MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held October 14, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in the Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main Street, 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. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY __________________________________________ Chair
   Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee Member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT __________________________________________ Chair
4. * APPROVAL AGENDA* ____________________________________________ Chair
   5.1. *September 9, 2015 ____________________________________________ Chair
6. ACTION ITEMS ________________________________________________ MPO Staff
   6.1. Appointment to BPAC __________________________________________ MPO Staff
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS ____________________________________________
   7.1. University Avenue Study Coordinator ____________________________ MPO staff
   7.2. NMDOT update ______________________________________________ NMDOT Staff
   7.3. Committee Training ____________________________________________ MPO Staff
8. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS _________________________________ Chair
9. PUBLIC COMMENT ____________________________________________ Chair
10. ADJOURNMENT ________________________________________________ Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held September 9, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers at City Hall, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
Councillor Nathan Small (CLC)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Wyatt Kartchner, Molzen Corbin
Jerry Paz, Molzen Corbin
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER
Flores: All right. It's 1:00 so I'm going to have, and call the meeting to order.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY
Flores: And first we'll have a conflict of interest inquiry.
ALL COUNCILLORS REPORT NO CONFLICT.
Flores: Anybody with a conflict of interest, you could state so now. All right.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT
Flores: Then moving along to public comment. Oh wait, have we done a roll call?
No. Let's go do a roll call, sorry.
Murphy: Okay. Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Here.

Murphy: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Here.

Murphy: Councillor Small.

Small: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Here.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Here. Okay. So we have a quorum and we'll move on to public comment. Anybody here from the public? No.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Flores: We'll move to the consent agenda.

Hancock: Motion to approve.

Sorg: Madam Chair. I have a correction for the minutes.

Flores: Okay. Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: According to the minutes as written, the meeting was called to order last month on 1:15 and the members present, it says that Councillor Pedroza and I left at 1:32 at about 17 minutes past the meeting start time as well as
Nathan Small departing at 1:53. According to the minutes, we stayed pretty much till the very end.

Flores: Okay.

Sorg: And so show that in the record.

Flores: Actually Mr. Murphy pointed that out to me right before we had the meeting and told me that he was going to be correcting that so thank you for bringing it up. So anything else on the minutes?

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Did you get a second?

Flores: No I haven't yet.

Garrett: I second the motion.

Flores: Okay. So Commissioner Garrett has seconded, nobody has any more comments so all in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Flores: Any nays? Okay. Seeing none, it's passed. (Inaudible) Okay. Oh. Wait a minute. That was for the agenda so, which also has the minutes on it, right?

Murphy: Yes.

Flores: Is that, okay. Sorry.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *August 12 2015 – Approved under the Consent Agenda vote – as amended.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Removal of BPAC member for nonfeasance of office

Flores: Next we'll move on to action items. Unfortunately, on 6.1 we have a removal of a BPAC member for nonfeasance of office. There's an e-mail in our packet and also a record of attendance so.
Sorg: Madam Chair. I move to approve this item.

Flores: Okay. Do I hear a second?

Pedroza: Second.

Hancock: Second.

Flores: Second from Olga Pedroza and the, it was moved by Councillor Sorg. Shall we, how shall we do the vote? Do we need a roll call vote or can we just say "aye/yea?" We can, discussion?

Murphy: Yeah, the, the Committee’s pleasure.

Flores: Okay. Does anybody want to make a comment on this? No. I think it's pretty, okay. Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you. I think that this is kind of like a model of the way to, to remove a, a member. You document what it is that the member has failed to do and on that documentation then the rest of the body votes and then you have no surprises to anybody etc. etc. so yeah I, I would vote in favor.

Flores: Okay. Anybody else want to make a comment? Okay. Seeing none, do we need a roll call vote or just an "aye/nay?"

Murphy: Since the, and I have the vitals up on the screen …

Flores: Okay.

Murphy: Just an affirmative vote of five of you, so I think probably it would be best for us to do a roll call on it.

Flores: I'll take a moment to let anybody from the public that might want to make a comment make a comment. And seeing none, what was that again?

Murphy: So this would be a, a, a vote of "aye" for removal of this member from the Bicycle and Pedestrians Facility Advisory Committee.

Flores: Okay. So all in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Flores: Anyone against? None. Seeing none the measure is passed so I guess the staff will be putting out a notice then.
Murphy: Yes. We will advertise for a vacancy on the BPAC and then hopefully relatively soon have another, another person for you to appoint.

Flores: Okay. So is this an at-large or from a particular member?

Murphy: I believe that this particular one is Bicycle Committee, or Bicycle Community Member.

Flores: Okay.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Amador Proximo

Flores: So next we'll move on to discussion items that, 7.1 Amador Proximo.

Murphy: Okay. Madam Chair at last month's meeting this came up in brief discussion. Staff was requested to put together a presentation along with the consultant from the DOT so Mr. McAdams will be giving you a briefing on essentially what was presented to the City Council on the Amador Proximo blueprint as well as how it interrelates to the MPO's adopted plans. Following that Jerry Paz will give a presentation on the work that they have done on Valley Drive for the Department of Transportation. I'll turn that over to Michael at this point.

Flores: All right. Thank you.

McAdams: Good afternoon Madam Chairman and Committee Members. Oh. I didn't, I always do this.

Murphy: Ah, there we go. Perfect.

McAdams: Always do that, yeah. Becky would've got me anyway. Let's just, it's a brief presentation on the Amador Proximo proceedings and also how it relates to our transportation priorities. And so the title is "Amador Proximo and Related Transportation Issues." Basically we're looking at the Amador Proximo area is contained by Amador, Valley, and Hadley and the railroad tracks on the east. The final report was provided in a blueprint format for people to review. The, the procedure, invited citizens, business owners, groups, stakeholders, and via direct mail and e-mail posters and approximately 200 individuals were participated in five days in a charrette. Basically this is the, the general outlay on the plan. You see that mixed-use development there's, now where there's no roads there be road put in and we'll talk about that later but it's really, now is a mixed-use with industrial, residential, and other uses and basically they're look, looking at a more complete plan or a neighborhood type of situation.
The charrette was first held, was held on June the 25th through 29th at the Alma de Arte school. Then the blueprint which is basically before a master plan was, was available for review and then staff, the Community Development staff reviewed and collected the comments. On the 17th of August the City Council endorsed the vision and the goals of the Amador Proximo. And the vision and goals are to create a healthy, prosperous community that is a broad range of housing and convenient options for work and play. And basically the goals are, are very consistent with the overall planning goals I think of the City and County in that leveraging industrial/agricultural heritage of this area cause it's on, it's near the downtown. And this is not a, like a one-step plan. It's really an incremental plan to take place over an indeterminate amount of a period, build on what is already in place, work with what's there, provide better connections between where people live and work, in other words cutting out you know vehicle or long, long distance travel or regional travel or district travel and providing a range of housing and job choices. If you look, there's various, since this is a vision there's various steps to implementation and of course these, these will require private investment and public coordination, a public/private partnership and there's also as any, any kind of improvements looking at utilities, drainage, etc. particularly in this area, and there's also cost because it's not free. Looking for repurposing of older buildings, very good and, and we'll later talk about Valley Drive. I'm not going to direct at, that in this, this, my, my presentation, and also public transit. We'll go a little bit further later on in the presentation about this. And also other factors you're looking at changing zoning, entitlements, right-of-ways, etc. and using an overfill process because this area's, it's, there's a lot of vacant land or unused land and it's really a potential for in, for infill. But also looking at public set-asides, construction, and maintenance so this is a very long-term thing I think.

