MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held January 8, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 N. Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
                    Larry Altamirano (LCPS) (departed 4:45)
                    Louis Grijalva (CLC Public Works) (arrived 4:10)
                    Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
                    John Knopp (Town of Mesilla)
                    Harold Love (NMDOT)
                    Rene Molina (DAC Engineering)
                    Greg Walke (NMSU)
                    Willie Roman (CLC Transportation)
                    Luis Marmolejo (DAC)
                    Bill Childress (BLM)

MEMBERS ABSENT:    Jack Valencia (SCRTD)
                    Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
                    John Gwynne (DA Flood Commission)

STAFF PRESENT:     Tom Murphy (MPO Staff)
                    Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
                    Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)

OTHERS PRESENT:    Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (4:05)

Bartholomew: Let’s see. It looks like it’s about five minutes after four o’clock so I’ll call to order the, the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Bartholomew: The first item is the approval of the agenda. Is there any changes to make Tom to the agenda?

Murphy:       Staff has no changes.

Bartholomew: I’ll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

Love:         So moved, Harold Love.
Walke: Seconded, Greg Walke.

Bartholomew: It’s been moved and seconded. All in favor please say “ayes.”

AGENDA APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed? I guess before we get too far in I should just have everybody introduce themselves so their names and voices are on the record for the meeting today. I’ll start down at my, I’ll start down there at my far right.

Knopp: Okay. John Knopp from Town of Mesilla.

Marmolejo: Luis Marmolejo, Dona Ana County Community Development Department.

Molina: Rene Molina, Dona Ana County Engineering.

Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Bartholomew: Mike Bartholomew, City of Las Cruces Roadrunner Transit.

Walke: Greg Walke, New Mexico State University.

Childress: Bill Childress, Bureau of Land Management.

Altamirano: Larry Altamirano, Las Cruces Public Schools.

Bartholomew: And we’ve got one more walking in, too. We have Willie Roman from the City of Las Cruces coming in as well.

3. ELECTION OF OFFICER

Bartholomew: So the first item of business is the election of officers so it’s a, a Chair and a Vice Chair, correct?

Wray: That’s correct.

Bartholomew: That have to be selected. I think Jack Valencia was the Chair this past year and I was the, the Vice Chair. I would entertain any motions for somebody who would like to be the Chair for the next year for the TAC.

Herrera: I would like to nominate Mike Bartholomew for Chair.

Altamirano: Second.
Bartholomew: Okay, any other?

Altamirano: Larry Altamirano with the second.

Bartholomew: Any other nominations for Chair? It’s an easy job so. Tom and his staff make it pretty, pretty painless. I’ll, I’ll do it if, if that’s okay. I guess I’ll close the nominations and all in favor of having me be Chair for another year please say “aye.”

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed? Then I’ll need a, a Vice Chair for those days that I won’t be here. Any nominations for that?

Herrera: I’d like to nominate Harold Love for Vice Chair.

Bartholomew: Okay. Any other nominations at this time?

Altamirano: Mr. Chair, I request that we close nominations.

Bartholomew: Okay nominations are closed. Is that okay Mr. Love for Vice Chair?

Love: That’s fine.

Bartholomew: Okay. All in favor of having Harold Love as Vice Chair please say “aye.”

Opposed?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: So I guess you’ve got your roster here for the, the next year.

Murphy: Thank you.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 November 6, 2014

Bartholomew: The next item is the approval of the minutes of November 6, 2014. Any ... hopefully everybody’s had a chance to take a look at the minutes and are there any changes, corrections needed on the minutes? Seeing none, I’ll take a motion to accept the minutes.

Herrera: So moved.

Bartholomew: Is there a second?
Molina: Second.

Bartholomew: Okay. It’s been moved and seconded to approve the minutes of November 6, 2014. All in favor please say “aye.”

MOTION Passes UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed?

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bartholomew: Next is the public comment period. Is there anybody wishing to comment? Don’t see anybody at this point so I’ll move on to the discussion items.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: Map Issues

Bartholomew: First one is 6.1, Metropolitan Planning, or Transportation Plan Update: Map Issues.

PRESENTATION BY TOM MURPHY.

Bartholomew: Okay.

Herrera: Mr. Chair can I ask a question first?

Bartholomew: Yes.

