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 August 19, 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.

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
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5. ACTION ITEMS ________________________________________________
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7. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS ________________________________
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8. PUBLIC COMMENT ____________________________________________ Chair
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The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held July 15, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT Rep)
Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Community Rep)
Albert Casillas (proxy - Dona Ana County Rep)
Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)
Scott Farnham (City of Las Cruces Rep)
Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)
Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)
Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla)
VACANT (Town of Mesilla, Citizen Rep)

STAFF PRESENT:

Andrew Wray (MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Kleitz, EMTS-DA, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

Pearson: Why don’t we just go around the table and announce everybody who is here, so we get it on the record.

Shearer: David Shearer for NMSU.

Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Safe Routes to School.

Farnham: Scott Farnham, City of Las Cruces.

Curry: I’m actually here representing the Town of Mesilla.

Kryder: Leslie Kryder, Community Member.

Leisher: Mark Leisher, Dona Ana County Citizen Member.

Coontz: Carlos Coontz, Pedestrian Community Representative.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, New Mexico Department of Transportation.
Pearson: George Pearson, City of Las Cruces Representative and Chair.

Wray: Andrew Wray, MPO staff.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Pearson: Okay, next item is the approval of the agenda. Any changes to the agenda? Hearing none, I call for a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Shearer: I move.

Leisher: Second

Pearson: It's moved and seconded, all in favor of approving the agenda as presented, aye? Any opposed? Hearing none, that passes.

All approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 May 20, 2014

Pearson: Next item is approval of the minutes. Any discussion on the minutes of May 20th? What I noticed is “Members Absent” we had Sean Higgins listed, but also under “Members Present” we had Albert Casillas as proxy for that position. So I would like to entertain a motion to amend … to delete Sean Higgins from the “Members Absent” since he was represented … that position was represented. And also, there is a vacant position that’s not listed, so if we add just a vacant, the position that’s vacant, then we can add up to all the Committee members both present and absent. That’s the only thing that I noticed in the minutes. Anybody else have any?

Shearer: Excuse my ignorance, who is the vacant position supposed to represent?

Pearson: It’s the Town of Mesilla’s Citizen Representative. So if somebody will make a motion with those amendments?

Shearer: I move that the minutes be approved.

Pearson: With the amendments?

Shearer: With the amendments.

Herrera: Second.
Pearson: It's been moved and seconded, all in favor of approving the minutes as amended? And any opposed nay? That passes.

All approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

Pearson: Next item is Public Comment. We have no Public Comment. We have Albert Casillas joining our meeting so we have everybody that is a member present.

Leisher: One question before we get out of the Public Comment period. What is the procedure for replacing Karen Rishel if she isn’t gonna do this anymore? Do we need to get someone to step forward and…

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Leisher, the … there is a procedure in the by-laws regarding a member replacement or removal and replacement. I don’t want to quote chapter and verse because I don’t have it memorized, I don’t remember it completely off the top of my head, what I can do is I will review those tomorrow probably send an email to George. I do have to be hesitant about going too far with it as I’m only acting MPO officer at the moment.

Leisher: Understood.

Wray: So I’ll need to wait until Tom gets back, but there is a process to go through. There is a process to go through, and I believe it is at the decision of the Chair as to whether that process needs to go forward. So I’ll leave it at that.

Herrera: I guess that the thing (inaudible) three meetings, right? If they’re absent three … three consecutive, unexcused absences.

Wray: There is a provision in there regarding absence. So Ms. Rishel would definitely fall under that at this point.

Pearson: So we should probably bring that up at our next meeting (inaudible). We’ll figure out what to do at the next meeting.

Leisher: I’ll try to get word to her.

Pearson: Is she a public representative or…?

Leisher: Dona Ana, no Las Cruces Community Rep, yeah public.

Pearson: Okay.
Leisher: I talked with her husband once in a while, I’ll have him pass the message on.

Pearson: (inaudible) to the Policy Committee for (inaudible… Mr. Pearson wasn’t using the mic)

Wray: That’s correct Mr. Chair.

Shearer: So should we be looking to replace the vacant position for the Mesilla Citizens Rep?

Pearson: We have been asking for a long time.

Curry: Who does that?

Pearson: The Mayor. No, the Policy Committee appoints the citizen representatives. So if anybody’s interested, they can come to the Policy Committee, so long as they meet the qualifications, which is lives in Mesilla and interested in the issues we address.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 Every Biker 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.

Pearson: Okay. So the next item is Discussion 5.1, Every Biker Counts Report Discussion.

Andrew Wray gave a short introduction about the discussion item.

Pearson: What kind of performance measures are you looking at? At safety or at … I’ve heard performance measures used a lot, and there are guidelines for the motorized, but I don’t know what they are, but I know that they exist.

Wray: Broadly speaking Mr. Chair, right now I think we are still in the information gathering phase. I … I … there’s been no conversation on MPO staff yet, settling down on specific performance measures. It’s obviously been something that has come up frequently, but not with a decision type of “we have decided that these are going to be…” So right now we’re very much just soliciting feedback from various stakeholders and, including this Committee, as to performance measures that the Committee feels to be appropriate. But I guess also I should say definitely safety would be one of the potential measures under consideration.
Herrera: If I can add to that, through the State long range plan process that we’re going through at NMDOT, we are looking at non-motorized modes as well, and trying to figure out if there can be separate performance measures for that, or how, we’re, we’re wondering how we’re gonna handle that because we haven’t had any guidance from the federal level about how to handle non-motorized modes and performance measures specifically. But it is something that we want to be ahead of the curve on and not behind, so.

Pearson: Yeah, I’m aware that at the federal level those perform… non-motorized performance measures are missing from MAP21 and there’s talk and pressure to get those included. But what those would actually look like is beyond what I am familiar with. I don’t know is it just counting number of miles? Facilities that are in place? Are we counting, I guess safety accidents?

Herrera: We really don’t, at this time we don’t have any speculations on what those would look like either. We know that safety is a big issue and a big factor so obviously it would have something to do with creating safer conditions, but what that means and to whom, I really don’t know.

Leisher: I think we can start by breaking down bicycling into three, at least three categories: safety, transportation, and recreation. Where we have transportation people riding in the street, recreating riding on the multi-use paths and then safety, of course, which applies to both or actually could be broken out safety for recreational and safety for transportation. What other performance measure? We also … well obvious ones are things like how may cyclists are we seeing on which facilities? But those are …

Pearson: On motorized side what type of performance measures do you look at there, do you know?

Herrera: Yeah, we’ll be looking at a lot of safety stuff there, so something like on rural roadways we’re gonna try to reduce fatalities by 20% or something like that. They would be pretty general.

Leisher: Twenty percent per what? Miles overall? Per state?

Herrera: Per year, per state.

Pearson: Number of incidents probably.

Herrera: Right, the number of incidents. So I think we’re looking at it more on a type of facility breakdown rather than kind of a mode, is kind of the feeling that I’m getting and then…
Pearson: So that’s where this report also talks about urban versus rural.

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: So that’s in the MPO area; that applies because we have both types.

Herrera: Right. So that kind of stuff and then we can also, in the MPO look at level of service too if we want that to be somehow included in performance measures. Again, I don’t know what that would look like, but it might be worth looking at.

Leisher: Did we ever discuss level of service with regard to cycling in Las Cruces? I have a vague recollection we might have.

Pearson: I remember using the term, I don’t remember that we defined it or picked out things.

Leisher: Yeah.

Pearson: At this point I’d like to introduce our other Committee member.

Rishel: Who’s just been absent for a while.

