looking for safety the Strategic Highway Safety Plan would be your resource.

Pearson: And, and there’s a rail plan also?

Herrera: There’s a rail plan. Yeah there’s, I think that’s all that’s really incorporated into this one. We do have transit plans. They’re sort of broken out by region though so ...

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: But yeah, this one definitely is the one that sort of rules them all.

Pearson: All right. You mentioned the 22 tribes. How many tribes do we have in the District 1? Any?
Herrera: There is one, sort of. It’s the Alamo Chapter of the Navajo Nation.


Herrera: Right. They’re not active at all. I don’t know if they’re actually considered their own tribe, to be honest. That’s just my ignorance. I definitely should know that. But in District 2 we have the Mescalero Apache tribe.

Pearson: Right. And the Fort Sill isn’t quite a tribe yet?

Herrera: No, no they’re not. Not yet.

Pearson: Okay.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I believe we have Tiwa tribe here also if they’re considered a tribe in terms of what NMDOT would look at.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: Yeah.

Pearson: And I looked briefly at the draft plan and one of the, the maps showed the, the state of New Mexico and all the RPOs and the MPOs showing that the entire state does get planning effort. I’d seen that map some time ago in some other context but it took me a long time to figure out that gee, that really does happen because back when this Committee was first born I was part of it and I didn’t understand any of that stuff so it takes a long process to figure out this stuff, so any of the new Committee members when we talk about these things I’m sure it’s just a, a blur but it’s, it’s a learning process and, and I think this plan has become much more simplified than the things that have been before it. The vision statement I particularly like. I remember being upset when the multimodal mention was removed from the NMDOT website so hopefully we can get that back up there, that this vision is actually the vision and that we move forward. The transparency seems real important too because I know from my perspective as a citizen and not necessarily recently, but it’s wrong. How do we fix that? It’s too late. It’s, we’re going to have to deal with this now. So getting the planning process in and getting public input before the project is built is very important but I think this plan supports that.

Herrera: Yeah, definitely. It’s a different kind of plan. We all realize that we’re going to have to adapt. We’re going to have to learn how to do things differently than we’ve ever done them in the past and amazingly enough, everybody that I’ve talked to within DOT seems to be on board. We all understand that and I think we’re, we’re ready for implementation.
Pearson: Any Committee member comments?

Leisher: I, I have one. Is NMDOT planning on creating a portal that will give access to NMDOT’s planning, plans as well as all the district plans at progressively lower levels, an online portal sort of?

Herrera: Yes. We will have it available online. I guess the point of clarification is there are no district plans. Everybody will be using this plan.

Leisher: Oh. Okay.

Herrera: Yeah. We don’t, we don’t want to plan in silos anymore so we …

Leisher: Right

Herrera: You know everybody’s using the same one but definitely after it’s adopted by the State Transportation Commission we’ll make the, the final document available in all sorts of ways. Right now the draft is available in a couple of different ways. I’ll make sure to get that press release out to you but yes.

Leisher: Okay. Thanks.

Pearson: Right. Kind of as a follow-up on that, the State Transportation Commission, they got their policies and one of the policies was specifically bicycle-pedestrian that I was looking at some years ago now, but it’s difficult to find the State Transportation Commission policies and they’re numbered up to a hundred and some probably so if you’re doing some sort of web-based portal it’d be great to be able to have, to see, to be able to find them anyplace on, even just knowing what the title is would be helpful for certain things.

Herrera: Yeah. That’s a good comment. I will definitely take that to my bosses and see if we can, I’ve never thought of it but I don’t even know where to access those as a DOT employee so it’s something that definitely needs to happen.

Pearson: Go ahead.