What, but we think that all the Amador Proximo is complete compliance with MPO plans in the overall scope. It does provide for transit-oriented development, which we're trying to decrease, actually eliminate any kind of automobile trips but also so it's that people can walk to public transit and use bicycles etc. creating a neighborhood atmosphere. And also if you look at we have a major project we, and hope you remember from the transportation priorities. Plan, part of that plan is to provide a bicycle boulevard from Hadley at Las Cruces to connect the two links of the bike, the multiuse path and we think this could be a, this is, this could be a real centerpiece for Amador Proximo if we're developing, create a, and also a bike boulevard we know is very low-cost as opposed other things and it'd be things like traffic calming. If you see in this picture right here where the bikes go ahead and the traffic would be diverted so basically it make it difficult for, make it for through traffic and were there's examples in, if, in Albuquerque of, of bike boulevards. We know that, that our plans may be long-term. There's plans to have El
Paso-Las Cruces-Spaceport linkage by commuter rail and the proposed site would probably be near where the railroad museum is right now and so this could, this could be a pole of growth around the trail section. Very common to do, so a real opportunity for many things to go, that would compliment the railroad station. But we also know that there’s a plan, maybe not between my lifetime for a high-speed rail going for Denver, from El Paso to Denver. So there’s, there’s a, long-term plans for that area but it's, you have to plan ahead for this type of stuff too.

If you look at the short-range transit plan Amador Proximo, the redevelopment's very, in light of this we have proposed bike sharing facilities at the Move It Center and also bike lockers and so basically people could, if they're living in the Amador Proximo area they could easily rent, use a bike share system or lock their bikes, ride their bikes to the transfer center then take transit from there. So we think that this would also be very accommodating to this. And there's, if you look at the routes there’s routes, bus routes going all around this area so it's very transit accessible.

Overall if, if you look at, if you look existing right now the upper portion of the area is, is all gridded but the lower portion is really the only access is on major arterials. It's, it, not a lot of connector streets or local or access streets. So we're thinking the Amador Proximo would be good in providing connectivity for all scale levels and facilitate movements in that neighborhood to create a cohesiveness. Right now I don't think the neighborhood is really cohesive because up, you know the lower part yes but there's no really connectivity between the south, southern part of the area to the northern parts so we think this could greatly help them connectivity.

In conclusion, Amador Proximo provides a vision for redevelopment in an important area of the central area of the, of Las Cruces. It is conformance with approved plans and the general goals of the MPO. And I can entertain any questions Madam Chairman or comments.
experience ourselves what public transportation is like. So I think it's very good and I would also say that I very much liked the idea about renting bikes. When I was in Chicago a couple of years ago, or last, I don't remember when. They did have bikes for rent, you know those racks of bikes.

McAdams: Right.

Pedroza: And a lot of people take them. So I think that this would be very, very useful and very good for the environment and for everybody. So thank you very much.

McAdams: I think so too.

Flores: I just went to the Municipal League and right outside the convention centers they had bikes that you could rent and I thought, "Oh I wish I had my helmet cause I'd just go for a bike ride." But yeah, I've seen them in Paris, in Austin.

Pedroza: Right.

Flores: And even small towns like Georgetown around, so they're nice. We thought about trying to get those in Mesilla.

Pedroza: Sure.

Flores: I think that would be nice so, but I like the idea of doing a field trip. I don't see why we couldn't just do that on our own maybe for one of our meetings or right, make our meeting a little earlier possibly if you, I don't know what people think about that but I'd be open to it so does anybody, I mean. Didn't, didn't you go to the charrette because I thought, I thought I saw you right beforehand and I remember saying, "Oh."

Small: Absolutely and Madam, Madam Chair. Thank you, thank you for the wonderful presentation and I think what's so exciting is so many of the ideas, efforts, and actual policies that were first discussed here at MPO really prior to my coming on to this are, you really uniquely connect in, in what's possible with Amador Proximo so it's great to see the great ideas that started here now potentially have a chance to flourish in an area. And with respect specifically to a tour I think that is very doable and, and as the current Councillor for that area I would love to help …

Flores: Facilitate.

Small: And of course all of those are with the property owners' participation over there and the different stakeholders to find a way to do a tour. I think
that's a really excellent idea and a, a good way to show some of the
ongoing efforts and opportunity that we have. So I appreciate very much
the suggestion and follow-up on it.

Pedroza: Lunch would be good too.

Small: I guess I'll ...

Pedroza: Right?

Small: If, if it's most appropriate we can, Nellie's cafe is over there. Very close,
I'd, I have to say that. I, I can work with the, with appropriate MPO staff to
look at the best way to facilitate a tour like that.

Flores: All right. So is anybody not interested in doing that? I don't know.

Garrett: You know it sounds like a good idea to me.

Flores: Everybody seems like, okay. All right. So we'll look into maybe putting
that on the agenda further down the road, maybe when it's a little cooler.

Pedroza: The High Desert.

Flores: Any other comments? So let's move on to 7.2, New Mexico ...

Sorg: Madam Chair.

Flores: Oh. Yes.

Sorg: Real, real quickly, I attended one of the charrettes and I was very pleased
with the turnout they had and the diversity of turnout, landowners,
residents, even elected officials were there, etc. and the, the, the
enthusiasm in the room was excellent.

Flores: That's good.

Sorg: A little, little too much heat but it was a very, very good charrette, yes.

Flores: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Pedroza, okay, you're just, all right so we'll move
on to 7.2: New Mexico ...

Murphy: Madam Chair.

Flores: Where's that coming from?

Murphy: It's Murphy down here.
Flores: Sorry, I'm looking out at the, okay.

Murphy: Prior to moving on to 7.2 we got the second half of 7.1.

Flores: Oh, that's right. The Valley Drive. I'm sorry.

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Paz from Molzen Corbin will be giving a presentation on the Valley Drive aspect of this area.

Flores: Okay. Thank you.

Paz: Good afternoon Madam Chairman, Members of the Commission. I, A.J. Romero from the Department of Transportation asked me if I would substitute for him on this and give an update on the Avenida de Mesilla/Valley Drive project and how it dovetail into what was discussed at Amador Proximo.

Again we were contracted and put together a study team to investigate alternatives for the Valley Drive corridor study. Our, our scope was very similar to what we have done on other corridor studies for the Department of Transportation where we look at all the deficiencies, all the needs in the corridor and then we prioritize alternatives and, and come up with a final recommendation. So again the scope of our project is from Picacho Avenue on the northern end all the way to Avenida de Mesilla and then that little piece up to Hickory where the DOT left off on the last project. We did follow the NMDOT Corridor Study Procedures. We combined the Phase A and B process into a single document and we also worked on it parallel with the environmental document so that we could move into the Phase D phase which is where we’re ready to do at this point.

We looked at the purpose and need to address physical deficiencies, basically where the road has physically broken down, congestion, safety, system connectivity, access, economic development, and legislative mandates. So we went through each one of these categories individually to look at the need and purpose of the project. And so as you can tell from this aerial overview, this is the Valley Drive and here’s Scoopy’s on the left and, and there are certain physical deficiencies like some access management. There’s no curbing. There’s, there’s a lack of median controlling, turning movements in certain locations, so we looked at all of that. Again you can see where there’s a lack of curbing so essentially cars can enter and exit Valley Drive wherever they darn well please and that needs to kind of be managed a little better. Some places where a wheelchair that's coming across the, the, the roadway to, can't get to the other side because of the, the poor median access so that needs to be fixed, the wheelchair, here this wheelchair ramp kind of goes off into nowhere. Ironically on the way over here I saw a wheelchair stuck.
just, you know and, and there were cars that were pulling over to help her and her wheelchair needs. So those all need to be addressed. Drainage, as you know Valley Drive floods a lot and, and the drainage doesn't have a, many places to go. Lot of, here in front of your fire station there's these ponds that fill up. Here's the Archuleta pond so we would want to correct the drainage situation.

We looked at all the traffic volumes and the traffic numbers and again there was a, there was northbound there was about ten, 11,000 vehicles and 12,000 southbound for a total of 23,000 vehicles. When we looked at the growth rate of 1.5% per year over the next 20 years we're looking at a 20%, I mean a 35% increase over that 20-year period. And what that does to our grading scale is we look at that, those numbers in terms of: a) being excellent flowing street all the way down to f) as you guys are familiar with this grading system; we look at both the intersection level of service, the roadway level of service, and also the signals at the intersection. So we did come up with a number of recommendations, tweaks to the intersections: Add in a southbound lane at Picacho from Valley Drive southbound; Valley Drive northbound and southbound at Amador is we'd be adding two left turning lanes at that intersection; Amador westbound at Valley Drive we'd add a left turn lane; and Avenida de Mesilla eastbound we'd add a, at Valley we would be adding a left turning lane. Looking at other lane modifications, deceleration lanes and elimination of left turns at unsignalized intersections.

One of the, one of the serious issues that we have is out of the 75 driveways that are on the corridor only 11 have valid permits. So 54 probably need to stay for sure because that's access to their business, that's access to their, their needs but we need to kind of bridge that gap between the number of driveways that are permitted and what's out there. And so we looked for opportunities to maybe save on the number of driveways. As you've probably heard the statistic before every two-way, every full intersection adds 39 points of traffic conflict, potential accidents, and a T-intersection or driveway would add 17 points of potential conflict so if you, if you limit the number of driveways you're limiting the points of conflict that are on the street. But of course we want points of conflict because we want people to get on and off the street so that's the balance that we're, we're tasked to do. Again, some of the crashed history showed that there was no fatalities, one injured, injury in crash, 15 damage-only crashes and this information comes from the State Police office and recorded citations. But I do know that, I do know that there was a homeless person that was killed on this segment of Valley Drive so we do have information provided by the public that sometimes isn't always recorded in the State Police database correctly. I don't know if they attributed it to something else but it was a bicycle injury.

Our study follows the NEPA process so we look at all the NEPA elements in terms of how this project conforms to the environmental effects and we looked at, through the A/B report as we developed our
alternatives we screened them against the environmental effects so that when we came up with our final recommendation it would include those environmental factors and that, and, and so that our final recommendation would be one that would be, could move forward. The Department of Transportation identified this as a, eligible for a categorical exclusion. There's very little or no right-of-way that's required and we may need to require, acquire a little bit of right-of-way at the corners where we have to put a traffic signal, pedestal, or something on that but for the most part all the lanes and curbing and sidewalk fit within the right-of-way.

We evaluated the impacts and mitigation to some of the issues that are occurring and we provided a lot of opportunity for the public to comment. One of the things that turned up, one of the ideas that we came up and you'll see later on is we, we identified maybe pervious concrete as a, as a technique that we would use to help with the drainage solution but when the environmental consultant came up with all these leaky underground storage tanks it kind of made me scared about that particular alternative maybe making that worse and not, and not, and not, and, and harming the groundwater so, but there is. When you think about it Valley Drive was the truck bypass. That's what they built it for before the interstate so all the trucks and they, they routed around Main Street that went through downtown Las Cruces so, "Let's build a bypass," and that was Valley Drive. They, they acquired a tremendous amount of right-of-way which is puzzling because why is there so much right-of-way? Usually we're boxed into this little narrow area. This particular area had, had quite a, little bit of, a lot of right-of-way and so that, along with trucks you got gas stations and they just popped up all along the corridor and then as they've been abandoned and moved and places like The Shed are wonderful places to eat but there's, it was an old gas station there too so a lot of these old gas stations are now repurposed but some of their environmental effects may still remain so that's something we're moving into the next phase. We take all of our alternates that we look at, we run them through this engineering and environmental meat grinder and we come out with the most promising ones that we study in more detail.

Real quick the alternatives we look at, and, and we completed our study in May and, and at the end of May and so we put that out for public comment and we looked at you know what I consider the basic alternative: Four lanes, bike lane, curb and gutter, sidewalk. This is, if the DOT had to do it on their own this is the most economical way to get in and get out and meet the demand of the corridor. The DOT partnering with the City on this and I'll explain in a minute that involvement but there was, there was a request by the City to add additional features so the alternative B we looked at a parkway that could be used for landscaping and, and to, to at least beautify the corridor a little bit. Alternative C we looked at the aggregate box and pervious concrete on the bike lane because it adds a visual differentiation and it also helps in the drainage. Again we screened that out after we got the environmental map but it was something we
looked at earlier. Another thing we looked at is, "Why not push the entire corridor off to one side because we have so much room?" And that creates a whole area for landscaping and also ponding. If we, if we have, the drainage report recommends a 72-inch pipe be put down the street. Big pipe, digging up the street, dropping in a big pipe, clearing out all the utilities, you can just imagine the construction effects of doing that. But if we could put half of it in a, in a linear pond and the other half in a pipe below it cuts that cost down in size and, and, and, and maybe benefits. So we looked at the size of ponding and at that time we were looking at pervious in the bottom to help drain a bit. Once again we would, we would drop that going forward.

This one Alternative E. The bicycle community wanted a buffered bike lane. They, they preferred a little bit of added safety so we added that to E. F is the same thing, a buffered bike lane but with the linear pond and, and I use the term "linear pond" but it, it could be landscaped to where it was attractive and it was kind of this meandering parkway along the shoulder. And something like this where we would have, it would be a pond but we would make it to where it was, it was, wasn't just like the other picture showed, a trapezoidal channel with the, with, with, with the drainage. We could make it actually into like a trail type, type feature. In a plan view, again as we went through the driveways we would meander this, this linear park, I was, I was referring to is like a linear park and looking at pushing the roadway off to one side and, and making room for this linear park so this is kind of something that we were looking at making a more enhanced corridor and the, the last one came from the public at the very last public meeting. They asked if we would go back to Section E which had the buffered bike lane but with a parkway and so that, this was the one that was preferred by the public. This was the one that was preferred by the City, by the DOT, so it looked like this is the one we were moving forward with. And then Councillor Small had, had along the way saying, "You know we got this Amador Proximo coming up and don't forget about Amador Proximo." And I was thinking "Amador." I was thinking "Amador," and, and you know he said, "Well Valley Drive is along part of it." And I was thinking "Okay. If Valley Drive's along part of it," I'm thinking Amador, that it really didn't have anything to affect our project.

The, by the, the DOT's objective is to take this Valley Drive and build it, build it up to current standards, build it for a 20-year lifespan, make it durable, strong, attractive, nice, and give it to the City to take over for maintenance. And so the win-win is for that, the City is they get a brand-new street. The DOT gets out from under the maintenance. So that's the kind of situation we're looking at at the time. When we worked with the City staff, the City staff felt like they wanted an oversized drainage pipe so they could serve neighborhoods that are currently experiencing flooding problems so the DOT agreed to oversize the drainage pipe because that would benefit the City, kind of sweeten the pot so the City takes it over for maintenance. And the benefits are that the City, DOT would no longer be
responsible for maintenance. They would have no cost for offset land
needed for drainage. If the, if the DOT did its own drainage plan they'd
have to build ponds to drain the water to and the right-of-way acquisition
would be simplified. On the cost end of it the DOT’s going to pay extra,
about a million and a half extra for the oversized pipe. They would pay for
all the infrastructure including the additional bike lane, the bike buffer that
was proposed and, and, and add that value to the project. For the City of
Las Cruces their benefit is they would be able to provide drainage to
adjoining neighborhoods in the future. They would be able to control the
corridor. When, when a business owner wants a building permit they go
to the City for a building permit and the DOT for a driveway permit. The
City would be a one-stop-shop so that would, that would be a, a benefit to
the City. And then they would, an improved corridor on Valley Drive again
within the city limits would improve travel efficiency. Again the cost for the
City was there would be possible right-of-way acquisition and long-term
maintenance which they estimated about $1.3 million.

We had a tremendous amount of public outreach. We had two
public meetings. The first one was completely virtual. It was all online.
We took questions at a call center and all the questions were answered
and they were answered live, so the, the public meeting was virtual on the
internet and the calls were, were live and we had about a 250-person
touch. Our, our facilitators looked at that. We're so happy when we have
a public meeting and 17 people show up or 30 people show up but what
Councillor Small pulled out the Amador Proximo it was packed, Alameda.
And you think, "Wow!" you high-five yourself about how much we had
public involvement but with our 17 or 30 people that really isn't scratching
the surface so we felt like our, our, our virtual public meeting was a little bit
better received and, and more people. The DOT pays us a lot to have
these public meetings and then when, when nine people show up it, it's
kind of disappointing that you put so much time and effort and money into
it, you don't, and you experience that too with your meetings but you, you
invite the public and, and sometimes they show and sometimes they don't.
Only if it's controversial will they show. So we felt good about that. Our
second public meeting was hosted here so our second public meeting was
live, it was both virtual and it was live and so people could come in here
and ask questions and that was well-attended and I think we had about 45
people here present but we also had you know a number that were online
and they'd call into our call center for questions and those were responded
to. And then the City was gracious enough to host it on their CLC TV for
months afterwards. So we're still getting calls that people go back and
look at those old programs and we're still getting messages. Again we
had a Facebook, Twitter, we were getting questions through those venues
so that was really nice to see.

And then Amador Proximo comes along and, and Amador Proximo
involved Valley Drive. It wasn't just Amador and so Small, Councillor
Small had been kind of warning us and we were excited to see what was
going on. We just didn't realize it was going to change the whole
dynamics of what we had already studied up to this point. It's a very
progressive section where you've got two lanes in each direction, so this
would northbound, this would be southbound. And then the bicycle lane
would be off to the shoulder. It would be protected. You see the curb
there and so it'd be a protected bike lane and then there would be another
landscape buffer and there'd be a two-way frontage, I mean a one-way
frontage road so cars could head in this direction and park. So it'd be on-
street parking, a frontage road, and on both sides of the street it would be
a more pedestrian-oriented, a more business-friendly, a more community-
friendly, walkability. It, it, it was a very, very attractive typical section but it
didn't look like anything like our Typical Section G that we had up to this
point so we got, we got to a point where we needed to kind of make the
two balance. Again this is from Hadley up here all the way down to
Amador and they were looking at the, the center median plus the, the side
medians and the frontage road system like that and they would have a, a
new street. Right now the City fire station is here. They would look at
developing a new street with a curb opening to get across at one location
throughout that area. So that, that's their vision.

Again here's a look at the, the frontage road where it would be a
frontage road here with on-street parking and, and, and the bike lane
again along the corridor. So it was, it was a really new and novel
approach to Valley Drive but it, we have subsequently met with the
Department of Transportation with the City on, up to that point our
coordination with the City was in this direction and then Amador Proximo
was in this direction so we're trying to haggle through how we're going to
get there and, and how the additional cost is going to be worked out and,
and so that's, we're, we're in, kind of in a holding pattern at that, at this
point. Again here's the bike lane and how it'd be a raised, this could be at
the same grade. I'm, I'm thinking it should be at the same grade. The
bicyclists have said they would prefer it at the same grade but something
to protect it. So we'll work through the details and the design but the
overall concept is a, is a shift from what we have now.