Pearson: We talked about you.

Rishel: You talked about me and you said we’re going to let, we’re gonna make her go.

Leisher: We were gonna send roses, flowers.

Pearson: Just identify yourself for the record.

Rishel: Karen Rishel, City Rep. Good to be here.

Pearson: The level of service.

Leisher: Level of service, type of facility, projected use of facility, safety on those facilities.

Pearson: And interaction with other modes I think would be.

Leisher: Oh yes.

Pearson: That’s where the crashes happen, are intersections and up in Santa Fe with trains.
Herrera: I really think like you had a good idea about looking at the different types of cycling that’s happening. When we do projects we try to keep that in mind, who’s using the road; is it commuters, is it recreational?

Leisher: Yeah.

Kryder: I think it would be also interesting if there was some way to find out what types of adherence to traffic rules by cyclists. So, I see a lot of breaking of traffic rules. I don’t know if there’s some way to measure that as far as educational need.

Pearson: Well your traffic counters are video cameras, right?

Wray: Mr. Chair we have one video counter. It can be used for cycling count, however I have only heard one reference in staff conversations that it might be used that way. The main bike-ped counters that we have are infrared based.

Leisher: Is it possible to get various community organizations to do community service by sitting on … next to facilities with a clicker counting cyclists as they go by?

Wray: Such things have been discussed, yes. I don’t know that we could necessarily utilize community organizations for that. But there has, I’m sure most of you are aware of the “Picturing El Paseo” project, and then the ongoing work with that. There … due to the partnership between the City of Las Cruces and the University there is some talk of utilizing student help to count cycle and pedestrian traffic on that corridor, but that’s in a very specific context of that partnership between the City and the University.

Pearson: There is nationally every month in September, I think, Let’s Count Cyclists Day. I don’t remember what it’s called? It’s an annual...

Leisher: It’s not a national holiday?

Pearson: It’s not a national holiday. There’s a national effort, one weekend, so two counts I think is what they try to do. One is during the weekday and the other is on the weekend. Try to get some metrics of some sort, and that’s not anything that we’ve participated in here. I don’t know that we have any metrics, usable metrics to compare from year to year for bicycle counts.

Rishel: When you’re discussing and talking about students, I mean that … because I’m at the University that’s the first thing that comes to mind and
utilizing students in various different programs who have an interest, and we have quite a few actually to … you know if … I know funding’s always an issue, but you know if there’s any way to find any funding, they, you know, student help and a student oriented research project, or many of them such as the one Carlos did, and his bikeability could have significant impact and potential, and so what students are you referring to?

Wray: The ones in particular for the El Paseo project are engineering students. I again have re-emphasize that that is related to a particular project. We couldn’t just go and utilize students willy-nilly for our ends. We can’t do that. If there was some specific project that was a partnership between the MPO or the City and the University, and the University volunteered to do that then we could go down that path, but it has to be within … it’s my understanding it has to be within the specific constraints of that particular … I mean we just … we couldn’t borrow students for our own ends.

Rishel: Right, right. Well you know, and I’m wondering if there’s actually, is, there a crossover with so many different disciplines and so many different colleges at the University. There are, you know the intercollegiate research grants as well that are available when multiple partners, multiple colleges get together. And, you know Carlos’ was from geography and you know I’m in the College of Health Services and Social Sciences and so, and engineering, and so right now, you know I’m thinking “wow” there are so many different disciplines. I mean maybe that is an avenue that’s untapped.

Shearer: Geography (inaudible) the University that’s done pedestrian studies and so on in the past that I’ve seen. One of the seminars we saw at NMSU recently was through the University of Berkley and UCLA and Sacramento were … and this was a consultant came in and actually used the internet to poll, again this was along the lines of safety, but asking for groups of riders if they could get their members to respond to a Survey Monkey, telling them how much they road per day, some idea of the areas that they covered, and on the line of safety, where they saw conflicts on the streets to try and put … but again it takes somebody to put these down, but they basically ended up finding spots around these universities and marking them down, and also getting some numbers on the, you know, where the conflicts might be, that this investigation, but also getting some idea of how much riding was being done from riders telling how often they ran, and how far they run, that sort of thing. So…

Rishel: So could we do something perhaps similar?

Shearer: I mean I’m not saying that this would give you all you’re asking but it might be something that could be done. But…
Rishel: I mean it sounds pretty simple.

Shearer: Again you’d need really some group to sort of design it and get it rolling and get it out there, but that would be use of social media.

Wray: It’s definitely something we could look into.

Pearson: Something that might be worthwhile on the National Bike Count Day. Maybe counting bike traffic that’s coming to and leaving the University since that’s a good destination. Give valid information. Give us some baseline information of traffic that’s on Espina, traffic that’s on Locust. I don’t know what else. There’s the main entrance for bicycles onto campus.

Shearer: Okay. From the safety office one of the things that we have noted at the University is the … the organizations, charter organizations have some requirements for community hours directed towards supporting the University. So something like that for an idea that might be able (inaudible) some of the other organizations to go out and stand with a clicker.

Rishel: That’s right. Right. Right. And right, there are so many in each college. I’m actually, I’m an advisor for an honor society for the College of Health Sciences and all of our members are required, we have about 50 I believe, are required to do community service. So that’s a great idea.

Curry: I just wanted to throw out the idea would it be a possibility to look at other communities around the country? What they have as far as infrastructure goes for biking? Whether it be in lane or multi-use paths and things like that and see how that compares, how many cyclists they have, cause I sort of feel like studying how much traffic we have along, for example El Paseo, it’s kind of a “If you build it they’ll come.” If there are bike paths, they’ll use it. If there are no bike paths, they’re not using it, and then we’ll say, well nobody’s using it, so we shouldn’t build it. So if we look at other you know, weather wise, size wise, university wise, communities around the country, can we get a comparison maybe they’re a little bit ahead of us in some of the infrastructure, and we could base what we might do on what other communities have done.

Pearson: I was interested in the video counting of bicycles, not knowing what’s involved with that. What I was hoping is if we get some baseline numbers on like Valley or you know all the way from city limits to Main Street, especially since there’s gonna be a big project coming up, NMDOT has some knowledge that this is well used by bicyclists. Anecdotally I see new and different bicyclists out there all the time and that’s a roadway I would never get myself on.
Leisher: I’ll only do it on my mountain bike, I won’t do it on the road bike, because I need to be able to get out of the way quickly.

Rishel: Is that what it is?

Leisher: Yeah.

Pearson: And there’s plenty of right-of-way, we’ve discussed before that maybe that should be a segregated bike path on, bike lane, and if we have some numbers we could justify that.

Leisher: Yeah, I think with the elevated speed, speed limit on the, on the sections of that road a segregated bike path is a good idea, if possible.

Herrera: I think we’re kind of going in circles. That goes back to we need the data to justify the funding. Cause if we’re talking about performance measures we’re gonna have to meet certain criteria, and so we’re gonna have to put the funding where we’re meeting those criteria for the feds, and then in turn the MPOs gonna have to do the same thing. So right now it’s really important to focus on how to collect the data that we need to justify all of these things that we’re talking about I think.

Rishel: I have a quick question then so where, where is the funding coming from that we can access? What are the potential sources?

Herrera: For…

Rishel: Collecting data.

Herrera: Data collection? That’s something that we’re struggling with right now, even as the State DOT

Rishel: Darn it.

Herrera: I know. Well they’re, they’re giving us all these performance measures and all these requirements that we have to meet but with no additional funds. So they call them unfunded mandates, and we have done and we’re passing them along and it’s not fair to anybody but…

Pearson: And then you don’t get the funding for projects unless you have…

Herrera: Right. The data.