Nunez: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. Thanks. I do have a general question first. Is this, is this coming from the vision of the NMDOT management or is this something that came across from complaints or something from whomever?
Herrera: Both maybe, a little bit. I think that like I showed in that one slide, we came up with the vision through a lot of public input but we had buy-in early on from DOT upper management all the way up to the Cabinet Secretary, Tom Church. He shocked me so we do have to do acknowledgement training every year where they read you know the sexual harassment codes and all those things to the DOT employees, and he actually talked about this plan to every single DOT employee which means that he thinks it’s important. That’s the first time that I’ve ever heard the Cabinet Secretary talk about a plan like that and so definitely there’s support and buy-in. They helped develop the plan as well.

Nunez: So who’s going to be there on the June 3rd, what levels of management from NMDOT?

Herrera: It’ll probably be a lot of District 1 and then we’ll have the project team there who worked on this, Cambridge Systematics, Parsons Brinckerhoff, and then the project manager Claude Morelli.

Nunez: And then I had one thought when you guys were talking about the different tribes, I was curious what Tortugas is. Is it more of a community, it’s both maybe?

Herrera: Yeah. They’re not a recognized tribe.

Nunez: Okay, thanks. Then while you were talking, can you elaborate or just touch on just for a second, well let me tell you a quick lead-in. About 16 years ago I worked in Dallas and I designed some toll roads and I remember a pretty big battle at the state level for the toll roads and how they were funded and how they were, how they benefited just the people that were on them and then people in certain parts of the state weren’t even benefiting from them but yet paying on their taxes and stuff. So anyway could you just touch on any comment or anything that’s coming along or discussions on any toll roads?

Herrera: Sort of. I have to be careful about this. Toll roads are not legal in the state of New Mexico without enabling legislation. At DOT we do not have an opinion really about whether that’s a good idea or a bad idea. We leave that up to the politicals but at this point it is not legal in the state.

Nunez: Thanks for letting me know that but I also was just more of if it was somewhere discussed or something great on the horizon or if it’s just not even considered at this point.

Herrera: Well it is discussed I think every year at the Legislative Finance Committee, the Transportation Committees. I just, nobody’s I guess had the political power to push it through.
Nunez: Okay, I, and not to spend too much time either, I do however have another question. I'm, I'm gaining a lot (inaudible) again I'm kind of new to all this but is, I'm also curious about all the, if you know the tax cuts or anything on the natural gas and all that's going on east, north, southeast corner of our state.

Herrera: That's something that is probably, has been looked at in the sort of low revenue scenario. I don't know details on it. I can try to find out for you and see ...

Nunez: No. It's all right. I'm taking more of y'all's time. Thanks.

Pearson: Okay. Anybody else?

Herrera: Thank you.

Pearson: Thank you. That was a great, great effort. Thank you.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

8.1 Local Projects update

Pearson: So we’re on to local project updates.

Murphy: Mr. Chair. We’ve added this as a, as a, under the comments section to allow each of, each of, those, those of you that are employed with one of the, one of the governments here to give us an update on your, your agency’s projects that will, will affect everyone you know pass it around between the City, the Town, and the, and the County.

Pearson: Does the City have anything?

Nunez: I'm, I'm not sure what you’re asking, I'm sorry. For ...

Murphy: Andrew ran away with the packet, but I believe in, in the future what we’re looking for is for each of you to give updates on TIP projects that, that your agencies are the lead agencies on and, and other projects of, of, of interest. You know for example we have been getting a lot of phone calls from the, from the public on the Baylor Canyon-Dripping Springs project and you know ongoing we’d like the County Rep to, to give us, give us updates on that and all, and Mr. Molina I understand you may not have been prepared for it as a proxy but, you know things of that nature.