Herrera: I’m sure you said it Tom, but I just didn’t hear, so the maps that are over there incorporated all of the changes that we suggested at the December meeting?

Murphy: We believe we’ve gotten ... 

Herrera: Okay.

Murphy: All of your comments into that.

Bartholomew: Okay. So I’d like to move we recess for a few minutes.

Murphy: And, and for the, for the minutes, Louis Grijalva, City of Las Cruces has joined us.
Bartholomew: Thank you.

COMMITTEE TOOK 12 MINUTES TO OBSERVE MAPS BROUGHT BY MPO STAFF.

Bartholomew: If, if we can reconvene the meeting in the next minute or so that would be wonderful.

    Okay, it looks like we're all back here so I'll, I'll just start opening it
up for comments from the committee to Mr. Murphy on ... that they'd like
to get on the record here for what they've observed on the maps. I know,
Mr. Childress, you told me you had wanted to ...

Childress: Yes. The only remaining comment I have is that I still believe that for a
truck route none of the Dripping Springs or Sonoma Ranch should be
included in that delineation, especially the Dripping Springs. I'm a little
less concerned about Sonoma Ranch and maybe Sonoma Ranch where it
meets up with Lohman but as far as the truck route delineation for any
portion of Dripping Springs, I have a little bit of concern with that,
promoting traffic in that direction up towards Dripping Springs natural area
and the new national monument. And also if, if in fact the Dripping
Springs and Baylor route is paved we need to do what we can to reduce
and not inadvertently promote truck traffic using that route to Highway 70
and to I-25. That's it.

Bartholomew: Other comments?

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I already shared this with MPO staff over at the maps but I'd
just like you to take a look at the functional classification rules again and
some of those little weird collectors that are sticking out there so thank
you.

Roman: Mr. Chair? I would just like to comment on Mr. Childress' concern. As far
as the City's concerned, I believe there's still a quarry at that intersection
in operation so that's, that would be one reason we wouldn't want to take it
off the truck route, just one of the reasons because they have to have
access for their trucks to be able to you know access that location. But
the second reason is that they're both arterials and we would, we'd sort of
you know be contradicting ourselves if we have an arterial and then we
don't allow trucks to then access on arterial systems because the arterial
systems are there for that specific reason. I think the truck, the truck route
helps us to determine more than anything which local roads or collector,
residential collector type roads we, we need to limit as far as access
because there's maybe too much of a residential component on that,
directly on that road. So that's, that's the difficulty the City has in trying to
balance the two, you know allowing access and then balancing the arterial
factor.
Childress: I, I appreciate this. I, I think what I said specifically in the comment is I understand that the, the route would be used for, for trucks, 16-wheelers from time to time as service vehicles going to residents to do whatever they need to do. To a lesser degree I, that probably does apply to the quarry that’s there as well, understanding that they use it for business purposes and I view that use as a little different than somebody taking off on Dripping Springs Road and trying to go all the way to 70 and by, and converting it to a bypass, and maybe there’s another way to resolve that issue and, and to place some level of enforcement to prevent that from happening down the road.

Murphy: Mr. Chair?

Bartholomew: Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Mr. Childress, I, I would think that probably the, the solution in that is we use this and then we can also ask, ask the County to come up with a method that they sign Dripping Springs east of Sonoma Ranch as, as no, no through trucks and I think you know we can use this map for that purpose and, “Look, you know it’s allowable up to here; past here it’s not allowed.” And then that, that would say, you know that, that way you, you’ve drawn a line in the sand saying, “Okay, we’re not prohibiting it but we’re prohibiting it here because of, you know all of, you know all the uses that you had mentioned that we don’t want to have Baylor Canyon turned into a bypass.

Childress: I appreciate that. I, I can understand that perspective and if that’s the way you need to move forward then that’s acceptable from my perspective.

Bartholomew: Okay. Other comments?

Roman: Mr. Chair, Mr. Childress, I think it might benefit us if maybe some County Engineering can explain to use how that, that bypass is going to be designed because if the, if the vertical curves and horizontal curves aren’t, aren’t designed to accommodate a truck they’re not going to prefer to use that route and that, that’ll be a, the design itself will, you know will, will work to prohibit them using that.

Molina: So that, the roadway, Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon, those improvements are not intended to be a bypass. That’s clear as day. There’s been no intention of referring to it as a bypass. The roadway’s designed as a minor local roadway with geometrics that aren’t conducive to that of a collector or arterial. With respect to the map, believe the map went to ...