Pearson: …done the unfunded portion.
Herrera: It’s a vicious circle, it really is. And we struggle with it as well as the DOT. It’s not just local governments and MPOs either.

Kryder: On a slightly different tack as far as how to determine interest in, or need for a particular bike path or whatever. Would there be a way to create a database of people who actively cycle in the city? I would think people who cycle would be interested in participating, and then use that as a source for surveys, saying, you know, given the choice of upgrading these three roads which one would you use most? Something along those lines.

Coontz: We’ve actually discussed that a lot in the lab I work at. Because we had, we played some part with No Throw app for BLM, and we’ve actually considered, but again funding, making an app where users, bicycle users can input data, input issues, put their stats in there, and we’ve contemplated that quite a bit. But again, funding. And BLM did it with their No Throw app, I don’t see why we couldn’t do something like that to collect stats and issues and get input and all that.

Pearson: Okay.

Leisher: Yeah, I might be able to track down somebody who would want to develop that app for free, if they had all the data available that needs to go into the app.

Coontz: And if that was possible, I’m pretty sure our lab could store the, that data in our server.

Leisher: Okay.

Coontz: Cause we’re currently doing that for BLM right now, in the meantime until they figure out what they’re gonna do.

Leisher: In other words for the next 10 years?

Coontz: Yeah.

Leisher: Well maybe we need to just buy a bunch of GoPro cameras and strap them to trees all over the city and get someone to sit and look at the video all day.

Pearson: Well that’s part of the question of the traffic control signals are video controlled and if there was enough extra that you could see what’s going on in those intersections, but I guess there’s no connectivity from those so it’s just a very localized thing.
Wray: Mr. Chair. We have actually had a number of conversations in the past trying to figure out ways to utilize the city’s traffic signal cameras. Not necessarily specifically with an eye to cycling issues, we were mainly trying to utilize it for the, the traffic count program. Unfortunately, in theory it’s an idea that sounds wonderful, but when you get down to in practice, the whole thing kind of falls down. We’ve had three aborted attempts to try to get something like that off the ground. A large part of the problem speaking specifically of cycling issues, is most of the cameras would not adequately cover cycle lanes in their view. That’s just speaking from personal experience of having looked at the views of the cameras, they’re mostly focused right down on the, stop line for the cars, and I don’t know whether the views could really be adjusted very much for the purposes of doing that, but it would be a rather large undertaking to be able to do something, or even investigate whether or not it would be possible … well I guess finding out whether or not it would be possible would be fairly simple, but doing the undertaking would be a pretty large project. Personally I think there are probably easier avenues available utilizing the video camera that we have now in strategic points, possibly purchasing another video camera should the utility of the first one prove warranted.

Pearson: So that begs the question about whether those traffic signals actually see bicyclists when they’re coming into those intersections.

Wray: I can’t speak to that.

Pearson: The claim that I’ve heard is that, that will happen, but we would have to ask somebody from traffic engineering.

Farnham: Question on the BLM app, is that something, what is that? Can you explain a little bit more?

Coontz: It’s basically just a, it’s a No Throw app, just like you’ve seen in the advertisement, you show up to a location, you see some garbage out on a trail and you click a picture and you send it to BLM. If we were to develop an app similar to collect data for cyclists it’d be the same sort of thing. You’d have access to, I don’t know features to input your route on any problems you see, how many times you ride a week, I mean it’s limitless. I mean…

Farnham: It seems to me that the options that have been discussed that an app such as that would provide you the best available data from the people that are actually riding, where the clickers are more geared toward that specific spot and might be used as kind of a check, but that is only one location out of how many square miles that we have to kind of collect this information. And it’s the bicycle riders that are kind of forging their own trails, which routes they’re trying to get to, whether that’s recreational or
actually trying to get to a destination. So it seems like the app would be
something that really could make a difference.

Leisher: Did BLM develop that app in house?

Coontz: Yes, they did. And the reason they're housing it with us is because they
have, you know they have their own IT administrative boundaries they had
to get around, so that's where we came into play.

Farnham: It's seems like an app is simple. It's at least an app. The data is being
collected and already going into a database that you can get immediate
results versus having to count bikes on a video or the infrared and try to
segregate the data that way.

Rishel: I think the trick would be to figure out exactly what you want to collect.
That's gonna be the hard part because you have to know that exactly
before your design it.

Leisher: We know ... everything.

Rishel: Oh, you do? Okay. Well the other thing I was just gonna mention, I was
in another meeting on a totally different topic this afternoon and someone
mentioned that there is a class at NMSU that teaches how to develop app,
and that possibly some of these could become class assignments or
projects for the students, so there's a possible option.

Curry: I just want to also keep in mind we probably need to find a way to reach
an indigent population cause only the people who have smart phones are
gonna have that, and I think there's a big segment of the population who
needs the safety on the roads who won't have a phone that they can snap
a picture of. So be it I fully support the idea of an app, I think we've also
got to be able to reach people who wouldn't have that connection.

Leisher: I will step in here and say that I have seen a rather unusually large
number of indigent who have smartphones. I talked with one. I talked
with one three weeks ago who said that some lady felt sorry for him and
gave him her, her I-Phone, and he has managed to scrounge enough
money to keep it going for two years. So, and he says a lot of his friends
have them as well, various kinds of smart phones.

Pearson: So they're ahead of me, because I am not a smart phone person. But that
was the point I...

Leisher: It's entertainment, information, they use it to find friends, they email and
text message between each other for places to stay, so. I don't know how
far it penetrates, but at least in the New Mexico community, down here in Las Cruces there’s a fair number of them anyway.

Wray: Ms. Curry’s point though is well taken. It is ... that is an aspect that we could not ignore. And that anecdotal evidence aside is something that we would have to take into consideration.

Casillas: One quick question though.

Coontz: Yes.

Casillas: Since the implementation of the No Throw app, how effective has it been? How many hits have you guys been getting, let’s say per week, per month, or?

Coontz: You know, I don’t know. We haven’t had a meeting since it kind of lifted off the ground. So I don’t know that.

Casillas: Okay.

Coontz: I don’t know that at this time.

Leisher: I will state publicly at this point that that picture that has me in it lies.

Pearson: But the self-reporting type of surveys are gonna be skewed in certain directions so that’s why ... for safety aspects I think we need something passive, counting of some sort.

Rishel: You’re absolutely, I agree, and couldn’t agree more. I just wanted to reiterate that I think there ... you know we, you know well that would come with research design and data collection, but it would be you know to everyone’s advantage to actually design data collection and research in a way that we can access all of the portions of the population so everybody’s represented and that’s, that’s...

Pearson: There’s certainly a value to using an application where people are actively reporting and engaging the community in reporting potholes or where they want to ride or whatever. But I think more for the safety aspect we need the passive thing. Because that’s how, that’s what the safety performance measures are gonna be based on, I think.

Rishel: And the indigent person that say, is using a bicycle for purposes of commuting to get you know from point “a” to point “b”, they’re not gonna necessarily have the resources to you know report.
Pearson: Or why would they stop and pull out their iPhone in the middle of a, of their route.

Rishel: If they had one. If they knew, the same woman that, right?

Coontz: Who is she?

Rishel: Can we all have her number?

Leisher: I asked. She wouldn’t give it up. I guess one of the things that we need to do then is just figure out what we want to know to … for performance measures. Safety, of course passive counting.

Pearson: I guess my question to staff is, have you picked up enough in this discussion that you can continue on?

Wray: I believe so Mr. Chair. This is obviously, since the writing of this is an on-going process, this is probably going to be … a discussion similar to this is going to be a regular item on your meeting agendas until, well about a year from now.

5.2 Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Renewal 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.

Pearson: Okay. Okay, so I think we'll move on to the next item them. Bicycle Friendly Community Certification Renewal Discussion.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. It is my painful duty to report to the BPAC that we have yet, MPO staff has yet to receive any significant support from the City of Las Cruces in this endeavor. We have received some flickers of support from the cycling community in the area, as I like to make the point, the Mesilla Valley MPO is not the entity that’s being designated as “bicycle friendly”, it’s the City of Las Cruces. And the NMDOT representative is sitting right here next to me, and she can tell you that we can't do the process for the City of Las Cruces. We just cannot do it. So, I was specifically directed by Tom to ask this question of the BPAC, of “Is it the will of the BPAC for MPO staff to continue attempting to jump start this process at the City, or does the BPAC think that there may be a message that needs to be sent and MPO staff can find other things to do with its time?”.

Leisher: I’m not sure if that’s a choice.
Pearson: Well I guess it would be nice to hear an answer from the City. I wonder if, can MPO staff, would it have to be addressed through the Policy Committee or is it something that you could just go to the City Manager and say “Hey there’s this issue here can you address that?” And just get some response.

Wray: I’m not sure of the answer to that question to be completely candid. I’m not sure I really want to give a detailed explanation as to why I’m not sure as to how to answer that either.

Pearson: I have a good idea.

Wray: Well, there are some things that we know that I can’t say out loud. So the thought that we had is that we are going to make sure that this is brought to the attention of Policy Committee at the August meeting which is their next meeting. There are City Councillors who sit on that committee. Like I said, City staff has not been responsive, been resistant is actually probably a good word to use. Beyond on that, I’m honestly not sure what more, what further steps MPO staff can take. We really kind of have not, among ourselves, looked beyond, well we can take this to the Policy Committee and make them aware of it.

Pearson: Yes, you should do that, especially, but that is, you have an agenda item for committee updates for the Policy Committee and so that should be the update is that we need, that this is an item that would behoove the City of Las Cruces that MPO, I don’t want to say had previously inappropriately driven that, but ...

Wray: Let’s not phrase it that way.

Pearson: But it needs a proper designated person in the City of Las Cruces or that designation is gonna be lost and just leave it to them.

Kryder: Mr. Chair, through what department have the inquiries been made at the City?

Wray: It’s been through the Public Works and Transportation Departments.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I would suggest that we go through the Policy Committee. And it might be helpful to have a member of the BPAC, if they can, attend that Policy Committee meeting and maybe stress the importance of what it is we’re trying to achieve with this. It might, I don’t know, maybe it’ll make more of an impact.
Wray: If I may ask an impertinent question. Ms. Herrera, you meaning somebody other than yourself?

Herrera: Yes, somebody other than myself.

Leisher: Out of curiosity is this resistance mostly based on a view of this being a nuisance? Or is there some other…

Wray: I’m not sure I want to answer that question.

Leisher: Okay.

Wray: But I will say that there is also probably no small amount of uncertainty as to who should be taking this mantle up on the part of the City.

Leisher: Okay. Alright, I was trying to gauge whether it would be worthwhile to actually bug cyclists that we know to contact their City Councillor.

Pearson: That would be worthwhile, because that’s, that is how things will happen. If they, if City Council hears it enough they, City Council will direct staff to do something, because, well City Council has one employee, and that one employee gets to tell everybody what to do. So if the City Council tells that one employee then things will happen because that becomes City policy. And that’s effectively how we got the bicycle designation the first go around. City Council decided in their strategic plan, that Las Cruces would become a Bicycle Friendly Community. That was a listed goal. So that became a metric for the City Manager, so that happened. It’s not at that level anymore, so it’s not happening. We sent through our recommendation to the Policy Committee that each entity appoint a bike-ped contact, and especially important for the City but that hasn’t happened at the City.

Curry: I just wanted to ask what the timeline is for the renewal.

Wray: The renewal expires … or the current certification expires in July. I am still unclear.

Curry: This month?

Wray: Next year, next year. Sorry ‘15. I am unclear as to what the timeline as far as submitting the renewal is. I keep getting differing interpretations. I don’t know, maybe someone at this table will have a clearer understanding. But it may be that we would need to have the application submitted as early as next February. But I don’t know if the Chair or anyone knows more.
Pearson: The League of American Bicyclists has two application periods per year. I did have an email discussion with the BF, Bicycle Friendly America person, July 2015 would be the drop dead application date. So we could go a cycle earlier, but the July 1 would be the last one. So they happen about every six months. So February and July are probably the two.

Kryder: So if members of the BPAC were to encourage other cyclists to talk with their City Councillors what specifically should they be encouraged to ask for?

Wray: As MPO staff I'm not sure we can make that suggestion. I think the … I think the cyclists will need to figure out what they want to say themselves.

Pearson: As not MPO staff, I think ask for… While staff backs up.

Wray: The DOT person’s sitting right here next to me remember.

Kryder: Is the issue that a person needs to be designated as a point person or that something else?

Pearson: Yes.

Kryder: You need a designated point person.

Pearson: The City doesn’t have anybody designated that would fill out that application. That would be the one piece that would be needed. They need to decide that they’re gonna apply and who’s gonna do the application.

Kryder: Okay.

Wray: With the clear understanding that MPO staff is not eligible for either one of those occupations and that, I think, is going to be an issue. I probably shouldn’t have said that.

Herrera: You should have said that. That needs to be made clear.

Pearson: Well that came up in the FHWA audit of the MPO, that it’s very clear that MPO is doing too much City stuff.

Herrera: Yes and MPO staff …

Pearson: That was, it wasn’t quite a, was … is a finding? It wasn’t a finding, it was a determination or whatever the…

Herrera: Recommendation.
Pearson: Recommendation.

Herrera: Or something to look at but just….

Pearson: But something that could rise to a finding if they kept on doing it.

Herrera: Right. Just so the rest of the Committee is aware, I don’t know if we’ve ever had this discussion but when, when the Federal Highway Administration came to kind of audit this MPO they did find that MPO staff was doing a lot of work for the City. And although they are housed in the City and that’s their fiscal agent they are not City employees. They work for the Policy Committee that’s paid by federal funds and…

Kryder: So we need a City employee to be designated to fill out the application.

Herrera: Right. Yes.

Pearson: And of course the confusion is, is that ultimately the City Manager is the boss of the MPO employees because he’s the boss of City employees and they’re under the City Human Resources but they’re not paid by the City.

Herrera: It’s very confusing.

Rishel: Let me ask, has that discussion ever taken place as to who, or why, would you know, be in charge of taking care of things?

Herrera: I think we tried to kind of bring that up.

Rishel: I mean and not for free.

Pearson: I think we tried to do that with our resolution.

Rishel: Not, not necessarily, I mean you know maybe as a paid position instead of a volunteer position?

Herrera: You mean for the cycling stuff specifically? Or…

Rishel: Well I mean for, you know, anything that has to do with bicycling, pedestrian, facilities, you know, structures.

Herrera: Right, and I think that’s what Mr. Chair was kind of talking about is we, the BPAC tried to do that through that resolution. Unfortunately, it hasn’t gone anywhere in the City I don’t think, but we were trying to make it clear that it can’t be MPO staff but that somebody at the City needs to be responsible for these types of things.
Pearson: Right. I think we were pretty, in our discussion, we were pretty clear that it doesn’t have to be a paid position, it doesn’t have to be dedicated staff only bike-ped, it can be additional duties. So it doesn’t have to be, it doesn’t have to be separately funded is the ultimate, we’re talking about dollars.