So we've, you know we've, we've turned in our draft Phase A/B.
We've turned in our final Phase A/B report in, at the end of May. We had
our, our public meeting and, and so we put the project in suspension and
the City is looking at authorizing the Public Works Director to enter into
agreement with the DOT for the road transfer and, and then work in some
of these elements in that process so we're, we're kind of in a holding
pattern hoping that the, we can get the two directions we've headed off
into a common direction so we could get into the design. And that's where
we're at. I don't know if Councillor Small or Trent wants to add more.

Flores: Thank you so much. Did anyone want to make a comment or a question?
Commissioner, or Councillor Sorg.
Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair and thank you for that presentation. It's very exciting to see all this planning that you're doing. You did mention that the City would take over maintenance or at least that's the plan so far. Being in the City I have some concerns in the future but to, first of all I'd like to ask how many intersections along this stretch of Valley Drive will be redone, will be changed?

Paz: They're all going to be re-changed.

Sorg: Okay. How many does that total up to be?

Paz: There's five that are signalized and they will all, we're going to add turning movements at, at various …

Sorg: Yeah, okay.

Paz: Various directions.

Sorg: Was at any time traffic circles considered to …

Paz: Yes.

Sorg: Replace them?

Paz: Yes. We did look at a, a two-lane roundabout at Amador and Avenida de Mesilla and it, it did not, it was, there's too much traffic to handle that, both of those. The two, the volume of traffic was too much for that design and configuration.

Sorg: For what kind of a circle?

Paz: A, a roundabout.

Sorg: Yeah, a roundabout but …

Paz: A, a two-lane.

Sorg: Two-lane.

Paz: A two-lane roundabout.

Sorg: Okay. So …

Paz: And so yes, we did look at that and the …

Sorg: Would a three-lane be, handle the traffic?
Paz: A three-lane won't fit.

Sorg: It won't fit.

Paz: No. It won't fit.


Flores: Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you.

Paz: Oh, yeah. Let me also mention the other, the area where it failed was left turns on the roundabouts. There was, there was too many left turns that was causing that failure.

Sorg: Oh, In that case I would like to have an explanation how that works at some time.

Paz: Okay.

Sorg: Not just now but in the future.

Paz: Sure. Absolutely.

Flores: Okay. Councillor.

Pedroza: Thank you. I just recently had, was invited to come and help with one traffic problem that arose generally because the, the people who were making the changes in, in the driveway or the drive and it wasn't Valley, tell me what it was again? In front of Las Cruces High School.

PERSON ON THE DAIS SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Pedroza: Okay. And …

PERSON ON THE DAIS SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Pedroza: El Paseo. Thank you. One of the, and I don't know but I, I, I'm asking whether the input that you got from the public included those members of the public who have an interest in having a driveway to their establishment, be it commercial, religious, educational, or, or whatever. Because on El Paseo this was not done and so with every good intention the people who designed the, the new street put about a, one of those little, I don't know eight-inch or something I, I, I don't know how tall it is
blocking, which blocked the entrance to a church. And they had not
participated in a, in several of the planning sessions that had been held
and so suddenly the church was, was, was in a position of not being able
to receive any of the southbound and you know all, most of Las Cruces is
north of, of that particular intersection so most of the traffic was going to
be southbound and they was, and they couldn't make a turn. So I guess
what I'm asking is did you get input or are you planning to get input from
all of the different establishments along the, the, the corridor?

Paz: Yes. We, we formed a stakeholder group of the business owners and we
met with them on two occasions. And in that we delivered handbills to
their business one at a, each one of them and asked them to come to our
stakeholder meeting and a number of them did show up and those were,
that was one of their primary concerns is access. And so that, that was
discussed with them individually. Also as we move into final design that's
one of the requirements of the Department of Transportation is that we
meet with them and, and hopefully get them to sign off on our, our drive
pad plan. It's, it's up to the Department of Transportation to grant those
and so they don't require it being, that, that they sign off on it but they do
require that we meet with them at least once and in many cases two or
three times. So we …

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: We look at, what happens when you have this situation is right now they
don't have a driveway and so you're saying …

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: "Okay you get this one spot."

Pedroza: Yeah these guys did.

Paz: And they're, and they're, they're not, they're not happy so then you work
out with them and their, maybe their neighbor to share a driveway. So it's,
it's a real negotiation process to get that and, and again minimize the
points of conflict.

Pedroza: Right. Okay. Okay. Thank you. As long as you know you are aware and
you're not suddenly blocking somebody and they say, "Wait a minute."

Paz: That, it, it, that does happen.

Pedroza: Oh, that does.

Paz: Particularly with medians.
Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: They, they don't appreciate medians cause they can't do the left-hand turn.

Pedroza: Right.

Paz: Into their business but it's, it's the greater good. Sometimes medians you know provide, particularly at intersections where you need that, at least that 300-foot spacing and those businesses that are right on the intersections, you know the convenience centers, they're the ones that oppose the medians the most and so that, that's where you do get a lot of grief.

Pedroza: What is the purpose of the median? What, what's the benefit of it?

Paz: Purpose at an, again a driveway if there is no median it's 17 points of conflict. If there is a median it's, it, if there is no median then there's 39 points of conflict so it minimizes the opportunities for accidents. The intersection itself creates a number of conflicts and then when you're adding a driveway in that 300-foot span it, it, it exponentially increases the possibility of an accident.

Pedroza: Supposing that you're not at the intersection, you're at midblock.

Paz: Then it, the same thing. It's reducing it from 39 to 17 so it's minimizing the opportunities for accidents.

Pedroza: Okay but you said that there were no serious accidents on Valley anyway except for the one that, the gentleman who was killed on his bike.

Paz: Yeah. The, the, the benefit we have here is there's already a median for most of it so it's not a surprise to most of the property owners. What will be a surprise is the driveways.

Pedroza: Oh.

Paz: Because they're not used to having, I mean they take the whole frontage and a lot of the businesses, they park their cars for sale and their, they use the Department right-of-way for all kinds of private purposes and that's probably going to be the most of the issues we're going to develop with property owners. But the Department requires we interview them at least three times to try to work out a situation.

Pedroza: Okay. All right. Thank you.
Flores: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Was there an estimate on the, on the change in property values?

Paz: Not on property values, no sir.

Small: It, it'll be, and, and I, I, it's a wonderful, Madam Chair if I might.

Flores: You get, all right, yes.

Small: Thank you Madam Chair. And I know that's, I'll get to my comments with Mr. Paz and, and, and the fantastic job that they're doing. Commissioner Hancock's question is an outstanding one though and all signs point to highly increased property values in that corridor and in, in fact that's one of the most important reasons for finding the right redesign and so I compliment the Commissioner on identifying that piece which of course generates far more commerce for our community which is good for property owners, good for the City, good for the County, good for our community. Thank you.

Flores: Mr. Trent. I'm, Mr. Doolittle, sorry.

Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. Madam, Madam Chair and Councillor. I just wanted to expand a little bit on what Jerry was talking about on the driveways. We've been in contact with a couple of businesses who are actually looking to develop even earlier than, than the Valley Drive project so for instance the Toyota dealership is looking at moving a little bit north and across the street so they approached us to make sure that they're not going to, to pay for or implement improvements either at their driveway or in the median that we're then going to come and tear out or, or change as part, as part of this project in 2017. So we have been in contact with a couple of those businesses, just the potential development that may take place prior to this project so even on top of what Jerry's doing as part, as part of the project development, our internal staff is working with those, those people and those businesses that are moving forward now to make sure not, we're not wasting their money or ours when this project does move forward.

Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Flores: Anyone else? Okay Councillor Small.

Small: Thank you Madam Chair and I just want to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Paz and the entire Molzen Corbin team, of course Mr. Doolittle and,
and the Department of Transportation. The way that they've gone about this is, there's just so many positives from the public engagement that, whether or not there's always as many folks in the chairs as we like, their process for doing that I think is exemplary and the fact that they're still getting input based upon the multimedia and CLC TV presence speaks to the ever, the lasting value of that and I foresee although it may take a little bit more investment as our, as we go forward with public engagement processes that is one to look at and to emulate as much as possible. In the same fashion, to praise the flexibility, as we saw there is a great deal of work at different levels. When this opportunity arose there was the foresight and flexibility to engage at a very deep level with that and I know just from the personal participation there was extensive commitment and so that's where we stand now, on the precipice of a, a street and a boulevard, street that, and a, the corridor that handles truck traffic, major truck traffic whether it's agricultural or otherwise just as well, perhaps better than it does today but with the added benefit of greater pedestrian safety, better for bikes, and as Commissioner Hancock pointed out fundamentally better for business. And to, there's, we still have some steps to go for that and there's a great deal of importance with how the transportation with Public Works and the City of Las Cruces because of course that's where the ultimate agreement would be negotiated. There's still work to do there but there's a lot of importance on that and getting it right and the participation of all the stakeholders to get to this point is very exciting and hopefully we're able to move forward with that in a way that honors the very deep commitment that the State has already made and the commitment of all of our community stakeholders that participated so deeply. So a little editorializing but a lot of excitement. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Thank you. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. And I want to echo all the positive comments that have been made and thank the City and, and the State for working on this. This is also, this is in my district too. And so I've been following what's been going on here. I'm concerned about the statistics relative to the accidents and I don't know who needs to do this but just the, the fact that there was a fatality involving a person on a bicycle and that that wasn't reported and I'll tell you it doesn't seem, the numbers just in terms of crashes don't seem right. And so whatever can be done to kind of ground truth this I'm, I'm curious about whether or not it's possible that there are accidents that are happening and people are saying, "Oh, they're not actually involving the road because they're off," but they're in, inside the right-of-way and people are making judgments about that that they really are in error on. But that would both I think help provide us with a better sense of what some of the safety issues are, I mean you're, you're working from principle and it would be very good to actually have a, a better baseline that then
we could also use as this process moves forward to, to keep track of whether the changes are, are, are making a, a, are going in the right direction. So I don't know who does that but I mean there's, obviously City Police are involved in any number of incidences along there and so why all this is rolled up at the State Police I don't know but, but there are other agencies that are certainly involved and I would just ask that something be done to try to find out more about the statistics and in particular why something like that one fatality was left out.

Flores: Did you want to make a comment?

Paz: We can, we can interview the police and sheriff departments to get a more ground, on the ground assessment. They probably have statistics about number of people who just trade insurance cards and go on their way without ever becoming a citation or a, a statistic that we get from the State database. So we can, we can do that and look at, at both those law enforcement entities to see what additional information they have.

Hancock: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett, or Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you. If I could suggest you might want to get with MVRDA. They have all the data. They have, they have all the police departments cause they get the call first so they would have severity, everything, them, just as a matter of convenience. Thank you. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Anyone else? All right. Thank you very much Mr. Paz.

7.2 NMDOT Update

Flores: So we'll move on to 7.2: New Mexico DOT Update.

Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. I'll start off by giving a, a quick update on the, the projects. You've got a list there.

1100620: That's our mill and inlay project basically from the I-10/I-25 interchange to the Texas state line. That project is actually expected to be put out to bid in December.

Next one on the list is our Ramp E or Union project as we tend to call it. Those of you that have driven through that, you'll notice that we've already got the westbound bridge torn down. They're working on shoring up the pier caps and doing that kind of work to replace it and then just like any of our other bridge projects, once we get that completed we'll switch traffic and do the exact same thing on the other side. Those guys are actually working real well. Again it's nice to have weather that's cooperating with us. That project again is about a year-long project so
you can expect that we'll be finishing up probably in about August of next
year but I'll keep you updated on the progress of that one. Again as I
mentioned last month just keep in mind that we do have periodic closures
of Union Drive on that one. We're trying to get public notices out on that
but all closures for Union are on weekends only because we know the
impact that it would have to the university and the students that cross from
one side of I-10 to the other so barring any kind of an emergency all of
those closures will be on weekends. And we've actually had a few of
those when we tore down the, the bridge itself so.

Next one on the list is our Missouri project. We are currently
working on paving the top mat for the southbound lanes. Here in the next
couple of weeks we should be switching traffic to the southbound and then
again mirroring the exact same thing we did there on the northbound.
That project is again way ahead of schedule. Contract time is April.
They're still looking at being completed sometime mid-December. So it'll
be nice to have that project completed by the time we hit the, the, the
Christmas rush but we've been real happy with them working, working real
well. We should switch traffic here in the next couple of weeks. There
was a little bit of a delay, the contractor had some issues bringing in a
paving, their, their paving crew. They got stuck on another project so we
were supposed to be switched at the end of August but because of their, I,
hate to say delay because that's really an improper term because they're
again three months ahead of schedule. But we had a little bit of a setback
on them paving that top mat so we're probably looking in the next two
weeks we'll switch traffic to the southbound.

The next one on that is our pavement preservation from 133 to 136,
that's basically the Corralitos interchange where the Love's truck stop is to
the I-10/I-25 interchange. We opened bids on that one August 21st. We
have a tentative low bid. The next couple of months we'll be working
through the contract, signing and awarding of that contract. That one
does have stipulations that the traffic control will not interfere with the
Union bridge project so it'll be completely separate. I would expect that
they'll start on the west end up out of the, out of the Valley, get that all
completed before they move into the Union area but I'll have a, more
updates on that one once we get a schedule from the contractor probably
in October or November.

Valley Drive, Jerry and MPO staff did a good job updating us on
that one so I don't have anything to add for that project.

And then the last two as I mentioned last month, those are railroad
safety projects that's actually coordinating with the City of Las Cruces on a
railroad section out of the general office and I don't have any information
on those specifically.

The last thing I wanted to share with you all is we're nearing the
end of the federal fiscal year. Actually next week is our last opportunity to,
to move forward with obligating projects with federal fiscal money. Our
district over the past several years has done a really good job in
coordination with South Region Design having a shelved, a shelf program so that when other districts or projects are, are under the obligated amount for instance that kind of goes into a, a pot and then they redistribute at the end of each fiscal year to the districts that are managing their projects and have that shelf program ready to go. Currently it looks like, these are not, haven't been guaranteed yet but it looks like our district is going to be the recipient of an additional $16.3 million worth of work. One of those projects is, is in this vicinity. It's the Aguirre Springs pavement preservation so we'll start at the, the pullout at the top of the hill at the missile range. It'll go all the way to the county line, basically from Aguirre Springs to the county line we'll do a pavement preservation but that's a $9.1 million project that originally was scheduled for 2018 that we're going to move forward which will open up that money in 2018. The other one is, is far north. It's basically from the Alamosa Canyon there north of T or C, finishing that last section of I-25 but that's a $7.2 million project. But this is really good news for the district because any time we get additional money it frees up something later so we'll be looking at some work probably in 2018 to fill that gap. Just so the MPO Board is aware, we're probably going to focus on some reconstruction projects of our I, our I-10 corridor. We have a couple of eight or ten-mile sections that are literally falling apart and we think it's past that preservation point. So we'll probably be looking at those in 2018 but I did, I did want to share with you specifically that $9 million project. If they do award that of course we'll be coming to the Board to amend our STIP and those types of things but good news for the district. Anytime you get an additional $16 million when you only have a $30 million program it's a really good, good shot in the arm. With that Madam Chair I will stand for any questions.

Flores: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Does that mean that possibly we could slide into the STIP the Upham exchange engineering? Thank you Madam Chair.

Doolittle: At, at this point Madam Chair, Commissioner. We, again we haven't moved forward with anything on the Upham interchange. I did pose the question to our planning section out of the general office to, to help provide a mechanism, for instance if the County wanted to move forward with the funding of a study. I think I mentioned to you we're currently going through that process with NMSU at the Arrowhead interchange. That is a priority for the university but not for the Department. They actually sought some grants to pay for that initial study. Actually they're working through Molzen Corbin on that so I'm, I'm trying to mirror that process and get the information that I would need to share that with the County so that if they wanted to proceed with their own study we could
find a mechanism to do that. At this point I have not received that kind of
information but I'll be sure to share that with you when I do.

Hancock: Thank you. Look for that. Thank you.

Flores: Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes, thank you very much. Good job Mr. Doolittle. That was excellent
and I look forward to you know you always having those shelf projects
ready. Thank you. My comment is nowhere near as comprehensive as,
or it's not for a new spending of huge amounts of money but this morning I
had occasion to drive from, well I got, I was coming from El Paso and
instead of turning off on I-25 I, I went I-10. And normally I get off at exit
142, which is University and I can't remember any signage that said exit
142 was closed but it is. And then they just said, "Well, just keep going
further. You'll get to 142." And actually it's a detour. It's on 140. But I
think it would've been a little bit more helpful to, to drivers if they knew
ahead of time that 142 is unavailable.

Flores: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. I, it's, the sign is there. It's, it comes up quick
and it goes away quick but I, I, I, I've come that way occasionally and, and
it is there. So Trent you're, you did a good job. It's there.

Doolittle: Thank you. I was fixing to start making some phone calls.

Flores: Anyone else? Okay. Thank you.

7.3 Committee Training

Flores: So we're moving on to 7.3: Committee Training.

Murphy: Madam, Madam Chair. Although in your packet it did say "Complete
Streets" it's actually going to do a, do a road diet one. We came across a,
a video. We, since we have the facilities do it's a, a really informative
quick-moving media, after which I want to then relate some of the statistics
that we have found here in the, in the MPO region when it comes to road
diets. So I'm going to go ahead and run the video and then I got the, got a
couple slides after that. And before I go if, if anyone in the audience
wants to view it they can pull a chair around to the, to the front then there's
a screen on the podium. For some reason the ones up overhead are not
working.

TOM MURPHY PLAYED A VIDEO.
Flores: Can we turn up the sound?

Murphy: Okay. And we've, we had typical, or we had the, the four-lane to three-lane road diet done in, in our area. First one that was done in the area was Solano. It was done Missouri to Lohman I believe way back in 2008. It was extended a few years later to go from Missouri to University. More, most, more recently last year Idaho was done El Paseo to Main and then one of our recommendations in Transport 2040 is that Idaho be continued from El Paseo to, El Paseo to Solano and we have, we have discussed others along, along the way. El Paseo project that was in, that the City had been working on that was under consideration, I don't know if the, I don't believe they're moving forward at that time but that's still within the discussion to have some sort of road diet on that facility. Another one that MPO staff is looking to request the City look into is in conjunction with our short-range transit plan route realignment is to look at a reduction in lanes on Walton between Lohman and Griggs and, and, and we're certainly open to identifying others that we may, you know that we may want to advance to any of our government partners to implement.

Since Solano was the, the first one that's done and we've, we had a, a, many years of statistics on there, the crashes, the, we observe crashes on that one have gone down since implementation of the, of the road diet and as a, as a side note as a future training we can discuss how the crashes are reported through the, from state law enforcement and get, and get passed on to Molzen Corbin, the MPO, and all others who, who do these reports and we can present that information in response to Commissioner Garrett's earlier question.

We also noticed through years, through the years that the road diet did not reduce the, the capacity or reduce the actual volume that we observed on it. The AADT that was recorded on Solano peaked in the mid-90s and was on steady decline till the early oughts and then it came back a little and flatlined. And as you ...

Flores: Could you define AADT?

Murphy: AADT is the, is the, is the annualized average daily traffic. And when the MPO staff, we go out and lay tubes in, in the roadways and we count, count the cars and then that, that, those numbers that we count are adjusted based, both based on daily factors and monthly factors you know, it, to come up with a, to come up with an average amount. Essentially the, you know traffic is always higher on a Friday than it is on a Tuesday. It's higher in February than it is in June and the, there's a series, you know there are many permanent counters throughout the state that the State uses to develop a adjustment factor that we apply against every count that we do so that we have a reasonable estimate of what the average traffic on any given facility is of which we go out and measure. And so with that background we can see that the, the average daily traffic
on, on Solano it, it decreased and then it plateau’d in the, in the, in the
oughts, at least that’s the right term for it. And then in ’08 when the, when
the road diet was implemented we did not see a decrease from that, that
aspect on, on forward so the, the effect on vehicular traffic of reducing the
lanes was negligible and then from the, and then, and this was the, the
count that we did or, or this, the, we put together for the El Paseo project
showing that you know from peak traffic in the ’90s it, it decreased steadily
until 2002, rebounded a little bit, and then plateau’d and then 2012-2013
you can kind of, kind of see when K-Mart closed essentially. It, the, the
traffic fell off the board. Part of this was used to, to, some of the evidence
that a road diet could be supported in that, in that the, the historical traffic
just wasn’t there any longer for that facility. And I, I think that concludes
my short little training on road diets and I’d happily answer any questions
that you may have.