Nunez: You mean just general construction cause I got that list but I thought you meant that it’s something to go into this MPO. I’m sorry.
Murphy: I think the general construction, the list that you have ...
Nunez: Yeah.
Murphy: To inform your fellow Committee members.
Nunez: That threw me off. Thanks. I did bring a list and it’s, it’s been mentioned, I’ve already mentioned the Locust and El Paseo overlay, Missouri to Hillrise bike lanes, El Paseo/Boutz to Farney shared bike lanes and shared signage. See Roadrunner Parkway ADA, improvements to and crosswalks. There’s the, right there at the Roadrunner Parkway and ADA they’re actually going to have flashing lights and a midblock crossing, right. I, I didn’t realize there was that much pedestrian traffic through there, all the people coming out of that housing development area. That was decided I guess with you all and Mr. Roman at the City. Let’s see what else we have. We have ADA improvements, corners at, see which, we’re, we’re working on Lees and 6th Street and, and Elks Drive, we’re going to be doing the widening there so that actually is going to have six-foot-wide bike lanes. We’re just starting on the design on that right there at ... Pearson: At fixing the, the cross-sections where it goes down to two lanes or what...
Nunez: Right. We ...
Pearson: Whatever.
Nunez: Right. We ...
Pearson: It comes into an undivided and then divided again.
Nunez: Right.
Pearson: Going to fix all that.
Nunez: We’re going to go four lane so that’s the few that I had written down. Thanks.
Pearson: Thank you.
Molina: Okay. I'll provide some information that Dona Ana County's working on. The Soledad Canyon corridor study, that kind of came up. We're at the final stages of the corridor study. We should finalize that and then look for funding. At this point in time we have not secured any funding. We are looking at several sources, one of which is federal and we're going to go
hard after that and we’ll involve of course the MPO and make you all aware of what we’re looking at doing. So that’s at Soledad Canyon. Moving on to Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon, that one FHWA’s really the lead. Right now we’re at the, at the EA stage. It’s out for public comment. I believe it closes on June 2nd.

Pearson: May 26th I think I saw.

Molina: I think it slid, it slid.

Pearson: Oh. They changed it?

Molina: I believe there was a, a little bit more time that was provided but regardless, May 27th to June, first part of June. Let’s say the first week. After that we’ll just keep on moving, funding’s programmed to come in 2015-2016. If everything moves forward as planned we’ll go into construction late part of the year and finish it up 2016, sometime in October I believe. That roadway well you’re looking at a cross-section of two 11-foot lanes and five-foot shoulders with signage for “Share the Road,” water, low water crossings, trying to keep with the rural nature of that area. So out on the TIP, Camino Real and Dona Ana School Road we’ve, we’re kind of at a standstill on that one. Project has been submitted to DOT for review but we’re, we’re doing, along with environmental, finalizing the environmental we’re also looking at property acquisition so that’s the holdup on that project. We’re hoping to move forward on it and get into construction late in the, the year, fiscal year, move out 2015-2016. Other projects, we’ve got other smaller projects. I don’t know if they’re of interest to you all but I would just point them out. There’s Northwind, Wildwind, Cochita, and Bogart Lane intersection that we’re looking at doing some islands and, and more for traffic control, it’s a smaller project. We’re also looking at doing some improvement in the Chaparral area, I know it’s not a, the MPO’s purview but you know to just get some information out. Road improvements in the Rincon area and you know in the, the southern part of the county by Anthony. That’s all I’ve got. Thank you.

Pearson: NMSU, do you have anything for us?

Bentley: I have one, are there going to be any bike paths put in next to the railway, railroad tracks? I know me personally, I use the others like there’s these little ridges that you could just ride down and I, I ride those a lot so I’ll be wondering if there’s going to be any bicycle paths going in kind of next to or around the railroad tracks.

Murphy: I don’t know that we have any plans to improve it. The, the owner of the right-of-way has been particularly hesitant to, to allow any public access
Bentley: Got it. It’s a very nice, I don’t know it’s a very nice route and a little bit of decoration would, would make that go pretty far so just, it’s already open. It’s pretty nice. That’s all I got.

Pearson: You have anything David?

Leisher: No

Pearson: Okay, I guess just for my comments then. We were talking about the suitability map. Can you give us a little status on where that is?

Murphy: Mr. Chair. We have, we have worked with the, the graphic artist that the City has, the City of Las Cruces has on retainer. We’ve, we’ve made some changes based, based on review through this Committee and we’ve submitted to the, to the printer. I think we are expecting to get, I, I think we’re expecting a delivery about June 3rd. We ordered 5000 copies of the suitability map at which point then we’ll disburse them to bike shops and all the other places that we had the maps distributed around last time.

Pearson: Is that how many you printed the previous?

Murphy: I think we, I think we printed more this time.

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: But the, but due to the popularity and quickly they ran out we, we went with the, we went with the next batch size.

Pearson: Okay. And other things that are coming up, the Ride of Silence is tomorrow at Mesilla Plaza. It starts at 6:15 on, then on Saturday May 23rd there’s the Mayor’s Bike Ride, starts at 10:00 in the morning and Branigan Library is helping to celebrate National Bike Month with other activities throughout the rest of the day. We’ll have some, couple of maintenance classes and we’ll have some videos available and assist anybody who wants with commuter route finding so if they want to ride their bike to work, find a safe and easy way for the, each individual person to do that.

Pearson: Ashleigh.

Curry: Yes. Just for a matter of public interest in the community I just wanted to update you. Picacho Middle School has just received some money from within the school. They’re a, oh I can’t remember what they call it, a transition school or something like that, that not quite the right term. But
anyway they had some funding to encourage extracurricular activities, after school programs specifically relating to health and there was a math teacher at the school who put in for a fund for $5,000 and they just received ten bicycles, bike stand, two bike kits, Slime, tubes, tires, helmets, locks, and all kinds of things and there’s an ongoing bicycle program that meets once a week after school and the kids have done some really cool field trips using the Triviz Trail, using the Outfall Channel Trail, and they’re going to be going up to the university using, using the trail systems and so it was just something I hadn’t heard of before and so I just wanted to kind of update people that that’s going on. I thought it was pretty cool.

Pearson: You might want to just update this committee on Safe Routes to School, the National Bike School activities that happen.

Curry: Oh, yes. I, if I had numbers that would be even better for you guys. We had National Bike to School Week last week. We had 19 schools that participated in that and a lot of kids on bicycles. We had really great participation. Local law enforcement was out there supporting Codes, the police on motorcycles and community volunteers and again I don’t have an exact number of how many kids participated yet but I can update you guys next time we meet on that, but a really, really great turnout and great participation with kids on bikes this month.

Pearson: Okay.

Murphy: And then MPO has one project, project update announcement. University Avenue study corridor, we're looking at a public meeting in the Town of Mesilla on June 8th. This is a, we're doing the NMDOT Phase A report, looking at improvements along University Avenue from 478 to Highway, NM-28 and contrary to a lot of the, the angry phone calls and e-mails I've gotten it’s, we're not, we're not four-laning University but we are looking at various different, different bicycle-pedestrian improvements that could be done in the corridor. Like I said earlier, you get, get somebody upset you really hear from them.

Curry: May I make a quick comment or question on that?

Murphy: Yes. I don’t know, I believe that the cameras currently are on the west side of Zia Middle School. Is there a plan to move the cameras to, to be able to count bicycles that are currently going, because the Mesilla Park neighborhood’s missed, I bike that almost every day and I don’t ever see the camera because I turn before that so I know that a lot of cyclists who cycle through Mesilla Park using Conway, using McDowell are not being
counted if they don’t go all the way to Mesilla. So I’m wondering if that camera’s going to be moved.

Murphy: I, I’ll, I’ll check, I’ll check with our, our traffic count crew and make sure that they, they do put the camera at different locations for that. That’s something that, that we promised the consultant we would, we would get as much data as we could for this.

Curry: Thank you.

Pearson: That’s for counting bicycles on the, in the corridor. Okay.

Curry: Thank you.

Pearson: Any other Committee members have comments? Go ahead.