Shearer: It has to be an employee, of the City?

Pearson: Yeah.

Shearer: That’s correct?

Pearson: We’d have to have, I believe, that would be my interpretation. I mean who else would do it?

Rishel: I think you can get a university employee you know. I’m just kidding. Is there anyone that was mentioned that, or in conversations that could do something? I mean this has been like an ongoing thing forever.

Wray: As far as that particular resolution goes I don’t think the MPO staff and the Policy Committee included felt it appropriate for the MPO to be making specific comments like that.

Herrera: So basically when we sent, when the BPAC sent the resolution kind of up it was with the understanding that each of the jurisdictions would pick who they thought was most appropriate. So the City would pick someone, the Town of Mesilla would pick someone, and Dona Ana County would pick someone. But that MPO staff or I guess any of the committees wouldn’t be saying “We think you should pick this person.”

Kryder: Have the County and Town of Mesilla picked someone?

Herrera: I don’t know.

Wray: Albert?

Casillas: Regarding that issue, can the MPO assist, if the City ever appoints somebody? (inaudible) expertise and knowledge to help out with the application?

Wray: We can certainly assist. The issue is that in the past the MPO, I don’t want to use the metaphor “driver’s seat” because it’s slightly inappropriate, but we were pedaling, we were pedaling the bicycle. We can’t pedal the bicycle.
Curry: So back to the question of community, cycling community members asking for something from the City Council. Should it be more along the lines of we want to support the Bicycle Friendly Community certification renewal or do we need a bike-ped coordinator or some variation thereof? Is it the second?

Pearson: Both.

Curry: Okay.

Pearson: Yeah, I think it’s both because we need one to get the other.

Curry: Right.

Pearson: Or effectively we’ll have the, if they decide to do the Bicycle Friendly Community they’re gonna have to pick somebody that is in charge of it. So that doesn’t necessarily become the bike-ped contact, but it effectively becomes the bike-ped contact because it becomes a job duty.

Wray: Mr. Chair if I can interject a little relevant tangent. I spoke with Mr. Keith Wilson up at the Santa Fe MPO, as it was discussed at this Committee last October I guess it would have had to have been. City of Santa Fe was designated as a silver level friendly community last September I believe it was. And at that time, I believe it was the October committee, the BPAC asked staff to make some inquiries up to Santa Fe as to what happened up there and I spoke with Keith regarding this, and Keith indicated that the member of the City of Santa Fe staff, and I do want to point out that Santa Fe MPO had nothing to do with that application. I asked Keith that question, he said they had nothing to do with it. It’s my recollection that the person who spearheaded that application on behalf of the City of Santa Fe is not one of their bike-ped people, it was somebody else, who did work in the Transportation Department but did not necessarily have bike and ped as their specific task. So while I agree with the Chair that it’s quite likely that speaking in the City’s context, that somebody who did end up being tapped to head the application process probably would end of being sort of the bike-ped person just from the experience of Santa Fe, it’s not necessarily, does not necessarily have to be the case.

Pearson: In our other discussion about when we sent up the resolution, we wanted to make clear, we didn’t want one person picked because that person goes away, we wanted a position designated so that there are job duties so that the job continues no matter who the current person is.

Leisher: Maybe we just need someone to prod them and remind them that resolution is around.
Pearson: So as far as talking points it might be easier just to say we need to iterate that we need to do the reapplication for Bicycle Friendly Community, and then they can figure out the rest. Because if City Council, like I say if you get four votes it’s says this is our policy, then it’s up to the City Manager to decide how to implement it, and however he implements it is fine.

Rishel: Pardon my ignorance, but has this ever been discussed at City Council? Or approached as a, an item that we need?

Pearson: In open City Council meeting? Not that I know of. I mean another thing that would be worthwhile is just showing up at City Council public input and say our Bicycle Friendly Certification is running out and what are you gonna do about it? And having, if you’ve got two or three cyclists that showed up for that, it’s not me, because they will expect that from me. And I have spoken to the Mayor about this and got no response effectively.

Rishel: Could we … is it possible to put it, to have it someway be put on the agenda of a meeting?

Pearson: That’s very difficult.

Wray: Putting, putting things on the City of Las Cruces Council agenda is very difficult as the Chair indicated.

Pearson: It’s not necessary for this type of thing. It just needs four councillors to say yeah we should do this. And having that said you know using public input would be a mechanism that could cause that to happen.

Kryder: Mr. Chair is there a cyclist group that could be encouraged to come forward with I don’t know, 20 signatures or something too?

Pearson: Well the group that I’m, I’m a lead cycling instructor and we’re doing education, and we’re purposely trying to stay away from advocacy. So we’d be happy to do a class, we do a special class for City Council. We do all those good things, but as that group of LCIs, that’s not what we’re doing. We need, need to have an advocacy organization, there’ Mesilla Valley Bicycle…

Leisher: *(inaudible).* Oh you mean Catrina Winters …

Rishel: Right, how, what about…

Pearson: But that’s been silent for the past year or two.
Leisher: Oh yeah, she hasn’t been around.

Rishel: Right. So that’s one of the issues, and in the other area of cyclists in the community, it you know I think, and everyone would probably share the same experience that every time you, one tries to get a group of cyclists together, yes it sounds good in theory but you know to get them there and to get them doing something they’ve got you know, homes and families and this and you know so it’s very very difficult to do.

Leisher: There is one sure way to do it, make sure there’s beer there.

Rishel: I was gonna say offer food. I could see that at City Council, let’s bring beer to City Council right. Strike that please.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I just wanted to point out to the BPAC members that you said that all it takes is four City Councillors to get something done, well three of them sit on the MPO Committee. So I think if we take it through the Policy Committee, make them aware, make them aware that maybe somebody’s gonna speak at the City Council.

Pearson: As a committee we should do that. But as members of the public who would be interested, can do the other part.

Herrera: Yeah.

Pearson: It’s like a typical marketing thing, if you hear it once you ignore it, hear it twice, well I thought I heard about it before; hear it three times, well maybe I should do something; Four times, five times, six times, well then you might start getting something done.

Curry: Maybe the cycling community can just send out some emails via you know, Bike and Chowder and Zia Velo and whoever else and pick a date and say we’re gonna show up at the City Council meeting, whoever can come, come in your helmets and we can just speak out. And of course you know we’ll have at least a handful of people who could show up for something like that. I think in the past it’s been a while, but in the past when things like that have been proposed, we needed the cycling committee to stand up and say something, it seems like there’s been a good turn out.

Shearer: And it gives me a year in advance to prepare, to get that application in.

Pearson: Now is the time that we need to be working on this cause as the speed of government. And we don’t want to have another fatality to drive this type of meeting because that’s kind of what’s happened in the past, and that’s
not the way to have these kinds of discussions. We need to have the
discussions in the environment we’re having now.

Leisher: Pro-act not react.

Pearson: Okay so we have some direction for staff and some good discussion.

5.3 BPAC Annual Report Discussion

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

Pearson: The next item BPAC Annual Report Discussion

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. This item is on the agenda at the request of the
Chair of the Committee. MPO staff regrets that we didn’t really have any
conversations on a staff level regarding this item. In our defense, every
single one of us was on vacation at some point over the past month. So
it’s been very rare that all of us have been in once place. I am looking at
the minutes, I looked through the minutes and the relevant portions that
discussed this and the one item that did seem to be left up in the air at
least from my reading over it that was left distinctly up in the air was the
timing. The BPAC asked the staff to discuss when would be a good time
for this report to be submitted to the Committee. Like I said, we just, we
didn’t discuss this item at all. So unless the Chair has more, I don’t have
anything further.

Pearson: Well, we’ve got August and October meetings still for the rest of the year,
so I think we want to have this kind of report. It should be very, pretty
easy, just pull together things from number of miles, bike lanes, just some
basic metrics. MPO staff has their monthly newsletter so you can pull out
some of the action items that happened from there, just kind of a little
narrative of what the Committee’s been doing, and that would pretty much
cover the report I think.

Wray: Well I think that this item ties very directly into the conversation we had
under 5.1, as far as performance measures. Basically the things that you
listed are under consideration as performance measures. So…

Pearson: Yeah, so it should be, in some ways it’s just a place where we can have
this as a metric so we can go back and easily find this. Because a lot of
this information shows up, like traffic, or the pedestrian, the trail counts
that we’ve had, we’ve had a report that someplace. There’s a nice little
map someplace. But where can you find that? If you have one place
where we can have this. As far as timing, I guess, well we have two more
meetings and if it’s gonna be an annual report that means we would close
it at the end of December. So, I don’t know if it’s appropriate then that we actually approve it in the January meeting.

Wray: Mr. Chair part of, I think the … I don’t want to use the word “disagreement” but I’ve gone blank, part of the question was whether we wanted to tie it to the fiscal year or the calendar year. And that, although, given the fact that the BPAC, the last meeting is in October, that sort of, if you wanted it to be fort that current year then that would be both of them at the same time. But I don’t want to speak for Tom as far as making that our decision on that.

Herrera: Mr. Chair if I could maybe suggest, the MPO has to submit an annual performance and expenditure report every year at the close of the fiscal year. They have 90 days after the close of the fiscal year to submit that to NMDOT. But maybe if we just made this kind of like a part of that report and then got an overall report on it in … at the January meeting like you suggested earlier that would maybe make it easier for staff. I’m not sure Andrew what you think about that, or Tom does.

Wray: I’m not the one to give an opinion on that probably.

Herrera: Yeah.

Pearson: Yeah because that, it’s a combination. We want to have good data that we can repeat year to year, so we want to pick one ending date. And if that’s fiscal year that makes sense to me.

Wray: Mr. Chair if I can just see if I’m accurately picking up on a nuance of what you said, it sounds like you would like to have a report for this, for ‘14, is that correct?

Pearson: I think in October. We should start with…

Wray: Okay. I can say that maybe we use this year as a test case to see what kind of report staff is able to generate and whether the BPAC likes it, and then, I’m sure there will be suggestions for changes and go from there.

Pearson: Yeah because it’s, like I said, I think we want something with some metrics that shows the number of lane miles, bicycle lanes, so, cause now we don’t have anything to compare with. We don’t know if we’ve made any progress, compared you know from 10 years ago. I know we’ve made some progress from two years ago. We know that we’ve had a couple of road diets go in, but we don’t have any metrics that say we’ve added 20% to lane mile lengths because of those. So that’s just where, that’s where the kind of metrics come from that I’d like to see. And then anything else would just kind of a narrative of like we passed the resolution
recommending to the Policy Committee for the bike-ped coordinator or contact, things like that. So do you want to have something for October as a preliminary and then we can have a discussion item in October that shows the report, and in January for a final or?

Wray: Mr. Chair we’ll need to bring this back in August. I will let Mr. Murphy know what said but I’m not the decision maker.

Pearson: Okay, so I think, I think we probably have enough information for you so we can make these decisions next meeting. Or make these recommendations, because we don’t make decisions on discussion items. Okay.

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

6.1 Local Projects update

Pearson: Local projects update.

Casillas: I’m still trying to get a hold of those construction plans and drawing plans and striping plans for Dripping Springs Road. I haven’t been able....

Pearson: So is it Dripping Springs or Soledad Canyon?

Casillas: Dripping Springs.

Pearson: So what part of Dripping Springs?

Casillas: I believe it’s gonna be all the way up, all the area that’s not paved right now.

Pearson: Okay, you’re talking about the part that’s the federal, the Federal Lands.

Casillas: Yes.

Pearson: Okay, cause there’s also another project under discussion that they had a meeting with about Soledad Canyon.

Casillas: Okay.

Pearson: And I did talk to I think was Bohannan Huston was the, I suggested that they should come to our meeting and talk about that but I’m not sure what kind of monies are involved with that, if they money. But they were talking, they’re doing some additional planning and looking at drainage issues. I think drainage is gonna be their biggest problem to start with, and at that meeting there was some discussion of putting up some sort of
bikes. I don’t know if was “Share the Road” or “Watch for Bikes”,
or whatever. The County traffic engineer for maintenance, I’m not, I can’t
remember who it was, he was at that meeting. So there might have been
some signage put up already from what it sounded like.

Casillas: I’ll inquire about that. I wasn’t about Soledad just Dripping, Dripping
Springs.

Pearson: Okay. But the Dripping Springs one, I, cause that’s Central Federal
Lands, and so that, is the County kind of the contact person on that or?

Casillas: Yeah. They’re the ones doing all the engineering work on that.

Herrera: Yeah and the County actually receives capital outlay funding as a, I guess,
to supplement the design of that so, there’s I guess $800,000, I think, of
State funding that the County received for that.

Wray: I believe that was what was on the TIP.

Pearson: So are there gonna be public meetings on that project coming up?

Casillas: We’re gonna get those worked out. I mean they were planning on having
meetings. They’re probably just waiting on having a final design on it
before they get started going out there and getting input from the public,
well not a final but a preliminary design.

Pearson: On the Soledad Canyon they did have some proposed designs, every last
one had a bike lane of some sort in it. Some had different drainage issues
with different width bike lanes, different, some with sidewalks, some
without, multi-use lane, or multi-use path, things like that, so it would be
nice, I would kind of hope that we’d see those kind of design process with
this other project but, that’s just a hope.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, that’s probably what they’re doing right now because from, this
is all just kind of what I heard about the project. I don’t know how much of
it is accurate but we needed to get the funding put into the TIP right away
because they wanted to start kind of preliminary I guess alternatives
analysis in May. And so we’re in July now, I would assume that they’ve
been working on that for a while and hopefully they would come forth with
some different alternative, alternatives for the public to look at. It’s part of
the NEPA process. It’s gonna be a pretty extensive environmental
document. It’s not just gonna be something simple like a categorical
exclusion, so they’ve got to have some public input at some point in the
process or it’s illegal.
Pearson: Gauging by the amount of public interest at the Soledad Canyon meeting, there's gonna be a lot of public interest on the Baylor Canyon meeting.

Herrera: Right. So again, I think the County's working on it and we're trying, DOT is trying to find contact information and do what we can, so we'll definitely keep everybody aware of any information that we hear.

Pearson: Okay and I guess, did the County do, redo Snow Road with a chip seal or something? Has anybody been on there since that's happened? Is it, I'd heard some kind of complaints. Is it a good road or is it, maybe it was earlier before it was finished what I heard something about.

Curry: Yeah, it's just up to the, to the Town of Mesilla county line, and it is chip seal, it's kind of rough.

Casillas: Which road was that?

Curry: Snow.

Casillas: Snow.

Pearson: So that's probably all we have on the local updates?

Casillas: I guess, probably for future meetings what I'll do is I'll inquire with the Roads Department, try and get a, their schedule of maintenance, and see what roads are being planned on getting paved or chip sealed or whatever, and I'll bring up those (inaudible).