Flores: Okay. I’m not seeing any questions so thank you.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Flores: All right. So we’ll move on to Committee and staff comments. So any
comments from the Committee? I’ll just say happy birthday to Leticia and
thank you for coming. Anyone else? No? Okay. Staff.

Murphy: Okay. Staff, we, a couple studies going on. We have the University study
corridor. We are looking to go out to our second public hearing on that.
We’re trying to have it either October 13th or October 15th in the Town of
Mesilla. Our consultant Bohannan Huston will be presenting what, what
we have, what we believe is the preferred alternative based on
stakeholder and public involvement to this date.

And then our Missouri extension project, we’re looking at having
public meetings on the week of October 20, or 19th with either have it
Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday which would be the 20th through the
22nd at which point we would want to have our first meeting out with the
public. Based on our stakeholder involvement it looks like there’s really a,
a desire to have some sort of non-motorized access pushed towards the
school and vehicular access not, not yet but certainly I, I think we’re going
to be putting, you know putting all that out there to the public and hear
what everybody has to say and develop further.

The third study that MPO staff is involved in is through the City, the
short-range transit plan update. Looking at revising the routes for
RoadRUNNER Transit. We have a presentation tomorrow at the Transit
Advisory Board at 3 p.m. to give them our revised recommendations
based on the public, public input meetings that we held during the
summer.

Flores: Okay. Thank you.
9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: So we'll move back again to public comment. Seeing none.

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:18 p.m.)

Flores: We'll move to adjournment. Thank you.

Chairperson
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 14, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee Appointment

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review, Evaluation, and Appointment

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Letter of Interest from Gabriel Rochelle
Letter of Interest from Dona Devine

DISCUSSION:
The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee (BPAC) has 11 members: 6 citizen representatives and 5 staff representatives. According to the MPO Bylaws, the staff representatives are appointed by the head of the department they will represent within each jurisdiction. The citizen appointments are made by the Policy Committee.

Currently, there is one citizen representative position open: Bicycle Community Representative.

There are two types of citizen representatives: jurisdictional and modal. The jurisdictional representatives will be selected to represent the three MPO member agencies – one per agency. Based on MPO staff’s interpretation of the Bylaws, this representative should understand planning issues and facility needs surrounding non-motorized transportation. This understanding is required to integrate walking and biking into the regional transportation system. Finally, the role of the citizen should be to promote walking and biking in their respective jurisdiction.

The modal representatives consist of two bicycling community representatives and one pedestrian community representative. For their respective roles, the desired representative should understand the planning issues and facility needs for bicycling or walking, and promote bicycling or walking in the community at large.

In this packet are the letters of interest MPO Staff received in response to our request for candidates. Please review the letters, evaluate their ability to fulfill the roles described above, and prepare questions that may help you make a final decision. Staff will prepare ballots for the Policy Committee members to cast for the position.
10 September 2015

Andrew Wray  
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization  
PO Box 20000  
Las Cruces, NM 88004

Dear Andrew Wray:

I am interested in serving on the MVMPO as Bicycle Community  
Representative. I have a long history of working with and advocating for  
cycling.

In the past I worked for 12 years with Community Bike Works of Allentown  
PA, an earn-a-bike program for inner-city children that earned multiple  
awards over the years. I was board chairman for 6 years. Web site:  
communitybikeworks.org.

During my time in Allentown I was also an active member of the Lehigh  
Valley Wheelmen, leading B level rides for several years.

I was a volunteer worker at the Lehigh Valley Velodrome for nine years  
and a participant for three summers in the Air Products track racing  
program.

Lastly, in that venue I was part of a group that organized an annual Bike  
for World Hunger event that raised large amounts of money for that  
cause, with over 1000 participants annually.

Since moving to this area, I have been active with Bike and Chowder  
Society.

I serve as secretary of Velo Cruces, the local cycling advocacy  
committee.

I wrote a column on bicycling for the BULLETIN for two years and now write  
the monthly column “Cycles of Life” for DESERT EXPOSURE.
I am in conversation with a number of people in the area to plan and implement an earn-a-bike program similar to the one I was connected with in Allentown.

I am a member of the League of American Bicyclists and of People for Bikes.

If you need references, I am sure that Ashleigh Curry (acurry@lcps.k12.NM.US), Pablo Lopez (Pablo@outdooradventures.com) and Lisa Willman, chair of Velo Cruces (willman@zianet.com) would vouch for my interests and involvements.

Thank you.

Gabriel C. Rochelle
I am interested in being a Bicycle Community Rep. I have been an avid cyclist since 1982. My husband and I have been Ride Leaders for the Twin City Bicycle Club (TCBC) since 1985. We have lead many rides through the years. We also are members of the Bike and Chowder Club here in Las Cruces. (Since 2002)

Once of my concerns here in Las Cruces is our Trail System and I would like to have input on current issues and future plans.

We are away in the summer for 2-3 months and there would be a couple of months during the winter where I would miss a meeting or 2. This may be an issue for you.

Let me know if you need anything else or if our being away would be a road block.

Thanks You,
Dona Devine
tdevine12@msn.com

4124 Papago Court
Las Cruces, NM 88005

home - 575-647-0757
Cell - 651-398-6778
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MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 14, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 University Avenue Study Corridor Presentation

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will give a presentation regarding the progress on the MPO University Avenue Study Corridor project.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 14, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 NMDOT Projects Update

DISCUSSION:
Update from NMDOT regarding current projects:

1100620 – I-10 Mill and Inlay Project, MP 146-164.3
1100820 – West Mesa/High Mesa Road
1100830 – I-10 Bridge Replacement Project (Union)
LC00100 – I-25 Bridge Replacement Project (Missouri)
LC00120 – Intersection w/Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses
LC00140 – US 70 Intersection with 17th Street
LC00150 – I-10 Pavement Preservation Project, MP 133-146
LC00160 – NM 188 (Valley Drive) Reconstruction Project
LC00210 – Goathill Road RR Crossing Project
LC00220 – NM 226 RR Crossing Project
LC00230 – Signal Upgrades at Various RR Crossings
LC00240 – US 70 Through San Augustine Pass
E100180 – NM 478 Pavement Preservation Project
LC00250 – University Interchange
LC00270 – North Main/US 70 Capacity and Safety Study
AGENDA ITEM:
7.3 Committee Training

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will give a brief presentation on Transit Oriented Development.