Bencomo: Mr. Chair. The bicycle suitability map, I know we looked at that, the first meeting I came to we looked at that and it was quite a challenge trying to figure out all the different colors and the suitability and those type of things and so I was thinking in my head, I know printing of the maps and handing them out is one thing with all the routes on there but is there any way, and I know it may not be this year it may be in the future, a lot of it’s going to be driven by funding I’m guessing. A lot of people access things online or even on their phones, I know when I run I track everything on my phone and it shows me my routes and everywhere. Is there a way where somebody could perhaps through software, could get online and say, “I want to go from Point A to Point B,” and it gives them the, the most suitable route to get there? I, I realize that, that may be way into the future, once again funding may drive some of that but can that be done? I, I, I’m pretty sure anything can be done with technology. The question is how much does it cost and, and how much time.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. I think that’s, that’s a, a great idea, that’s something that we could probably move towards, you know particularly as, as we do develop our asset management databases and then we can work on you know pushing that out to the public so that it, it’s more readily available but that, I, I think that, that is one of those, those ideas that’s great and put it on, look, look to it in the future.

Bencomo: Thank you.

Pearson: Okay. Last call.
9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Go on to our public comment. Anybody from the public wishing to comment? Seeing none.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Pearson: Call for adjournment. Hear a motion to adjourn?

Bentley: Motion to adjourn.

Shearer: Second.

Pearson: All in favor?

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: We are adjourned at about 6:50, 6:52 p.m.

______________________________
Chairperson
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 21, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
5.1 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Report
Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planner

DISCUSSION:
On May 7, 2015, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>Doña Ana County</td>
<td>El Camino Real Rd At Intersection of Dona Ana School Road</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction for Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>Add $42,746 per revised estimate by DAC ($3,500 in FY2016 for ROW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00250</td>
<td>2016/2018/2019</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>University Ave &amp; Triviz / I-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement &amp; Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>Adding $1.2M in FY2016 for PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00270</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>US 70 / MP 149.5 – 150.8 – Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Capacity and Safety Study</td>
<td>New project, planning phase using State Road Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100820</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>West Mesa Road</td>
<td>West Mesa Road From near NM 136 to I-10, Exact termini unknown at this time</td>
<td>Phases 1C-1D to complete alternatives analysis and environmental document</td>
<td>New project phase using State Road Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Funds listed on TIP</th>
<th>Project total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>El Camino Real Rd</td>
<td>At Intersection of Dona Ana School Road</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction for Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$474,519</td>
<td>$517,265</td>
<td>Add $42,746 per revised estimate by DAC ($3,500 in FY2016 for ROW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00120</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 149.2-149.5, Intersection of Spitz, Solano, Three Crosses</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment &amp; Improvements</td>
<td>$5,450,000</td>
<td>$5,450,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00140</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 146.4 - 146.6, Intersection with 17th St</td>
<td>Install new Traffic Signal and Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NM 188 (Valley Drive)</td>
<td>MP 1 - 3, Picacho to Avenida De Mesilla.</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction. Includes Avenida De Mesilla from Valley to Hickory</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00230</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Various RR Crossings in CLC</td>
<td>Signal Upgrades at various RR crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00250</td>
<td>2016/2018/2019</td>
<td>University Avenue &amp; Triviz</td>
<td>Interchange with I-25</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement &amp; Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$26,200,000</td>
<td>Added $1.2M in FY2016 for PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00270</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 149.5 - 150.8, Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Capacity and Safety Study</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>New project, planning phase using State Road Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100820</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>West Mesa Road</td>
<td>From near NM 136 to I-10, Exact termini unknown at this time</td>
<td>Phases 1C-1D to complete alternatives analysis and environmental document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>New project phase using State Road Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $50,804,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good morning Andrew,

Can you please include this email and the attachment in the upcoming BPAC, TAC, and PC meeting packets along with an action item on each agenda? I will be available at all three meetings to answer any questions the committees may have.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N Solano Dr
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O: (575) 525-7358
C: (575) 202-4698
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 21, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Presentation on the Valley Drive Improvement Project

DISCUSSION:
Molzen-Corbin staff will present regarding their work on the Valley Drive Improvement Project.
AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Presentation on the University Avenue Study Corridor

DISCUSSION:
Bohannan-Huston staff will present regarding the ongoing work on the University Avenue Study Corridor.