Curry: I'll also just add in just a little bit on behalf of Safe Routes to School, we've started the infrastructure updates at all the ongoing $500,000.00 project that we've done through the NMDOT, and those will be, they start July 15. Is that today? And then it'll go through mid-October. So I can't think off the top of my head, it's about roughly 10 elementary and middle schools that will have some pedestrian and mostly signage and ramp access to ADA access and that kind of thing. So those projects will be happening around the district. If you want any more information, let me know.

Farnham: The City has about 30, 35 capital improvement projects scattered throughout the city, that's going to be designed and into construction over the next 30 years. Most of these are in residential type street areas but they will be addressing the ADA type ramps and updating a lot of those that don't meet the current code and some locations that don't even have any ramps at this point. There's probably only one project that I'm aware of right now on Elks Drive widening that will probably put some bike lanes associated with that too.
Pearson: The City’s doing their annual grind down the roadway and replace it, I forget what the project is, they let that Cutter, whatever the contractor is, Cutler, and there are a couple of projects that, one is on University so when they do that they lower the roadway and then replace the asphalt and so there’s an opportunity to restripe. And I was just on University, I wonder if there’s an opportunity to do better work with the bicycle lanes there. There’s a place where there’s a right turn only and there’s, cause there’s that really wide travel lanes there, there must be 16 foot travel lanes on part of that roadway. So there might be an opportunity even to put in a five-foot bike lane with a two-foot buffer between the bike lane and the travel lane, and that might help with the, with lowering the speeds. Speed mitigation. Not necessarily in that part of town but something that could help. That’s … I wonder if that’s been thought about at the…

Farnham: Well Mr. Chair I can definitely look into it, if you could maybe send me the location.

Pearson: Well all locations are on, in the City Council packet for the Cutler project s. They were just let at the last, or the previous, or recent City Council meeting. Not the last one, the one before, well maybe this, maybe first in July. And the other one, piece that’s on there is Idaho, from El Paseo to Main, and that seems like a candidate for a road diet. Cause especially, I don’t know what the road counts, the traffic counts are there. They’re not doing the segment from Solano down to El Paseo on this pass. Ideally you’d do the whole thing as a road diet, but, but they certainly are having speeding problems down there because they’ve got a flashing light for the crosswalk there. So if that was a road diet that would improve safety for pedestrians also.

Rishel: Mr. Chair, I just have a question, an inquiry. The Solano road diet, do we have any data that has been collected that shows that it has in fact made a difference?

Wray: It depends on what you mean made a difference.

Rishel: In far as, insofar, well, I, let me leave that open, in any aspect. What has it done?

Wray; I don’t know, off the top of my head. I know the traffic volumes were broadly similar. It’s made, it’s not had an impact on the, the utility of the roadway for vehicles. Anecdotal evidence, so take it with a grain of salt, but I have seen more cyclists on the portion of Solano that had the road diet so it’s been beneficial for cyclists as well. As far as crashes, I’m not the crash data guru so I don’t have those numbers in my head to just pull out. But I can look into that and bring that back to the Committee.
Pearson: Cause that was a discussion that been happen, that happened shortly after they did that. It’s like well it’s gonna improve safety, it’s gonna reduce the number of rear end crashes, and okay, let’s have a traffic study and find out, or hear the traffic reports. I’ve never heard the results that verify that that’s true or not. Anecdotally I would say sure, it’s much safer but there’s no data that, I mean there should be data collectable from the traffic reports, from the accident reports that might have them.

Rishel: And the, the DOT has, you have FARs data right?

Herrera: Yes.

Rishel: And access to all of it?

Herrera: Yes.

### 6.2 NMDOT Projects update

Herrera: Is it my turn now?

Pearson: It’s your turn now.

Herrera: Actually, everything’s on schedule. It really is. I don’t know if anybody has questions specifically about any of the ongoing construction. Be careful when you drive through it. Everything’s on schedule. There’s a lot of construction kind of around the city. Does anyone have specific questions on anything or want updates on anything in particular?

Curry: Do you mind giving an update on 28, Hwy 28?

Herrera: Sure. It’s done. The project is done. And so I drove it the other day, it was right after they finished the sweeping, and it seems like it’s pretty smooth for a chip seal road. We did go with the smaller chips as referenced in the AASHTO bicycle design guide. So we did use that. And it’s funny, the project manager, he said that he’s been chasing down cyclists that he’s seen on the roadway to ask them about their riding experience on it, and that he hasn’t heard anything negative really about the chip seal.

Leisher: Same from Zia Velo, no negative reactions so far.

Herrera: Okay great. And I think it probably helped a lot that we did have the public meetings beforehand and let everyone know kind of what was gonna be happening, but I can say that we’re pretty pleased with the way that it turned out. So hopefully you all are too.
Pearson: Yeah the only, I talked, or got an email with somebody that was down there, and I guess they weren’t, didn’t see the improvement that they thought they might have. It’s still kind of the way it was so it’s not really a, it wasn’t a resurfacing, it was just a chip seal, so.

Herrera: Right. And that’s, yeah, that’s really the main thing that we try to get out is, it was a maintenance project. It was purely to extend the life of the roadway. It was not to make any sort of geometrical changes or upgrades.

Pearson: Yeah, I think the expectations of some people were different than what was reality that was gonna happen.

Herrera: Yeah.

Leisher: A lot of people I knew expected something like North Valley to show up. No, not quite yet.

Herrera: Yeah. And I mean that’s kind of you know in the works. It’s kind of our long term goal, but for right now we needed to do something.

Pearson: So the only part that I was on was somewhat outside of the Town of Mesilla limits into the Town of Mesilla, and there’s no shoulder lane striping. Is that a different project or, and also into Town of Mesilla where there’s the right turn lanes for University or whatever it’s called there, and … I forgot what the name of the road is, the one that’s past the Bean, Calle del Norte, the next one that turns down, turns into Motel eventually. Yeah those, there’s no lane striping’s for the turn lanes so it’s, there’s still, what, cause that wasn’t supposed to be part of the NM 28 chip seal project, but there’s another project that went through there somehow I guess, or something happened.

Herrera: Yes, ok, so that originally wasn’t supposed to be part of the chip seal project but there was enough funding to extend the chip seal project all the way into where you’re talking about, so I guess when I said it’s done I mean the chip seal part is done. There’s still some things, some striping and some other things. We also talked about adding some additional signing to the roadway. You know “Share the Road”, “Be Aware of Cyclists”, that kind of thing. So hopefully that will be coming here in the next few weeks. I don’t know for sure. I should get an update on that.

Pearson: Okay, so they’re still gonna put in the shoulder lane?

Herrera: Yeah.
Pearson: So that’s something you might address, discussion that we’ve had previously is how to address those at intersections, whether they should be dashed or? Has your traffic engineer been able to look at that or can we address that?

Herrera: Yeah we actually did look at that with this project specifically. Some of the engineers felt like it would cause more, maybe not more collisions, but it would cause more confusion for vehicles if they did a dashed line up to the intersection, because in, I guess in the traffic engineer mind that means that the vehicles are allowed to use the shoulder as part of their driving lane. So that was kind of where their thought process came from.

Pearson: But I think that would be appropriate at a turn lane.

Herrera: And my argument was it lets everybody know that there’s mixing of modes, and so it’s an ongoing discussion, I guess.

Pearson: Right. Okay. I guess. Well you might bring, maybe we can get a consensus from the Committee is that, we feel that a dashed line with an open space is appropriate.

Leisher: For right turn?

Pearson: For a right turn. So if you can bring that to your...

Herrera: I let them know that we had had this discussion at BPAC meetings, multiple BPAC meetings.

Rishel: And the data supports that as well, doesn’t it?

Herrera: Yeah.

Pearson: Because the METCD’s kind of vague on this.

Herrera: Well and it says engineering judgment and unfortunately I mean, who, whichever engineer is in charge gets to use their judgment on that.

Pearson: Right, so that’s any influence from here to help their judgment would be good.

Herrera: I’m trying, I’m trying. I just have to explain it in a way that makes sense to the traffic engineer brain.

Pearson: You can invite them to our meeting too.

Herrera: Yeah, I could.
Leisher: We'll learn 'em.

Herrera: No, I do think that it is new, but the engineers are willing to listen. They really are, it's just, it has to make sense to them what they're doing, and they also have to look at not only the cyclists, but the vehicles too. As so they're looking all modes and, but I will say that the mentality seems to be changing and they seem to be more open to even having this kind of discussion.

Pearson: It strikes me as the worst thing to do is continue the line lane, lane line all the way up to the intersection which puts the bicyclist next to the vehicle that's gonna make a right hand turn into the bicyclist.

Herrera: Well I will talk to the project manager again, actually tomorrow morning and before hopefully we get the striping out there and see what he decided.

Leisher: You're talking about doing it at the last minute.

Pearson: So we had some discussion of the Valley Drive project. That's still off in the future? Is there any change on that?

Herrera: Yes, there is. We have selected a consultant. It is Molzen Corbin. They do a really good job for us and they will be having stakeholder meetings. We're still kind of doing some paperwork internally, so I don't know exactly when those will be but they have been made aware that this Committee is a stakeholder and so they will be inviting someone from the BPAC directly. Also, Jerry Paz, he's great to work with, he's well aware of the cycling issues and discussions that are happening in the city.

Leisher: So this is the stretch from the north edge of the city to…

Pearson: No, from Picacho to Avenida de Mesilla.

Leisher: Oh, Picacho to Avenida, ok, right.

Herrera: Yeah, right, and as part of that we added that little section that goes from Avenida to I think it's Hickory, where our current project stops. So it's gonna look weird when we get done with Avenida, there's gonna be a partial bike lane. It'll stop right there, but with this Valley Drive project, we'll pick that up and continue it.

Pearson: Is there a chunk of City responsibility in there or is that in the DOT around the corner?
Herrera: It’s, it’s us, all around there.

Pearson: Because it changes. There’s, I guess there’s another section further south then that must be City and then NMDOT picks up again.

Herrera: Yes. But because that’s close enough to I-10, that whole stretch is ours.

Pearson: Any other questions on that? Shall we go on to public comment?

Wray: Actually Mr. Chair, we really out to reorganize the agenda, make it more clear that staff gets to comment at this time too. I have a fairly important announcement, it is with regret that I must announce to the Committee that Mr. Chowdhury Siddiqui resigned from, Dr. Chowdhury Siddiqui I should actually say, resigned his position with us effective last Friday. So we are short staffed again. The position, HR has moved with commendable speed and the position is posted, and is open until the 28th of this month. However, as the Chair referenced the speed of government combined with speed of HR, I don’t anticipate having the position actually filled until early September at the earliest. So that is what it is.

Kryder: The position is a traffic planner?

Wray: It’s associate transportation planner. So we are short staffed for at least a month or two probably so just a FYI to everyone on that. The other important announcement is we are gearing up for our second round of public involvement meetings. We’re looking at September but no specific dates have been set yet, so I will keep everyone posted. There’ll be at least one meeting between now and then of this group. So maybe we’ll know a little bit more definite at that point, no promises though.

Pearson: But on which project? Public input on…?

Wray: The MTP.

Pearson: Okay. Okay any other?

Wray: Nope, that’s it for staff.

Pearson: Committee member comments?

7. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment
8. ADJOURNMENT

Pearson: So, anybody move to adjourn?
Curry: Can we just talk about when our next meeting dates are?
Pearson: August and October and I don’t remember. It’s gonna be the…
Wray: The next meeting is August 19th.
Herrera: In here?
Pearson: Yes they are.
Wray: Yes, BPAC meetings are always at the County. Well, this year they’re always at the County. I see no circumstances that would arise to change that, but you never know.

Jolene Herrera motioned to adjourn.
All in favor.
Meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.
### AGENDA ITEM:
5.1 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

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

### SUPPORT INFORMATION:
TIP Amendment Spreadsheet  
Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planner

### DISCUSSION:
On May 8, 2013, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2014-2019 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>1100830</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10 MP 141-143</td>
<td>Bridge Rehab &amp; CCTV Installation</td>
<td>Update scope to include: Roadway &amp; Ramp Reconstruction, Acceleration Lane extension, ADA Improvements, and lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00150</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10 MP 133-143.2</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>Move project to FY2015, Amend EOP to 146, add $5.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100620</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10 MP 146-164</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>Add $4.7M to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00240</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>US 70 MP 162-170</td>
<td>Shoulder Widening, Guardrail</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Funding Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100820</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>West Mesa Road</td>
<td>Add PE phase to TIP, no construction funding identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00230</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Various CLC Streets – RR Crossings</td>
<td>Signal Upgrades</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00220</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2015</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Goathill Road at BNSF Crossing #019679L</td>
<td>Design and install new lights and gates</td>
<td>Add $30K to construction phase in FY2015, $30K in FY2014 for design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00220</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2015</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>NM 226 at BNSF Crossing #019744P</td>
<td>Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates</td>
<td>Add $10K to construction phase in FY2015, $30K in FY2014 for design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amendment 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>1100830</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>MP 141-143</td>
<td>Bridge Rehab &amp; CCTV Installation</td>
<td>$7,605,016</td>
<td>$7,605,016</td>
<td>Update scope to include: Roadway &amp; ramp Reconstruction, Acceleration lane extension, ADA Improvements, and lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00150</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>MP 133-143.2</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,900,000</td>
<td>Move project to FY2015, Amend EOP to 146, add $5.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100620</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>MP 146-164</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
<td>Add $4.7M to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00240</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 162-170</td>
<td>Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Replacement, Drainage Structure Extensions, CWB Replacement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,362,000</td>
<td>New HSIP project-NASA Road to Dona Ana County line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100820</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1B Engineering Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td>Add PE phase to TIP, no construction funding identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00230</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Various CLC Streets</td>
<td>Various RR Crossings</td>
<td>Signal Upgrades</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,026,000</td>
<td>New HSIP RR project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00210</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>Goathill Road</td>
<td>at BNSF Crossing #019744P</td>
<td>Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>Add $10K to construction phase in FY2015, $30K in FY14 for design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00220</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>NM 226</td>
<td>at BNSF Crossing #019679L</td>
<td>Design and install new lights and gates</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>Add $30K to construction phase in FY2015, $30K in FY14 for design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good afternoon Andrew,

Please see the attached TIP/STIP Amendments for FY2015-FY2017. We are currently preparing for our submittal of the FY2015 STIP baseline to FHWA. Will you please add the attached spreadsheet and this email to the upcoming BPAC, TAC, and PC meetings as an action item?

I will be available at all three meetings to answer any questions that may arise.

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) 525-7558
C: (575) 202-4698
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 19, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 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.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 19, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 Soledad Canyon Project Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Road Cross sections from Bohannan-Huston

DISCUSSION:
Bohannan-Huston Staff will present on the Soledad Canyon Project.