Murphy: Sonoma,
Molina: Sonoma Ranch and that was it so with respect to additional signage, we could take a look at that. I'm not too certain there will be a warrant to place the signage but we can certainly take a look at that at a later date.

Childress: I appreciate it. Yeah, when the first generation of map that we reviewed last month did actually have a portion of Baylor Canyon Road delineated as a truck route as well and that's no longer on the map and I think that's a good move. And I guess as long as we can, you know cut it off at Sonoma Ranch Road going around to 70 that, you know that, I understand the rationale behind leaving it because you have a customer that's using heavy trucks to move sand and gravel and if that, you need that truck route delineation for that, I understand that.

 Bartholomew: Other comments on that? I, I would, I would comment as I was talking with you earlier Tom, that we perhaps get with Jamie Rickman about Mesquite. I'm not opposed to it being sustained as a truck route, I'm just relaying the information that I know that there's a lot of, of residents in the area that seem to be concerned or not a lot but some residents that seem to be concerned that it was a truck route. Regard, regarding the transit one, I, I was really, I like that, that it was included, you included the two alternate locations we were looking at for the side transfer area because going into the Mesilla Valley Mall as we do now really is a time-killer, to get in and get out of the mall and I think looking at either of the locations there behind Petco or at the combination of the City-owned/BLM-owned land near Paseo de Onate and Lohman might be good areas to look for an alternative for a transfer area.

 Under the transit-oriented development policies area in there it, it, you kind of mentioned land use but it might be good to maybe specify like when the corridors are developed for transit-oriented development to make sure that there's space to develop proper bus amenities, pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, in addition to the street in those transit-oriented development corridors.

 Another comment I had, I remember that there was some stuff done in December when we were drawing on maps that I didn't know if it's reflected on them, any of those I may have missed it, but about perhaps having Triviz eventually go underneath University Avenue into the university. I don't know which map in particular that would best, best go on or that idea.

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, yeah that's, that project's actually been kind of discussed. I, I'm, it's not on any of the maps. And I need to figure out which map it goes on best so, but that's, that is a project that I think I, I know the DOT has studied it. I think they have some design on it already, already drawn. We just have to figure out which map to put that on and we will get it on one of them.
Bartholomew: Okay. And my other comment was that, and I understand you were telling me while we were on recess there that there, there will be a separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities map that you’re going to be presenting to the BPAC, correct?

Murphy: Yes. Currently the MPO, the current Transport 2040 has a trail system map and has an on-street bicycle map but I also want to add a third one to the mix and that being a pedestrian priority plan map, and we want to vet those through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Bartholomew: And by the, you’re going to be doing that this month with the, that committee so perhaps by February we might see, hear about what comments they would have on that, that particular map?

Murphy: Yes. We should have, we should have all of them ready to go you know when we come back in, in February and then of course we will always put our maps onto the website so that you can review them at any time.

Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I have one other comment/question. When you bring the Bicycle Pedestrian Committee the existing maps and are looking for updates, can we somehow get an overlay of what the truck route map is with that because I don’t think we necessarily want to be putting truck routs on roads that we deem as Tier 1 for bike facilities?

Murphy: I think we can, we can do the overlay, yeah.

Herrera: Okay. Thank you.

Childress: One additional comment, I did make some comments on proposed recommendations on bicycle Pedestrian so I will provide those as to, as well today for consideration with the idea we’d have pedestrian and bicycle on Dripping, Baylor, and Arroyo roads as well. Both go in proximity to the new monument to provide I think enhanced recreational opportunities for the community.

Bartholomew: Are there other comments? So just to clarify Tom then in February we’ll be making some kind of a recommendation then on these to the Policy Committee?

Murphy: That’s correct. I hope to have, I hope to have everything compiled, put together so that we have a, a complete MTP for you to, you know recommend for us ultimately to go out to the public.
Bartholomew: Okay. And you'll probably have that on the website for us to review before the next meeting too?

Murphy: Yes. Probably not much, probably not more than a week before but yeah.

Bartholomew: Okay.

Murphy: We're getting, we're getting down to the, we're getting down to the, the do or die time so it'll, it'll be there in some form.

Bartholomew: I don't see any other comments out there so it looks like we're ready to move on to the next item.

6.2 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: Loop Road Presentation

Bartholomew: Which is 6.2: Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: Loop Road Presentation.

Murphy: So Michael McAdams is going to give a presentation for MPO staff on some of the, some Loop Road issues and bypass issues. Some of, some of you raised some of the comments last month when we were looking at the maps as far as construction of bypasses. We also got some, some public comment concerning, concerning the issue when we went out, we went out with our public input last or in the fall, and then the Policy Committee also has a concern, so Michael has put together a, a, a brief presentation to kind of brief, brief you on the issues and then get your feedback and I'll turn that over to Michael now.

PRESENTATION BY MICHAEL MCADAMS.

Bartholomew: Are there any questions from the Committee at this point in time? Kind of you talking about all the, all that's involved with bypasses and everything and you have to plan, is that, is, what's the status of all that planning and everything right now in, in this MPO?

McAdams: I mean, this is all preliminary right now. This might, all in the planning stages ...

Bartholomew: Right.

McAdams: Nothing has been done, it's, nothing's set in stone.

Bartholomew: Right, but you mentioned like starting now rather than 50 years from now so I was just ...
McAdams: Yeah, I mean I guess when we’ve talked about it before it’s, it’s maybe 50 years in the future but I think it’s, if there’s ever going to be action there should be sort of a plan saying, “This is where it does happen,” but this Committee and the Policy Committee has, has the right to say, “We want to delineate the bypass,” or they could say, “We would like it studied further or to continue in the plan because we believe it’s, it’d be necessary in the future”.

Bartholomew: Okay.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, can I maybe add a little bit more information to that answer? So I think that some of the proposed bypass routes have been studied in a little bit of detail. I know for example the West Mesa or High Mesa Road was, we started studying it and then the Policy Board of the, this MPO decided not to approve the, the next phase of that so I think that there has been some planning going on. I’m not sure about the other, the other lines on that map but I know that that for one has been looked at at least in some detail.

Bartholomew: I do you recall that one.

Murphy: I, I can, I can give a little bit more. As such the, not only the state did a Phase A report on the High Mesa and West Mesa, it also factored into the City-sponsored Jackrabbit Interchange Study at the convergence of US-70 and I-10. Back in the ‘90s the County had done some preliminary environmental documents on the, on the Weisner alignment connecting from US-70 down to I-10 near the Mesquite interchange. That is the documentation that I’m, that I’m aware of. We just kind of in, yeah in, in talking with your agencies and kind of polling what, what your plans are none of, none of the agencies and part of the MPO or, or a partner in the DOT, can I sense that anybody’s, anybody’s looking to move forward with any of these facilities save the DOT had considered the, the West Mesa aspect. However when we go out to public we’re, we’re getting two reactions; one is you know, “We’re not a real city until we build a loop road. We need to, we need to build, we need to build one yesterday. Why haven’t you, why haven’t you done that yet?” so, so we, it continually comes up in the public forum. At this time in our public forum is we’ve also got the, the polar opposite comment that said you know, “If, if there’s not an immediate need for it, you don’t see the need for it in the 20-year horizon, why is it even on your map?” So that, that was a fair enough question so we thought that ... and then a, a couple of you had made some, some comments on the maps last month about, about getting a loop road system constructed and so we thought, “Okay we really need to dive into this, into this issue deeply kind of, kind of get some firm answers for it.” So we had Michael, you know kind of give this, and he’s going to give the same presentation, maybe a little modified it to Policy...
Committee next week so that we get, get some firm direction from our Technical Committee and our, our Policy Committee on whether or not to include this in our planning, you know in our planning maps. From the looks of things and from what I'm understanding your projects to be, you know the County, the County's main number one concern is, remains they have many miles of unpaved roads out there is that's their first foremost need. City of Las Cruces, they're, they're implementing their pavement management system. They want to get their pavement quality up to, up to the quality that their citizenry expects. They're also looking at ITS solutions in order to better manage the, manage the existing transportation system. So all, and then the, and then NMDOT has been and my, I, it sounds like you guys will continue to be in maintenance mode here for the foreseeable future due to the uncertainty of funding at the federal level and, you know maintaining what we have is you know the number one listing in the federal regulations so I was looking at, you know essentially having our, our MTP come out with; that we're not going to do any capacity expansion projects, that we're going to concentrate on maintenance, that we're going to you know take care of what we got. But the, but the loop road and calls for new interchanges kind of fly in the face of that so I think we need to, we need to have the discussion out here. We need to have the discussion very publicly and, and, and settle it one way or the other if that's the, if that's the route that we're going to, to go with this MTP.

Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you, Tom. Any other comments or questions of Tom?

Herrera: Mr. Chair, another comment. I think that's a good route to go, to say that we're pretty much in maintenance mode, that it's fine to study these and if we want to put them in long-range plans that's okay, but so far none of the local governments and, you know the DOT did that Phase A but we're not looking at spending $60 or $70 million to build loop roads right now. We just can't afford it, so.

Bartholomew: Other comments, agreement, disagreement? Sounds like there, people nodding heads in agreement pretty much.

6.3 Transportation Improvement Program Update

Bartholomew: If there's no other comments then I guess we're going to move on to the final discussion item: Transportation Improvement Program Update.

Wray: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is less of a discussion item and more just a brief update on the TIP and TAP projects that we received last month. We only received two that were submitted to us. One was from the Town of Mesilla for road improvements in the area of Zia Middle School. As the Committee is no doubt aware, that's been a problem area for several
years and the Town of Mesilla is seeking funding to implement some remedies for that area. The other application that we received was from the School District. They’re looking to put flashers and other safety features around several crossings throughout the area. And those were the two projects that, or applications that we received and staff is going to be convening very soon to start work on putting those through the TIP process. We anticipate probably having them before this Committee in March, I would say. Probably in March for this Committee’s review.

Bartholomew: Thank you Andrew. Any questions.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, Andrew I have a couple of questions more about the, the application submitted by the Public School District. What source of funding are they looking for on that?

Wray: I have to defer to Mr. Murphy on that as I have not actually seen the document.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, they’re looking for, to be funded under the, the TAP program is the funding source referenced.

Herrera: Okay. And that’s what I figured but we need to keep in mind that the deadline for submittal of TAP applications to the statewide coordinator is February first. And this, since it’s a statewide competition the MPO doesn’t need to take action, we just need to make sure that that application is submitted with a signed resolution and everything else by February first.

Murphy: You know I thought it was February 15th but I think, I think we’re going to, we’re going to do the same hustle either way.

Herrera: Okay. Thanks.

Murphy: So we’ll get it in.

Bartholomew: Any other questions or comments? Thank you, Andrew.

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Bartholomew: Any comments from the Committee at this point in time?

Knopp: All right. One thing that we usually do on an annual basis is approve the calendar. I don’t think we did this time. And as we do that for the, typically the first Thursdays of the month other than today, I would suggest that we change September’s from the third to the tenth, just so that it’s after Labor Day and there’s a lot of vacations and things like that going on.
And also we don’t meet in July and it already said the locations, you know July wasn’t included in either so it kind of acknowledges that.

Bartholomew: Okay. Tom is, is this usually an action item that’s brought to the, to the group? The calendar?

Murphy: We have in the past taken it, taken through here for recommendation of the Policy Committee and it, it’s apparent that we’ve neglected to get your, get your feedback on it because we, you know I wanted, I think mainly because we were not changing anything on there. I think the solution, the solution would be that, that’s, could be at the discretion of the, of the Chair or the discretion of the MPO officer when it comes to September. We can cancel the meeting that’s set for September 3rd and just call a special one for September 10th. That way we don’t have to amend the, we, we don’t have to amend the official calendar and take it through Policy Committee because it is a, it is a, a power that’s vested in either, either you or myself.

Bartholomew: I, I would be agreeable to doing that as the Chair at the time it comes if we do have a September meeting, I’ll leave it to the Committee if we’d like to, to do it any, anything more formal than that. Okay? I guess we’ll just do it informally, then that way when the time comes just remind me.

Murphy: Okay, if you remind me to remind you.

Bartholomew: Okay. John will remind us. Any staff comments at this time?

Murphy: No staff comments.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bartholomew: Okay. And I haven’t seen any public walk in yet so I’ll pass over that.

9. ADJOURNMENT (5:00)

Bartholomew: I’ll take a motion for adjournment then.

Love: So moved.

Herrera: Second.

Bartholomew: It’s been moved and seconded. All in favor? Thank you.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairperson