







# University Avenue Corridor Study PHASE A STUDY

January 2016 FINAL

**Prepared for:** 

**Mesilla Valley** Metropolitan Planning Organization

( Ro

LLL+333

(3)

Prepared by:

# Bohannan \land Huston

7500 Jefferson St NE, Courtyard One Albuquerque, NM 87109

toti S (marking)

# **UNIVERSITY AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY** PHASE A STUDY

**FINAL JANUARY 2016** 

PREPARED FOR:

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION** 

PREPARED BY:

**BOHANNAN HUSTON, INC.** 7500 JEFFERSON ST NE COURTYARD ONE ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87109

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
A. Project Introduction	1
B. Purpose and Need	1
C. Public Involvement	1
D. Alternatives Considered	1
E. Recommendations	1
II. INTRODUCTION	2
A. Project Overview	2
1. Project History	2
2. Study Area	2
B. Purpose and Need	2
1. Physical Deficiencies and Safety:	2
2. Traffic Demand and Capacity:	3
3. System Connectivity:	3
4. Access:	3
5. Economic Development:	3
6. Legislative Mandate:	3
C. Funding	3
D. agency and stakeholder coordination	3
E. Public Involvement	3
III. EXISTING CORRIDOR CONDITIONS	5
A. Corridor Conditions	5
1. Typical Sections	5
2. Signage and Striping	5
B. Adjacent land use	5
1. Irrigation Ditches	5
C. Pavement Condition	7
D. Utilities	7
1. Water Lines	7
2. Overhead Electric Lines	7
3. Gas Lines	7

4. Sewer Lines	7
E. Access	7
F. Drainage	7
G. Right-of-Way	7
IV. TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS	11
A. Existing Traffic Conditions	11
1. Traffic Volumes	11
2. Crash Data	11
V. ALTERNATIVES	13
A. initial Roadway Alternatives considered	13
B. recommended alternatives	20
1. Roadway	20
2. Drainage	20
C. Additional Alternatives considered	20
1. Multi-Use Trail Alternative	20
2. Elephant Butte Irrigation District Right-of-Way	20
VI. PUBLIC AND AGENCY COORDINATION	23
A. Public involvement	23
B. Agency Coordination	23
VII. ENVIRONMENTAL	28
A. Geology and Geography	28
B. Water Resources	28
1. Floodplain Management	28
2. Surface Water	28
3. Groundwater	28
4. Wetlands	28
C. Vegetation	28
D. Wildlife	29
1. Threatened and Endangered Species	29
E. Cultural Resources	29
F. Hazardous Materials	29
G. Sections 4(f)	29
H. Prime Farmland	29

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

# JANUARY 2016 INTRODUCTION

# UNIVERSITY AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY PHASE A

1. Prime and Unique Farmlands	
I. Visual Resources	
J. Air Quality	
K. Environmental Justice	
L. Noise	31
M. Land Use	31
N. Community Cohesion	31
O. Multi-modal Access	31
P. Economic Development	31
VIII. CONCLUSIONS	
IX. REFERENCES	

# LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – STUDY AREA	4
FIGURE 2 – EBID FACILITIES	6
FIGURE 3 – UTILITIES	9
FIGURE 4 – RIGHT-OF-WAY1	0
FIGURE 5 – ACCIDENT DATA1	2
FIGURE 6 – TYPICAL SECTION A1	4
FIGURE 7 – TYPICAL SECTION B1	5
FIGURE 8 – TYPICAL SECTION C1	6
FIGURE 9 – TYPICAL SECTION D1	7
FIGURE 10 – TYPICAL SECTION E1	8
FIGURE 11 – TYPICAL SECTION F1	9
FIGURE 12 – TYPICAL SECTION G2	21
FIGURE 13 – MULTI USE2	22
FIGURE 14 – RENDERING2	25
FIGURE 15 – RENDERING2	26
FIGURE 16 – RENDERING	27

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE1: AVERAGE ANNUAL DAILY TRAFFIC (AADT) TABLE 2 - MAJOR SOIL TYPES THAT INTERSECT TH

APPENDIX A – RIGHT-OF-WAY DOCUMENTATION APPENDIX B – PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT APPENDIX C – ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

# JANUARY 2016 INTRODUCTION

)	•••	••	•••	•••			•••		•••										 •••		 	•••	 	••	 	 1	1
⊦	HE	Ξ	Ρ	R	C	)၂	IE	C	Т	. (	C	DF	RF	RIE	C	)R	2	•••	 • • •	•••	 	•••	 		 	 3(	0

# APPENDICES

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### PROJECT INTRODUCTION Α.

The University Avenue Corridor Study – Phase A is being led by the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO). The project corridor crosses through both the jurisdiction of the City of Las Cruces and the Town of Mesilla and the roadway corridor is maintained and owned by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT). All four agencies have been key stakeholders in the planning process. In addition, the funding is being provided through planning funds distributed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); therefore, the project development process will follow the NMDOT Location Study Procedures (2000).

#### PURPOSE AND NEED Β.

The purpose and need for the University Avenue Corridor Study is based on physical deficiencies, safety concerns, lack of bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and potential for economic development. The Purpose of the project is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Avenue between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

The existing roadway is a 2-lane road with no shoulders and no pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The road is located within an area that is predominantly residential and provides access to an existing middle school. The existing road does not contain curb & gutter so storm water runoff flows off the existing roadway into adjacent ditches or properties. The existing pavement is in fair condition but is showing signs of deterioration. Along with physical deficiencies, there are also safety concerns based on the potential for pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular interaction and conflict due to the lack of adequate multi-modal facilities.

This corridor also provides connectivity between the Town of Mesilla, the Las Cruces Convention Center, and the NMSU campus. Installing multi-modal facilities could enhance the potential economic development opportunities for the community. This initiative also complies with the regional plans for completing a city-wide bicycle loop.

#### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT C.

In compliance with the NMDOT Location Study Procedures, a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was prepared for the project. As defined in the PIP, there were 2 public meetings held during Phase A to present and discuss proposed alternatives. In addition, there have been two Project Team meetings to discuss issues and develop alternatives.

# D. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

In response to the project purpose and need, along with stakeholder and public input, six separate initial typical sections were evaluated for the initial alternatives analysis:

- Typical Section A: 38-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / curb and gutter.
- Typical Section B: 43-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 10-foot multi-use on one side /curb and gutter.
- Typical Section C: 50.5-foot ROW / 2-foot driving lanes / 6-foot sidewalk / 10-foot multi-use trail / curb and gutter.
- Typical Section D: 46- foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / 6-foot sidewalk on one side / curb and gutter
- Typical Section E: 48-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lane on one side / 10-foot multi-use trail on one side / curb and gutter.
- Typical Section F: side / curb and gutter.

Throughout project development and as a result of continued input from stakeholders and the public, an additional alternative (below) was developed. This alternative also meets the purpose and need of the project.

 Typical Section G: 44-foot ROW / 11 to 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / 4 to 6-foot sidewalks on both sides /curb and gutter.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS Ε.

At the conclusion of the University Avenue Corridor Study - Phase A, the recommendation is to carry two alternatives forward for further evaluation, as well as further consideration of multi-use trails on EBID facilities. The two recommended typical sections provide the needed bicycle and pedestrian facilities but also allow for flexibility in ROW availability. Typical Section F was part of the original set of alternatives considered, and requires approximately 60.5 feet of ROW.

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

60.5-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 6-foot sidewalk on one side / 10-foot multi-use trail on one

It includes 2-driving lanes, in-road bicycle lanes, curb and gutter, and pedestrian facilities on both sides. Pedestrian facilities include a sidewalk on the north side and a multi-use path on the south side.



**University Avenue** 

Given the ROW limitations within the majority of the corridor, Typical Section G was also developed and considered as a baseline for the entire corridor. It includes 2-driving lanes, in-road bicycle lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks on both sides. The minimal ROW need of 44 feet makes Typical Section G feasible in almost all locations, although there may need to be minimal ROW/easement acquisition from EBID east of McDowell and from private property owners west of Zia Middle School.

Typical Section G is favored by stakeholders for most of the corridor. Then, in some locations where ROW (or easements) may be acquired from the Elephant Butte Irrigation District there is an opportunity to expand the typical section to look more like Typical Section F with a multi-use path on the south side.

It is recommended that both Typical Section F and G, as well as the multi-use trails and no-build alternative be further evaluated in the next phase of project development.

# II. INTRODUCTION

# A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

# 1. PROJECT HISTORY

The University Avenue Corridor Study – Phase A is being led by the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO). However, the project corridor crosses through both the jurisdiction of the City of Las Cruces and the Town of Mesilla and the roadway corridor is maintained and owned by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT). All four agencies have been key stakeholders in the planning process. In addition, the funding is being provided through planning funds distributed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); therefore, the project development process will follow the NMDOT Location Study Procedures (2000).

This corridor has been studied in the late 1990s by the NMDOT. The lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities has been a concern for the past 15 years due to the location of Zia Middle School and the daily access by students. There were no recommendations or designs completed in the past. Therefore, the 2015 planning funds were allocated to develop a set of alternatives to be studied along the University Avenue Corridor.

# 2. STUDY AREA

The study area along University Avenue is located between Main Street in the City of Las Cruces on the eastern end and Avenida de Mesilla (NM 28) in the Town of Mesilla on the western end. (Figure 1). This section of University Avenue provides local access to Zia Middle School and a variety of residential neighborhoods. University Avenue also connects the Town of Mesilla and the university area, southeast Las Cruces, and I-10. Outside of the study area University Avenue extends east to I-25, and then transitions into Dripping Springs Road. The western end of the study area is the western terminus of University Avenue, regionally.

# B. PURPOSE AND NEED

# 1. PHYSICAL DEFICIENCIES AND SAFETY:

Physical deficiencies along the roadway are evidenced by unimproved shoulders and lack of pedestrian/bicycle facilities. This lack of multi-modal facilities results in potential conflict between vehicular and non-vehicular movements causing safety concerns along the study corridor.

# **Bohannan A Huston**

#### TRAFFIC DEMAND AND CAPACITY: 2.

The need for increased vehicular capacity has not been established along the study corridor, and the recommended improvements are not expected to provide additional travel lanes.

#### 3. SYSTEM CONNECTIVITY:

The installation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on University Avenue is rated high on the MVMPO's list of unfunded projects due to its location on the Tier-1 Trail Priority Plan. University Avenue is also identified in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan as a high-priority east/west link for the city's bicycle facilities. Therefore, the completion of the project would improve system connectivity for multimodal facilities on a local and regional basis.



**Bicycling along University Avenue** 

#### 4. ACCESS:

There are currently no bicycle or pedestrian facilities within the study limits. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities will be included in the recommended alternative, improving access to Zia Middle School and local neighborhoods. It will also provide more multi-modal options for access between the Town of Mesilla and the university area including the Convention Center.

#### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** 5.

The proposed improvements are expected to indirectly improve the economic development opportunities for the Town of Mesilla and the City of Las Cruces by enhancing the city-wide bike loop and improving the connection to Mesilla from the university area and the Convention Center.

#### LEGISLATIVE MANDATE: 6.

Although there is federal funding identified, there is no legislative mandate associated with this Study.

#### C. FUNDING

The funding for this project is being provided through planning funds distributed by the FHWA and administered by the MVMPO. At this time the study is only funded for planning purposes. There has been no design or construction funds identified.

#### AGENCY AND STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION D.

Given the multi-jurisdictional nature of this corridor, a Project Team was established from the beginning. This Project Team includes representatives from the MVMPO, City of Las Cruces, NMDOT, Town of Mesilla, Elephant Butte Irrigation District (EBID), and the Las Cruces School District. There have been two Project Team meetings which helped establish the need and purpose for the project and develop a set of recommended alternatives.

#### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT Ε.

In compliance with the NMDOT Location Study Procedures, a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was prepared for the project. As defined in the PIP, there were 2 public meetings held during Phase A to present and discuss proposed alternatives.

# Bohannan **A** Huston



P:\20150434\TRANS\Study\Analysis\GIS\ReportFigures\Figure1-StudyArea.mxd Author: gmaynard



# University Avenue Corridor Study

# Study Area Figure 1



0	600	1,200
		Feet



### III. EXISTING CORRIDOR CONDITIONS

### A. CORRIDOR CONDITIONS

A summary of Corridor conditions that are included within the study limits are listed below (Figure 1):

- o Residential development exists to the north and south of the corridor.
- The Elephant Butte Irrigation District (EBID) ditch facility is located along southern portions of the corridor with one crossing location near the western end.
- Other than an existing sidewalk on the north side, near the western end, there are no pedestrian/bicycle facilities.
- o There is a current transit stop located between Teresita Street and Boldt Street.
- There are approximately 12 local road intersections and approximately two existing driveways along the study corridor.

### 1. TYPICAL SECTIONS

Within the study area, University Avenue is a 2-lane road with one 12-ft driving lane in each direction. The roadway includes an unimproved shoulder along the entire corridor. In front of Zia Middle School, the typical section expands to include a turn lane of approximately 600 feet. The turn lane provides access to both Zia Middle School and McDowell Road. There is a crosswalk just east of McDowell Road with no clear connections for pedestrian/bicyclists in the east/west direction on either side of University Avenue. There is a sidewalk, on a portion of the corridor, along the north side of University Avenue which begins just east of Boldt Street and continues to the end of the study area at Avenida de Mesilla.

### 2. SIGNAGE AND STRIPING

The existing signage appears to be in decent shape. Signs are up-to-date and appear to be fairly new and placed in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Existing school flashers and school signs are located on both sides of Zia Middle school. University Avenue has posted speed of 35 miles per hour (mph) heading eastbound and westbound prior to the school. Striping is also in accordance with MUTCD but is currently in poor condition.

### B. ADJACENT LAND USE

University Avenue corridor crosses through both the jurisdiction of the City of Las Cruces and Town of Mesilla; therefore, the adjacent land is regulated under each jurisdiction respectively.

In addition to the Zia Middle School, about midway along the corridor on the north side, the rest of the adjacent land use is primarily residential. There are a few vacant lots, subdivisions under development, and some remaining agricultural uses. On the eastern end – south side, the agricultural land is owned and managed by New Mexico State University.

### 1. IRRIGATION DITCHES

There are multiple irrigation ditches adjacent to the roadway corridor. They are a combination of facilities owned/managed by Elephant Butte Irrigation District (EBID) system, and private land owners (Figure 2). The EBID facility primarily runs along the southern edge of the corridor and includes an open irrigation ditch with trees and some elevation. The EBID ROW is approximately 25-30 feet. There is one perpendicular irrigation crossing structure, owned by EBID, under the roadway corridor on the western end. There are private ditches as well with the primary one running on the north side of the corridor. Associated with all of these ditches are a variety of concrete and stone auxiliary facilities in various locations.



# **Bohannan A Huston**

# JANUARY 2016 EXISTING CONDITIONS



P:\20150434\TRANS\Study\Analysis\GIS\ReportFigures\Figure2-EBIDFacilities.mxd Author: gmaynard

# Legend

Elephant Butte Irrigation District Facilities



# C. PAVEMENT CONDITION

The existing pavement on University Blvd appears to be in generally fair condition. The existing pavement does demonstrate alligator cracking along the pavement edge in some locations. The edge of pavement does not appear to have a pavement taper.



**Pavement Conditions on University Avenue** 

# D. UTILITIES

There are various underground and above-ground utilities along University Avenue. A subsurface utility investigation and research has not yet been performed for this Study. This level of detail will be completed later in subsequent phases of project development. However, below is a summary of the known existing utilities within the University Avenue corridor. There are also various connections from the utilities within the ROW to the residences north and south of the corridor. (See Figure 3)

## 1. WATER LINES

Waterlines exist within the ROW along University Avenue from Bowman Street to McDowell Road. The waterline crosses the width of University Ave at Bowman Street as well as between Old Farm Road and Rosita Court.

# 2. OVERHEAD ELECTRIC LINES

Overhead electric lines do exist along the entire length of the Corridor. In several locations the overhead electric lines cross over University Avenue and at multiple locations result in an overhead utility corridor on both the north and south side of the roadway.

### 3. GAS LINES

There are underground natural gas lines within the ROW along University Avenue between Avenida de Mesilla and just east of Rosita Court.

### 4. SEWER LINES

There are sewer lines in some of the adjacent residential development but none in the project corridor.

# E. ACCESS

There is vehicular access for existing driveways and local roadway intersections within the study limits. Currently, there are approximately 12 local road intersections and approximately two existing driveways along corridor. There are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities along the corridor, with the exception of the one crosswalk near McDowell Road.

# F. DRAINAGE

The existing corridor does not have any formal drainage improvements today. Currently, roadway drainage runs off the edge of the roadway onto the earthen shoulders and infiltrates or exits the ROW to follow historic drainage patterns.

# G. RIGHT-OF-WAY

Right-of-way (ROW) along the Corridor is owned and maintained by the NMDOT. ROW boundaries have not been surveyed along the Corridor in order to define the exact width; however, preliminary ROW investigations were conducted including the evaluation of Doña Ana County parcel data, acquiring and evaluating existing ROW maps, and a site visit. It is the belief of the NMDOT that all ROW indicated on the on the maps has been acquired.

# **Bohannan A Huston**

Based on this information, the ROW width varies greatly along the corridor from approximately 40 feet to 108 feet; however, the majority of ROW is around 40 to 45 feet. Figure 4 indicates the areas where ROW may be needed for any of the proposed alternatives. Documents supporting this estimate are included in Appendix A.

As presented previously, adjacent to the roadway is the irrigation infrastructure within ROW managed by EBID. Ownership of the ROW is yet to be fully determined. The EBID ditch is located along the south side for a large portion of University Avenue; from Bowman Street to McDowell Road. The ROW width for this ditch varies along the corridor but is approximately 25-30 feet.



P:\20150434\TRANS\Study\Analysis\GIS\ReportFigures\Figure3-Utilities.mxd Author: gmaynard

# Legend

Overhead Electric Lines
Water Utility Lines

Gas Utility Lines

# University Avenue Corridor Study

# *Utilities* Figure 3









P:\20150434\TRANS\Study\Analysis\GIS\ReportFigures\Figure4-ROWUse.mxd Author: gmaynard



# University Avenue Corridor Study

# Right-Of-Way Figure 4







### IV. TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

### A. EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Traffic volumes and crash data were collected from the MVMPO and the NMDOT for University Avenue within the study corridor. This information was used to complete evaluations along the corridor and establish the purpose and need for the project. The existing data doesn't indicate a need for additional capacity or any existing safety issue due to vehicular infrastructure.

### 1. TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The only traffic count data which was readily available along the University Avenue Corridor is represented in Table1. Total Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes for 2014 and 2013 are shown. Counts were taken along different segments of the roadway with noticeably different results, so they are presented separately. In addition, a breakdown of automobiles and trucks is provided for each segment. The increase in trucks from Bowman to Main Street does indicates that trucks must be accessing the NMSU agricultural facility along that segment and that Bowman may be a primary route for trucks in the local area.

Table1: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)											
	AADT 2014 – University Blvd Bowman to Main	AADT 2013 – University Blvd NM 28 to Bowman									
Total Traffic	5930	4037									
Automobile	4934	3902									
Truck	996	135									

# 2. CRASH DATA

Crash data was collected from the NMDOT for years 2012 and 2013. The data is represented in Figure 5. It includes information on the quantity of accidents as well as the type of accident. Over the 2year period, there were only 10 accidents identified along the corridor. These 10 accidents include 3 at the eastern intersection with Main Street and 2 at the western intersection with Avenida de Mesilla (NM 28). Although these intersections establish the project termini, intersection improvements are not included in the scope of the corridor study. It should be noted that additional accidents may have occurred along the corridor but not reported. The slow speeds and congestion at the Zia Middle School during pick up and drop off times could result in minor accidents which may not have been reported due to the minimal vehicle damage.

# **Bohannan A Huston**



P:\20150434\TRANS\Study\Analysis\GIS\ReportFigures\Figure5-AccidentData.mxd Author: gmaynard

2042	Creak Data	2040	Creak Data
2013 ¥		2012	
7			Fixed Object
	Other		Other
æ	Other Non-Coll	æ	Other Non-Coll
	Other Object		Other Object
	, Other Vehicle		Other Vehicle
$\bigcirc$	Overturn	$\bigcirc$	Overturn
-	Parked Vehicle		Parked Vehicle
50	Pedalcyclist	50	Pedalcyclist
*	Pedestrian	*	Pedestrian
Â	Railroad Train	<u>e</u>	Railroad Train
5	Veh Other Road	5	Veh Other Road
	Corrido Accide Figu	nt D Ire 5	tudy ata
	Corrido Accide Figu	nt D Ire 5	tudy ata
	Corrido Accide Figu	nt D Ire 5	tudy ata
(	Corriao Accide Figu	nt D re 5 N S S O	<b>tudy</b> <i>ata</i> 1,200
	Corrido Accide Figu w	nt D re 5 v s	tudy ata 1,200 Feet
	Corrido Accide Figu w	nt D ire 5	tudy ata 1,200 Feet
(	Corrido Accide Figu w 60	or Si nt D ire 5	tudy ata 1,200 Feet
	Corrido Accide Figu	or Sint Dure 5	1,200

December 2015

#### ALTERNATIVES V.

#### INITIAL ROADWAY ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED Α.

At the onset of the planning process the Project Team met and discussed issues and concerns along the corridor as well as established the purpose and need. With the lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities being one of the main needs for the corridor, all alternatives include some form of bicycle/pedestrian facilities. The existing 2 driving lanes for vehicular traffic remain consistent with each proposed alternative, although the width of driving lanes may be adjusted during design due to ROW limitations. Given the drainage scenario along the corridor, some form of curb and gutter is also included under each proposed alternative. Due to the historic nature of Mesilla, the Project Team has also been sensitive to local needs and issues throughout project development.

The initial set of alternatives included 6 typical sections with a combination of different pedestrian, bicycle, and drainage facilities. Buffers are indicated in the figures associated with the typical sections considered. The buffers provide space between the back of curb and sidewalk but could be reduced due to ROW limitations or widened to provide comfort to the pedestrian user and provide a space for landscaping. There is also some flexibility in the width of driving lanes and sidewalks, as necessary with 11-foot driving lanes and 4-foot sidewalks and 5-foot bike lanes being the minimum width allowed by AASHTO.

Below is a summary of each typical, associated benefits/issues. Typicals are also represented in Figures 6-11 on the following pages.

• Typical Section A:

38-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / curb and gutter

Typical Section A is the narrowest of alternatives considered. It does provide in-road bicycle facilities but does not provide dedicated pedestrian facilities; therefore, it doesn't meet the purpose and need for the project. It was not recommended for further analysis.

Typical Section B:

43-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 10-foot multi-use on one side / curb and gutter

Typical Section B doesn't provide dedicated in-road bicycle facilities which was requested by many stakeholders as a priority. The multi-use trail does provide bicycle/pedestrian access; however, it only provides it on one side of the roadway and all users must share the same facility. This combined use for bicycles and pedestrians and the limitation of providing it along one side of the corridor was not supported by stakeholder/public input. It was not recommended for further analysis.

### Typical Section C:

Typical Section C includes pedestrian access on both sides of the corridor. It also provides a

50.5-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 6-foot sidewalk / 10-foot multi-use trail / curb and gutter separate opportunity for bicyclists and pedestrians with both a sidewalk and multi-use trail. It doesn't, however, include in-road bicycle facilities for commuter-type users. This was represented as a priority by stakeholder/public input. It was not recommended for further analysis.

Typical Section D:

46- foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / 6-foot sidewalk on one side / curb and gutter Typical Section D does include in-road bicycle facilities but only provides pedestrian access along

one side with a 6-foot sidewalk. This is limiting for this corridor given the school is the north side and the residential areas are on the south side. This land use pattern makes it difficult to establish which side would benefit from the pedestrian access the most. Therefore, this alternative was not recommended for further evaluations.

Typical Section E:

48-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lane on one side / 10-foot multi-use trail on one side curb and gutter

Typical Section E was created to provide options for bicyclists; however, with the concept of a oneway bicycle lane in the roadway was not supported by the stakeholder/public input. In addition, pedestrian access is only provided on one side of the corridor and as previously discussed this is not complementary with the land use along University Blvd. It was not recommended for further evaluations.

• Typical Section F:

60.5-foot ROW / 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / 6-foot sidewalk on one side / 10-foot multi use trail on one side / curb and gutter

Typical Section F is the widest of the alternatives. It includes all the features supported by the stakeholder/public input with in-road bicycle facilities and pedestrian access on both sides of the corridor. It is, however, too wide to fit in the current ROW available along the majority of the corridor. This alternative was recommended for further evaluations with the understanding that additional ROW would be needed to construct.

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

# **Typical Section A**



# **Typical Section B**



# Typical Section C



# **Typical Section D**



# **Typical Section E**





#### **RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES** B.

#### ROADWAY 1.

As one of the initial set of alternatives considered, Typical Section F was recommended for further analysis. However, since it requires approximately 60.5 feet of ROW and currently the corridor has ROW limitations which would prevent Typical Section F from being feasible in many locations, an additional alternative was developed to meet the purpose and need for the project. Typical Section G was developed and recommended as a baseline for the entire corridor. The minimal ROW need of 44 feet, makes this typical section feasible in almost all locations (Figure 12).

• Typical Section G:

44-foot ROW / 11 to 12-foot driving lanes / 5-foot bike lanes / 4 to 6-foot sidewalks /curb and gutter

Even with Typical Section G, it is expected that some ROW/easement acquisition will be required along the EBID facility as well as the private land west of Zia Middle School property. If ROW acquisition/easement is not possible then a narrower roadway section could be designed for a short distance. One solution for the narrower section would be to create14-foot driving lanes that would be shared with bicycles and maintain the 4-foot sidewalk on both sides of the roadway for a short distance, if necessary.

For most of the corridor, Typical Section G is presented as a minimum but provides several options for additional amenities and widened features - ROW permitting. For example, buffers are not currently included between the back of curb and sidewalk but could be added to provide comfort to the pedestrian user and provide a space for landscaping and drainage. The driving lanes and sidewalks could also be widened if desired.

There is an opportunity in a significant portion of the project to utilize the existing EBID ROW to house the pedestrian facilities on the south side of roadway. The EBID ROW provides ample width to contain both the existing irrigation facilities and a sidewalk or multi-use path. The land area needed for the recommended alternatives would not impact the current use of the EBID irrigation facility nor would it preclude any future piping of the EBID facility.

#### 2. DRAINAGE

Both Typical Section F and G include curb and gutter to address drainage issues along the corridor. However, the addition of stand-up curb to the corridor would require the addition of a storm drain system to collect and discharge runoff.

The recommended typical sections would add curb and gutter on both sides of the road, impeding the runoff from infiltrating or existing in the ROW as is does today.

As part of the storm drain system, the grade of the road would be altered to collect runoff in low spots along the road and then drain via inlets at these locations. There are opportunities throughout the corridor to discharge the storm drain system. One option would be to pipe the storm drain north and discharge into the existing EBID ditch (Park Drain). This would require additional coordination with EBID but is a feasible option for further consideration. This scenario is viable for the eastern two-thirds of the corridor. For the western third of the corridor, there is an existing ponding area along Avenida de Mesilla that would be an option if there is capacity or the storm water could be piped and connected with the storm drain system within Avenida de Mesilla. This scenario would require further coordination with the NMDOT on capacity, but this is a feasible option for further consideration. Overall, collecting the runoff in a storm drain system will remove ponding from the roadway and allow the ROW to be fully developed and utilized.

#### ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED C.

#### MULTI-USE TRAIL ALTERNATIVE 1.

Coordination with the EBID has been ongoing throughout the planning process. EBID facilities exist adjacent to the corridor and also provide multi-use trail opportunities in the near vicinity. A Multi-Use Trail Alternative is shown in Figure 13. This Figure represents a proposed alternative which utilizes the nearby EBID facilities as an alternative route for multi-modal trail use. This alternative could be paired with any of the proposed roadway alternatives. It would just add additional opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian use in the local area. EBID has agreed to consider this use along the area EBID ditches. Further coordination amongst the City of Las Cruces, Town of Mesilla, and EBID would be required to develop agreements and determine improvements necessary to develop this alternative.

#### 2. **ELEPHANT BUTTE IRRIGATION DISTRICT RIGHT-OF-WAY**

Opportunities to use the additional ROW currently utilized for the EBID ditch on the south side of the corridor was also considered by the Project Team. There is approximately 25-30 feet of ROW which includes a berm and open irrigation ditch. The possibilities of piping the EBID ditch and building a berm with natural vegetation over the top has been discussed with members of the Project Team. It was determined that although the piping of the ditch could potentially provide additional ROW for an enhanced corridor, it is not necessary to construct the two recommended alternatives. In addition, the two recommended alternatives do not preclude EBID from making improvements to the existing facility separate from the roadway project. However, continued coordination between the improvement initiatives and the associated agencies is recommended.

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

# JANUARY 2016 **ALTERNATIVES**

# Typical Section G







Author: gmaynard

800.877.5332

EBID Ditches

Proposed Multi-use Trail

Alternative

Figure 13

600

1,200

Feet

December 2015

### VI. PUBLIC AND AGENCY COORDINATION

Public involvement and agency coordination was ongoing throughout Phase A of project development. Primary activities included one Project Team meeting (as well as ongoing email coordination) and two public meetings.

The following is a summary of public involvement and agency coordination during Phase A.

#### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT A.

A Public Information Meeting was held in the Mesilla Community Center on June 18, 2015. The meeting had 10 attendees including Project Team members from the MVMPO, NMDOT, and Bohannan Huston. The meeting was an open house format with information boards available for viewing and Project Team members there to answer questions. Information boards included details on the study limits, project history, project development process, project schedule, purpose and need, existing conditions, and alternative evaluation process. There were also boards displaying the six initial alternatives under consideration. A summary of comments / questions is provided below with a copy of the entire summary included in Appendix B.

- Discussion of the alternative scenarios
- Clarification of the environmental and public involvement process
- Concern over sidewalks
- Concern regarding additional lighting on the corridor ٠
- Signage
- **ROW** issues •

A second **Public Information Meeting** was held on October 15, 2015. The meeting was held at the Mesilla Community Center and had 34 attendees including the Project Team. The meeting format included both an open house and a casual presentation. The two recommended alternatives were discussed and displayed in addition to boards with ROW information as well as project purpose and need. Renderings of the recommended alternatives were also provided to give a visual of what the corridor would look like (on following pages). A summary of comments/questions is provided below with a copy of the entire summary included in Appendix B.

- ROW questions ٠
- Concerns with noise and barriers for the adjacent houses •
- Traffic, speed, and congestion issues
- Desire for safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Questions on next steps in the process

![](_page_26_Picture_18.jpeg)

#### AGENCY COORDINATION Β.

A Kick-Off Project Team Meeting was held on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2015 at the Mesilla Community Center in Mesilla, New Mexico. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the project scope, NMDOT Location Study Procedures, identify issues, discuss alternatives to consider, and plan for the first public meeting. As previously established, the Project Team was made up of representatives from the MVMPO, City of Las Cruces, Town of Mesilla, NMDOT, EBID, and Las Cruces Public Schools, as well as Bohannan Huston, Inc. Key issues discussed at the Project Team meeting are as follows:

- Overview of the Study
- Lack of a shoulder and bicycle/ pedestrian facilities
- Economic Development •
- Roadway safety
- MPO Bicycle Safety Priorities
- Land Area Limitations
- Rural Character of the project area

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

# JANUARY 2016 **PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION**

Public Meeting – October 2015

- Circulation at the Middle School
- McDowell Road Intersection

Subsequent to the Project Team meeting ongoing coordination with the Project Team was maintained via email. This allowed continued input on alternative development.

There was an individual **Stakeholder Meeting with EBID** to discuss the potential use of EBID ROW for the proposed alternatives. This meeting took place on September 2, 2015 at the EBID facility. All meeting attendees were in agreement that it is probable that through an agreement between the EBID and the NMDOT, use of a defined amount of ROW would be allowed for the use of the proposed alternatives.

In addition to the Project Team meetings, presentations on the Study have been made to the MVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and the Policy Board throughout the planning process. Input received from these committees has been used to develop the recommendations and complete the Study. Presentations were made on the following dates with copies of the presentations included in Appendix B.

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting was held on July 21, 2015
- Technical Advisory Committee Meeting was held on September 3, 2015
- Policy Committee took place on October 14, 2015

All input received during Public Involvement Meetings and Project Team meetings have been considered throughout the planning process and was integrated into the final recommendations.

# **Bohannan A Huston**

Page |24

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

### VII. ENVIRONMENTAL

A preliminary analysis of potential environmental issues was completed for study area along the project corridor. The following documents information that was evaluated based on research and limited site visits. Documentation on these investigations are included in Appendix C. Further environmental analysis will be required prior to final design and construction but based on the analysis completed it is expected that a Categorical Exclusion could be used to complete the environmental compliance process under the National Environmental Policy Act and regulations established by FHWA and the NMDOT.

#### GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY Α.

The study area is located within the floodplain of the Rio Grande Valley and has been modified for residential development as well as agricultural use. The project is entirely within Doña Ana County and the communities of Las Cruces and Mesilla.

Las Cruces and Mesilla are in the basin and range province of New Mexico, making it a semi-arid area characterized by narrow mountain ranges separated by broad basins. The terrain is relatively flat east and west along the corridor. The natural topography in the project area has been altered to create the residential development in the area.

According to the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, seven soil mapping units cover the study area. The majority of the study area consists of Glendale and Harkey loam and clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes. The remainder of the study area is covered by Agua silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Belen clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes and Brazito very fine sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes.

#### WATER RESOURCES В.

The study area is located within the Lower Rio Grande Region which encompasses Doña Ana County. The study area is located approximately three miles from the Rio Grande. There are irrigation ditches owned/managed by the Elephant Butte Irrigation District (EBID) in the study area. The major EBID ditch travels along University Avenue on the south side from the Zia Middle School east to Bowman Street. There are other EBID facilities in the vicinity of the study area.

#### FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT 1.

Protection of floodplains is required by Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, which requires that potential impacts to floodplains be assessed to reduce the risk of flood loss, minimize impacts from flooding on human safety, and protect the natural resource value of healthy floodplains.

The project corridor has been mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Community-Panel Number 35013C0633E (Appendix C). The corridor is in zone X.

Consideration of floodplain management will be maintained throughout project design for any of the proposed build alternatives.

#### 2. SURFACE WATER

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to prohibit or regulate, through a permitting process, discharge of dredged or fill material in waters of the U.S. Field surveys have not been completed during Phase A, but waters of the US do not exist within or cross the roadway corridor.

#### GROUNDWATER 3.

Groundwater within the project area is generally ranges from approximately 10 (near the Rio Grande) to 300 feet or more (closer to Las Cruces) below the land surface.

#### WETLANDS 4.

Sections 404 of the Clean Water Act regulates discharge of dredge and fill material into wetlands considered jurisdictional by the USACE. In addition, Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, requires federal agencies to avoid, whenever possible, adversely impacting wetlands. Wetlands are areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and, under normal circumstances, do support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.

Field surveys have not been completed but wetlands are not expected within the corridor.

#### VEGETATION C.

Historic natural vegetation communities in the project corridor included Chihuahua ecoregion, which is dry and has vegetation such as Creosote Bush (Larrea tridentata), Soaptree (Yucca elata), Tarbush (Flourensia cernua), Broom Dalea (Psorothamnus scoparius), and various desert grasses such as Tobosa (Hilaria mutica or Pleuraphis mutica) and Black Grama (Bouteloua eriopoda). The Rio Grande flows through the region and supplies irrigation water to the agricultural activities happening in the area. Current land use is primarily urban, which has converted much of the native vegetation in the corridor to residential development. Biological field surveys will be completed prior to construction but little or no impact are expected to vegetation as a result of the recommended alternatives.

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston

### D. WILDLIFE

Due to the urban composition of the project corridor, wildlife habitat and distribution is limited. The presence of water and tree cover near the study area provides habitat for a variety of species.

Common bird species include: Bald Eagle, Bell's Vireo, Bendire's Thrasher, Black-chinned Sparrow, Brewer's Sparrow, Burrowing Owl, Cassin's Sparrow, Chestnut-collared Longspur, Golden Eagle, Gray Vireo, Lark Bunting, Loggerhead Shrike, Lucy's Warbler, Mccown's Longspur, Painted Bunting, Sonoran Yellow Warbler and Swainson's Hawk. Trees provide potential nesting sites for migratory birds. Common mammals likely to inhabit the general area include: coyote, desert cottontail, raccoon, black-tailed jackrabbit, and striped skunk.

Field surveys will be completed prior to construction but little or no impact to wildlife are expected as a result of the recommended alternatives.

### 1. THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 regulates the protection of endangered, threatened, and proposed species and their critical habitats. In addition, the State of New Mexico also lists species as endangered, threatened, and sensitive.

Evaluations of plants and wildlife protected or monitored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) indicate that five species could occur within or near the study area. No suitable habitat for other species is present. Protected or monitored birds that may pass through the study area include Least Tern, Northern Aplomado Falcon, Spraque's Pipit and the Yellow-billed Cuckoo. There is also a potential for the Sneed Pincushion Cactus to be in the study area.

A biological field survey of the corridor will be completed before construction but no impact to threatened and endangered species are expected, due to the urban setting of the study area.

### E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 1992, and applicable regulations, all federally funded or permitted undertakings must consider the direct and indirect effects of a proposed project on archaeological, cultural, and historic resources. Cultural resources are evaluated in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

A review of records from the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was performed to identify existing archeological, cultural, and historic resources within the general project vicinity. Results of the research, to date, indicate that there are no cultural resources identified that occur within the project's area.

Residential development is continuing to infill this corridor and more of the existing farmland is becoming developed into residential neighborhoods.

A more detailed investigation, including field surveys and further coordination with the SHPO, will be required in subsequent project phases to determine if some of the existing homes are potential historic properties.

However, given the developed nature of the corridor, little or no impact to cultural resources is expected as a result of the recommended alternatives.

### F. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Contamination of soils or waterways is a concern related to right-of-way acquisition and construction activity due to liability with regard to cleanup and human health issues. The only leaking underground storage tank (LUST) located near the corridor is the gas station at 2920 S NM 28 with a status of "cleanup, responsible party."

In addition, a review of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 data determined that no Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Resource Conversation and Recovery Act (RCRA) sites exist along the project corridor.

A further determination on the need for an initial site assessment (ISA) will need to be coordinated with the NMDOT Environmental Geology Department. If necessary, appropriate clean up, avoidance or mitigation measures will then be taken in accordance with the NMDOT's The Hazardous Material Assessment Handbook (2007).

Additional research and field surveys will be completed prior to construction; however, little or no impact from hazardous materials are expected from the recommended alternatives.

# G. SECTIONS 4(F)

Section 4(f) of the 1966 Department of Transportation Act included provisions that stipulated restricted use of publicly-owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and historical sites for transportation projects.

A potential Section 4(f) resource in the project corridor is the Fabian Garcia Botanical Garden (owned by NMSU) located on the southeast end of the corridor.

Further investigation of the potential impacts of 4(f) resources present within the study corridor will be completed during subsequent phases with respect to the recommended alternatives.

### H. PRIME FARMLAND

The project corridor crosses several major soil types that are identified in Table 2. This table also describes the characteristics of these major soil types. The study area is composed of mainly clay, loam and combinations of the two soils.

# **Bohannan A Huston**

Based on the soil properties, they are suitable for supporting traffic capacities. The study area has limitation from low soil strength and shrink-swell potential. Overall, the project area has moderately suitable soil for road development.

Table 2 – Major Soil Types that Intersect the Project Corridor									
Map Unit Name	Percentage	Soil Characteristics							
Agua silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	15.2	Well drained soils with slow runoff, moderate permeability, intermittently moist. Used for livestock grazing and irrigated cropland.							
Belen clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	13.1	Well drained soils with slow to very slow runoff and slow to very slow permeability. Relict mottles indicate drainage was restricted in the past. Used for cultivated crops and permanent pasture where irrigated.							
Brazito very fine sandy loam, thick surface, 0 to 1 percent slopes	1.9	Well to excessively well drained soils with slow surface runoff and rapid permeability. Used for livestock grazing, irrigated cropland and urban land.							
Glendale loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	13.1	Well drained soils with medium runoff and moderately slow permeability. Used for livestock grazing and irrigated cropland.							
Glendale clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	22.3	Well drained soils with medium runoff and moderately slow permeability. Used for livestock grazing and irrigated cropland.							
Harkey loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	16.8	Well drained soils with slow runoff and moderate permeability. Used for irrigated crops.							
Harkey clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	17.7	Well drained soils with slow runoff and moderate permeability. Used for irrigated crops.							

# 1. PRIME AND UNIQUE FARMLANDS

US Congressional Public Law 95-87 (Federal Register January 32, 1978: Part 657) requires the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to identify and locate prime and unique farmlands. These farmlands are protected in accordance with the Farmland Protection Act of 1981. Prime farmlands are defined as land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food and agricultural crops. Unique farmlands are land under cultivation other than prime farmland that is used for production of high value food and fiber crops.

Based on soils information reviewed from NRCS, the study area is made up of 83.2 percent farmland of statewide importance which is soil that nearly meets the requirements for prime farmlands when treated and managed correctly.

Further field surveys will be completed prior to construction, but given the developed nature of the corridor, little or no impact to soils is expected from the recommended alternatives.

# I. VISUAL RESOURCES

The visual landscape of the University Avenue corridor is residential in nature, with the presence of Zia Middle School near the center of the corridor and some scattered agricultural land. There are currently no street lights in the area and no landscaping. Overall, the corridor is not an important or unique visual landmark. It is expected that the recommended alternatives could improve the visual landscape along the corridor. Input will continue to be obtained from the stakeholders and public to determine any lighting or landscaping enhancements.

# J. AIR QUALITY

The Clean Air Act (NMED, 2013e; USEPA, 2013d) of 1970 established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQs) to protect public health from impacts associated with six criteria pollutants. Air quality pollutants are not expected to be increased as a result of the recommended alternatives. There will be no additional vehicular capacity. There is a potential for reduction of air quality emissions as pedestrian and bicycle facilities are proposed; however, this decrease would be impossible to quantify.

# K. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order (EO) 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations", was signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994 and published in the Federal Register on February 16, 1994. EO 12898 focuses federal attention on the environmental and human health conditions of minority and/or low-income populations, promotes non-discrimination in federal programs affecting human health and the environment, and provides minority and/or low-income populations with access to public information and an opportunity to participate in matters relating to the environment.

The demographics for Las Cruces are similar to Doña Ana County while Mesilla is more distinctive. Doña Ana County and Las Cruces both have a median age of 32.4 years versus 42.9 for Mesilla. In terms of the younger population, 26.7 percent of Doña Ana County residents are under the age of 18 compared with 24.3 percent of Las Cruces residents and 14.6 percent of Mesilla residents.

# **Bohannan A Huston**

The older population is 12.4 percent over 64 in Doña Ana County, 13.6 percent over 64 in Las Cruces, and 24.1 percent over 64 in Mesilla. Homeownership rate is high in Mesilla with 73.1 percent of the town's population living in owner-occupied units. However, homeownership rate is moderate in Las Cruces with 56.3 percent and in Doña Ana County with 64.2 percent of the population living in owner-occupied units. A large proportion of Doña Ana County population is Hispanic/Latino (65.7), while Las Cruces is 56.8 percent and Mesilla is 48.2 percent.

Given the nature of recommended alternatives which include the addition of pedestrian/bicycle facilities, is not expected that proposed improvements would affect a disproportionate population of minority or low-income groups. Additional analysis of potential environmental justice issues will occur during subsequent phases; however, based on the initial review, recommended alternatives are expected to comply with EO 12898.

## L. NOISE

Noise impacts occur when future traffic noise levels resulting from a project approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria. Under federal (23 CFR 772) and state (CP 86, 2002 and AD 236, 2002) policy, a noise study would analyze potential project-related noise impacts at existing and proposed land-use activities, and evaluate mitigation if impacts are expected to occur.

The recommended alternatives do not include infrastructure improvements which would increase capacity; therefore, under NMDOT AD 236 a noise study is not expected to be required for the recommended alternatives along University Avenue.

## M. LAND USE

Land along the University Avenue corridor is under the administration of both the City of Las Cruces and the Town of Mesilla. The roadway corridor is under management of the NMDOT.

About halfway between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla is Zia Middle School, adjacent to the road on the north side. The rest of the land uses along University Avenue, within the corridor, are primarily residential neighborhoods with some agricultural use. On the eastern end, the agricultural land is owned and managed by New Mexico State University (Fabian Garcia Botanical Garden).

There are multiple irrigation ditches adjacent to the roadway corridor. They are a combination of facilities owned/managed by Elephant Butte Irrigation District (EBID) system, and private land owners. There is one perpendicular irrigation crossing structures under the road near the western end of the corridor.

Coordination with private land owners, the school district, and the EBID will be ongoing throughout project development; however, there are little or no impacts to adjacent land use as a result of the recommended alternatives.

# N. COMMUNITY COHESION

The study limits are located within two communities and this corridor is a primary travel corridor between Las Cruces and Mesilla. Any enhancements to this corridor that fit within the context of the area will create lasting value for both communities.

# O. MULTI-MODAL ACCESS

Multimodal transportation within the corridor is lacking. The purpose and need of the Study includes the addition of pedestrian/bicycle facilities. Currently there are no designated bicycle/pedestrian facilities along the corridor. Below is a summary of existing multi-modal access within the study corridor. *Transit:* There is public transit service along this corridor with one daily route and one

*Transit:* There is public transit service alo designated bus stop on the western end.

**Pedestrian:** There are limited pedestrian facilities along the corridor; however, there are numerous pedestrians during school drop-off and pick-up times. There is one section of sidewalk along the north side of the corridor near Avenida de Mesilla. It fronts the neighborhood along the western section of the corridor.

**Bicycle:** This area is commonly used for bicycling; however, there are no facilities other than riding in the travel lane. This corridor is identified on the MVMPO City-wide bicycle loop, and bicycle improvements would provide a strong east/west connection between Las Cruces and Mesilla.

# P. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

This project promotes a connection to the City-wide bike loop that is currently under development. The area also serves as a potential gateway corridor to Mesilla from the convention center with a 1.5 mile walk/bicycle ride. It also connects the local neighborhoods to the new businesses developing at the South end of Mesilla.

An improved corridor which provides a gateway for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians between Las Cruces and Mesilla could promote economic development and benefit both communities. The opportunity to capitalize on bicycle tourism can be another economics benefit.

# **Bohannan A Huston**

# JANUARY 2016 ENVIRONMENTAL

### **VIII. CONCLUSIONS**

The purpose and need for the University Avenue Corridor Study is based on physical deficiencies, safety concerns, lack of bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and potential for economic development. The Purpose of the project is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Avenue between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

At the conclusion of the University Avenue Corridor Study - Phase A, it is recommended that both Typical Section F and G, as well as the no-build alternative, be further evaluated in the next phase of project development.

The two recommended typical sections were presented in this report, and include 2 driving lanes, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and drainage infrastructure. Both alternatives meet the purpose and need for the project and respond to stakeholder/public comment. Right-of-way requirements for the recommended alternatives vary between 44 feet and 60.5 feet. Including both alternatives in the recommendation allows for flexibility and opportunity along the corridor as ROW issues are addressed further along in the project development process. During the design phase, all proposed designs for the bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be developed in conjunction with the City of Las Cruces Traffic Engineer to ensure the most current and acceptable infrastructure. In addition to the two typical sections for the roadway corridor, it is recommended that the multi-use alternative along EBID facilities in the area be further considered as well.

Preliminary environmental investigations to date do not identify a fatal flaw for the proposed improvements, although additional environmental investigations will be required prior to final design and construction. It was also concluded that the recommended alternatives do not conflict with the current plans presented by EBID to improve the ditch facility along the south side of University Avenue.

Given the multi-agency component of this corridor, it is recommended that the Project Team remain engaged and that coordination continue on issues such as ROW, jurisdiction, and funding acquisition.

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

**School Pick-up Time** 

# Bohannan 🛦 Huston
### IX. REFERENCES

Bureau of Business and Economic Research. 2012. *Project Annual Population Growth Rates, New Mexico Counties, 2010-2040.* Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of New Mexico. Website: <u>http://bber.unm.edu/demo/table2.htm</u>.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013. *Web Soil Survey.* Washington, DC: Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web site viewed on August 12, 2013:

http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm.

New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources. 2003. *Geologic Map of New Mexico*. Socorro, NM: New Mexico Institute of Technology and USGS.

New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. 1999. *New Mexico Lower Rio Grande Regional Water Plan.* Santa Fe, NM. Lower Rio Grande Water Users Organization. Website:

www.ose.state.nm.us/Planning/RWP/Regions/LowerRioGrande/ExecutiveSummary-12-2003.pdf

NMED 2013a. *State Clean Up Sites.* Santa Fe, NM: NMED Ground Water Quality Bureau. Web site: <u>http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/gwb/NMED-GWQB-RemediationOversight.htm</u>.

NMED 2013b. *Closed / Inactive Sites.* Santa Fe, NM: NMED Ground Water Quality Bureau, Remediation Oversight Section. Web site: <u>http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/gwb/NMED-GWQB-</u>

RemediationOversight.htm.

NMED. 2013c. LPST Databases. Santa Fe, NM: NMED Petroleum Tank Storage Bureau. Web site: <u>http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/ust/lists.html</u>.

NMED. 2013d. *Hazardous Waste Facilities*. Santa Fe, NM: NMED Hazardous Waste Bureau. Web site: <u>http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/hwb\_facil.html</u>.

NMED. 2013e. *Nonattainment Areas in New Mexico*. Santa Fe, NM: NMED Air Quality Bureau. Website: <u>http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/aqb/modeling/na\_map.html</u>

U.S. Census Bureau. 2013. *American FactFinder, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics, 2010 Demographic Profile Data.* Suitland, MD: U.S. Census Bureau, Department of Commerce. Website: <u>http://factfinder2.census.gov</u>.

USEPA. 2013a. *Superfund Information System.* Washington, DC: USEPA. Web site: http://cfpub.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/srchsites.cfm.

USEPA. 2013b. *RCRA 2020 Clean-up Baseline*. Dallas, TX; USEPA Region 6. Web site: <u>http://www.epa.gov/wastes/hazard/correctiveaction/facility/index.htm</u> .

USEPA. 2013c. *Enforcement and Compliance History On-Line.* Washington, DC: USEPA. Web site: <u>http://www.epa-echo.gov/echo/</u>.

## **Bohannan A Huston**

**APPENDIX A – RIGHT-OF-WAY DOCUMENTATION** 

#### Subject:

#### University Boulevard Corridor Study - EBID ditch

From: Denise Weston
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 2:14 PM
To: Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT <<u>Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us</u>>
Cc: Andrew Wray (<u>awray@las-cruces.org</u>) <<u>awray@las-cruces.org</u>>; 'Tom Murphy (<u>tmurphy@las-cruces.org</u>)'
<<u>tmurphy@las-cruces.org</u>>; Zachary Libbin <<u>zlibbin@ebid-nm.org</u>>; Love, Harold A., NMDOT
<<u>Harold.Love@state.nm.us</u>>
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Study - EBID ditch

Thanks Aaron for your detailed response.

My initial answers are as follows:

1: Does additional ROW help your typical section? Yes. The use of some portion of the current EBID ROW is expected in some locations in order to fit the recommended typical section. However, the piping of the ditch would not be necessary for the recommended typical section to fit because the ROW needs are on the north edge of the EBID ROW. That said, the piping could allow for improved/wider facilities in some locations.

2. Does phasing this work make a difference to your design? No. The ditch upgrades can be made prior to the roadway project. If completed with separate funds and under a separate project, the roadway improvement project development process would just consider the culvert piping as existing conditions after they are completed. I would, however, agree with you that the removal of trees could be a potential issue with the neighbors. I am not aware of the outreach process EBID adheres to but I would recommend some coordination with those residents.

Tom – do you have any comments or concerns?

Those are my short answers but I do think a call or meeting is probably a good idea. I can set up a conference call for next week if that is helpful.

Thanks, Denise

### **Denise Weston, AICP**

Vice President

Direct line: 505.923.3321 Cell: 505.980.6065

## Bohannan 🛦 Huston

Courtyard I 7500 Jefferson St. NE Albuquerque, NM 87109-4335 www.bhinc.com voice: 505.823.1000 facsimile: 505.798.7988 toll free: 800.877.5332

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail, including attachments, may include confidential and/or proprietary information, and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this e-mail immediately.

From: Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT [mailto:Aaron.Chavarria@state.nm.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2015 1:47 PM
To: Denise Weston
Cc: Andrew Wray (awray@las-cruces.org); 'Tom Murphy (tmurphy@las-cruces.org)'; Zachary Libbin; Love, Harold A., NMDOT
Subject: RE: University Boulevard Corridor Study - EBID ditch

#### Denise,

We did meet with EBID. EBID would like to run their irrigation water through culvert pipe underground. The top of pipe could be installed as low as the top of existing roadway grade. EBID would like NMDOT to take the lead in installing this culvert pipe. They would also allow NMDOT the use of this ROW for a path. They are willing to provide the materials and also put some money on the table (amount has not been determined yet). EBID would like to get this project rolling as soon as possible. We would like Mesilla to take the lead and call it phase I.

We wanted to take some time to discuss this with you and see how this would fit into your proposed typical. I know we are tight on ROW and if the use of EBID ROW fits well with your intentions then we can look at it more closely. There may be some utilities that get affected. I believe that the trees will become an environmental issue because we will have to remove them or at least some of them. This will expose some of the backyards that currently use these trees as a privacy barrier, not sure if noise will be a factor. I am not sure about putting trees near the pipe because their roots cause damage. A minimum of 18" of pipe backfill would be required plus additional material depending on final surface. EBID has 30 feet of ROW. I see no issue with building a berm. EBID will enter into an agreement for the use of their ROW.

Question 1: Does this additional ROW help your typical section? Question 2: Does phasing this work make a difference to your design?

Thank you,

Aaron Chavarria, P.E. Technical Support Engineer – D1 2912 E. Pine St. Deming, NM 88030 Office 575-544-6575 Cell 575-640-6804

From: Denise Weston [mailto:dweston@bhinc.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2015 8:02 PM
To: Andrew Wray (awray@las-cruces.org); 'Tom Murphy (tmurphy@las-cruces.org)'; Zachary Libbin; Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Study - EBID ditch

Andrew Wray explained that there was a meeting last week on the University Boulevard Corridor Study and how the proposed improvements relate to the piping of the EBID facility on the south side of the roadway. Previously we discussed the potential of relocating the EBID pipe to the north side of the roadway. Well, after some analysis it was determined that there were a few engineering complications making all the needed connections to existing users, concerns with the location and transfer of right-of-way, and conflicts with an increased number of driveways and/or roadways on the north. Ultimately, it was determined that the benefits would not be worth the effort. It has been

Hi –

determined that the placement of the recommended typical section could occur with the covering of the ditch on the south side of the corridor. The pedestrian facilities would be a sidewalk at the least with some expansion of that in locations where there is available right-of-way.

There is some concern regarding the need to remove all vegetation when the ditch is piped? Is it possible to salvage any of the trees? Could we design a berm over the top of the pipe with some native vegetation to maintain the natural barrier between the backyards and the trail / roadway corridor?

If you have additional questions, please let me know.

Thanks, Denise

**Denise Weston, AICP** 

Vice President

Direct line: 505.923.3321 Cell: 505.980.6065

## **Bohannan Huston**

Courtyard I 7500 Jefferson St. NE Albuquerque, NM 87109-4335 www.bhinc.com voice: 505.823.1000 facsimile: 505.798.7988 toll free: 800.877.5332

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail, including attachments, may include confidential and/or proprietary information, and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this e-mail immediately.



X



X





## PARCEL BLOCK

### PARCELS

	PARCEL NUMBER	OWNER	AREA C acres	F TAKE sq. ft.	AREA REMAINDER	LARGER PARCEL ACRES
	2—1	HAHN, EUGENE / SNYDER, DARLENE	0.4570	19906	20.3840	20.841
	2-2	BASH, DALLAS	0.0167	729	0.2974	0.3141
	2-3	GALLAGHER, B. JACK	0.0132	573	0.2483	0.2615
	2-4	MESILLA FARMS HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION	0.0107	788	0.8709	0.8890
	3–1	WRIGHT, BEN & JANET	0.0072	503	0.2693	0.2808
	3-2	HARRIS, KENNETH	0.0117	512	0.3333	0.3451
(REVISEDCTO A CME)	-3-3-	ARROWOOD, ROY & PATRICIA	0.0169	-735	<del>1.984</del> 1	-2:001-
	3-4	ESTRADA, YVETTE	0.0073	317	0.2427	0.250
	3–5	PRICHARD, JAMES T.	0.0210	915	5.3240	5.345
•	3–6	POLONER, BONNIE D.	0.0103	450	0.7707	0.781
	4—1	LAS CRUCES SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2	0.7313	31856	14.7525	15.490
	5-1	WUNSCH, ET. AL.	0.1354	5897	11.3799	11.5412
(DELETED)	-5-2	JORNADA LODGE NO. 70	-0:0226	984	<del>-3.0034</del> -	<del>-3.026</del> -
(REVISED TO A CME)	-5-3	MARTINEZ, CATHERINE M. & MONTOYA, LINDA L.	<del>.025</del> 2	<del>-10</del> 98-	<del>-0.9748</del> -	-1.000-
	6-1	RALEY, FRED & EVELYN	0.0092	402	0.9908	1.000
	-					
	7–1	RALEY, MYRTLE - SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE	0.0014	61	31.4276	31.429
	7–2	EDWARDS, GILBERT & EARLENE	0.0531	2315	6.2839	6.337
	7–3	NMSU REGENTS	0.0308	1341	>100	>100
۰.	7-4	NMSU REGENTS	0.3130	13633	>100	>100
	8–1	NMSU REGENTS/NMSHTD - SEE NOTE BELÓW	0.3782	16473	>100	>100
	8-2	NMSU REGENTS	0.5036	21936	>100	>100

## CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE EASEMENTS

		OWNER	AREA OF TAKE			LARGER PARCEL
	NOMBER			sq. n.		ACINES
	3 - CM E - 1	ARROWOOD, ROY & PATRICIA	0.0169	735	1.9841	2.001
	5-CME-1	RALEY, MYRTLE - SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE	0.0728	3709	0.2499	0.335
	5-CME-2	RALEY, FRED & EVELYN	0.0554	2414	0.9446	1.00
	5-CME-3	RALEY, MYRTLE - SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE	0.2285	9955	0.9985	1.227
	5-CME-4	RALEY, MYRTLE - SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE	0.1561	6802	38.6889	38.845
	5-CME-5	McCOWEN FARM LIMITED	1.3739	59846	81.7651	83.139
(DELETED)	5-CME-6	-MARTINEZ, CATHERINE M. 8 MONTOYA LINDAL	0252	<del>-1098-</del>		<del>-1.000 -</del>

NOTE: AREAS FOR REMAINDERS AND LARGER PARCEL AREAS WERE OBTAINED FROM INFORMATION SONTAINED IN THE DEEDS, SUBDIVISION PLATS AND OTHER RECORD DATA PARCEL 8-1 IS NMSHTD R/W OF TOLD UNIVERSITY AVENUE ALIGNMENT OCCUPIED BY NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY. A PARCEL DESCRIPTION HAS BEEN CREATED TO FACILITATE CONVERSION OF OWNERSHIP FROM NMSHTD TO NMSU.

6	REVISE NAME 5-CME+3	12-20-00	J.G.
5	DELETED PARCEL 5-CME-6	9/11/00	C.S.
4	REVISED PARCEL 5-3, CHANGE TO 5-CME-6	8/01/00	J.G.
3	REVISED PARCEL 3-3, CHANGE TO 3-CME-I	8 /01/00	J.G.
2	DELETED PARCEL 5-2	7/31/00	J.G.
1	CHANGE OWNERSHIP OF VARIOUS PACELS	3/27/00	SGB
NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY
	REVISIONS (OR CHANGE NOT	TICES)	

LEEDSHILL - HERKENHOFF, INC. 2000 ST. MICHAEL DRIVE SANTA FE, NM 87502 (505) 471-4443



FINAL MAP DATE \_\_\_\_



MARCH 10, 1999





















**APPENDIX B – PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT** 



## Sign in Sheet

## University Boulevard Project Team Kick off Meeting

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Jesús M. Morgles	EBID	cmorales@ebid-nm.org	52.6-6671 ext 424
David Nacster	C:4. FLos Cruces / Transportation	de marstas e las-crures. ors	5411-2048
NORAL. BARRAZA	Town of Mesilla	noralbarraza@comcast.net	624-3262×106
Debbie Lujan	Town of Mesilla	debrale mesillanm.gov	CEII 636-7553 524-3262 x 103
LARRY SHANNON	TOWN OF MESILLA	LARRYS @ MESILLANM. COV	524 - 3262 × 104
Ashleigh Curry	Safe Routes to School	acurry @ leps. k12.nm.us	202-1317
Todd Gregory	LCPS	tgregory@lcps.k12, nm, ms	5756355130
JOLENE HERIZERA	NMDGT	jolenem. herrera@state. nm.us	(575) 525-7358
Andrew Wray	MVMPO	awayelas-cruces.org	(575) 528-3070
Garon Chavarria	NMDOT	davon chavarrice state nm. vs	575-3744-6575
Louis Grije Va	City of Las Cruces	LHGe Las-Cruces. org	(575) 528.3479
Loretta M Reyes	Coty of Las Cruces	lreyes & las-concessory	(575) 528-3125
Kommela Espinoza	city of les Cruces	Kespinora @ Las-couces.ong	(575) 541. 2505 /541. 2598
Chris Mangusing	Town of Messills	marshal@ warsillanm. sou	(575) 649-4343
Dane Kennon	LCPS	dkennen @lcp1. K12.hs. us	5

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Mesilla Valley MPO

Project Team Kick-Off Meeting Summary

## April 22, 2015

Present:Sign-in Sheet AttachedSummary Created by:Denise Weston, BHI

### 1. Introductions

- **a.** After a welcome by Tom Murphy (Project Manager) the project team introduced themselves.
- **b.** Denise Weston led the meeting with a summary of topics and issues discussed provided in summary below.

### 2. Study Overview

- a. The study area was defined University Boulevard Corridor from Main Street in Las Cruces to Avenida de Mesilla in Mesilla
- b. The project is being completed with FHWA planning funds so the NMDOT Location Study Procedures are being followed.

### 3. NMDOT Location Study Procedures

- a. Phase A Initial Evaluation of Alternatives is the expected product. This will result in 1-3 conceptual alternatives for further evaluation.
- b. Purpose and Need are based on the following:
  - i. Safety
    - Crash data was reviewed at the meeting. Maps were provided to identify the total and type of crashes. Further evaluation into the crash data will be done and documented in the report.
    - 2. A formal safety audit will not be completed but one may be recommended so that funding sources can be sought in the future.
  - ii. Physical Deficiencies identified along the corridor include:
    - 1. No shoulder
    - 2. No bicycle/pedestrian facilities
    - 3. Not enough parking
  - iii. Economic Development can be identified as a need due to the potential connection with the City-wide bike loop, potential gateway corridor to Mesilla from Convention Center (1.5 mile walk), and opportunities to walk to the new businesses developing at the south end of Mesilla (i.e. Brewery).

### 4. Issues identified

- a. Safety has been identified as the most important issue along the corridor.
  - Although the crash data doesn't show a significant number of crashes along the corridor – it will be further evaluated for any patterns or connections with physical deficiencies including the need for lighting.
  - ii. The greatest problem identified was the combination of bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles during school pick-up and drop-off. The roadway width and typical sections do not allow for adequate separation of uses. This is a problem on University Blvd as well as McDowell and Bowman (the connecting streets).
    - 1. Kids don't walk to school because there is no safe route
    - 2. Parked cars cause visibility constraints making it unsafe
    - 3. Lack of shoulders limits bicycle use along the corridor
- b. Bicycle facilities are needed for the school kids as well as the local cyclists.
  - i. This route is identified on the Long-range plan for bicycle facilities Tier 1 proposed
  - ii. There is a direct connection with economic development opportunities and bicycle facilities -both Las Cruces and Town of Mesilla are interested in capitalizing on this with new bicycle facilities proposed on this corridor.
  - Suggestions from the Project Team include: Bicycle facilities for school kids should be separate (i.e. Multi –use path) but bicycle facilities for cyclists should be adjacent to the roadway (i.e. shoulder bike lanes).
  - iv. MPO may initiate bicycle/pedestrian counts along the corridor.
- c. The corridor is limited by adjacent land use including **EBID Laterals** and private ditches.
  - ROW width is not yet determined. A map was provided with estimates based on parcel data. It clearly varies from 45 feet on the west end to 115 feet on the east end.
  - ii. EBID laterals are adjacent to a portion of the corridor –with one crossing located at the west end of the corridor. Mr. Morales with the EBID stated that EBID would be amendable to the covering of the laterals for trail use, if desired. There would need to be coordination on the effort, with restrictions on design and landscaping but that EBID would consider it. EBID would prefer a hard surface and restrict deep-root plantings. The comparison was made with the recent project completed along NM 292 resulting in a covered lateral for a multi-use path.
  - iii. The City expressed concern because in the past it has been difficult to modify the laterals due to their historic nature. This is true and would

require comprehensive planning and associated documentation and funding to complete –but not a fatal flaw.

- d. **Character** of the corridor was discussed. It currently feels like a rural corridor with some residential and agricultural lands.
  - i. Mayor of Mesilla stated that only the west end is in the historic district and would need to comply with the requirements associated with that.
  - ii. There is an interest in creating a sort of gateway connection from Las Cruces to Mesilla along this corridor.
  - iii. There was some discussion on lighting the Mayor said she had some requests for lighting. This could change the feel of the corridor so it was suggested that it be decorative lighting like on Avenida de Mesilla. The NMDOT / City said they would be okay with as long as there was a maintenance agreement with the Town of Mesilla. Anything proposed would comply with the Night Sky Protection Act.
- e. Circulation at **Zia Middle School** was discussed in depth. This has been defined as the cause of the main safety/congestion issue on the corridor. The issues were identified as not enough parking, lack of defined pathways or facilities for bicycle/pedestrian traffic from the nearby homes or from the cars parked to drop-off/pick-up.
  - i. Zia leadership is working on a plan to increase/modify the drop-off/Pickup lane so that it circles around the school - providing more space to get cars off of University Boulevard.
  - ii. It was explained that there will still be an issue with the turning movements in/ out of the school facility.
  - iii. Zia currently has a crossing guard on University Boulevard
  - iv. There has been consideration of an alternative drop-off/pick-up zone.The vacant lot on the west end was discussed as it is being developed as a church. With good pedestrian access it could potentially work well.
  - v. And, pedestrian/bicycle facilities near the school will still be needed!
  - vi. Anything the school does will be value added to the recommendations provided under the Corridor Study but close coordination will continue throughout the planning process.
- f. **McDowell Road** Town of Mesilla has put a project on the TIP to address this intersection. Coordination will continue to make sure proposed improvements are considered in recommendations.
- 5. Other

- a. Raylee Farms property east of Zia middle school and on the north side of University is potentially for sale and may transfer from farm land to residential in the future.
- b. Corner lot on the west end is going to be the home of a church in the near future.
- c. Need to understand the current expected and required use of the private ditches

### 6. Next steps

- a. Continue collecting existing conditions data
- b. Create several proposed alternatives
  - i. Will share with the project team prior to public meeting via email
  - ii. Will present alternatives at the public meeting
- c. Schedule public meeting end of  $May/1^{st}$  of June
  - i. coordinate with Debra Lujan on facility









## **University Boulevard Corridor Study Public Information Meeting**

June 18, 2015

## Sign In Sheet

	(Please Print)			
	Last Name	First Name	Email	Ph
1	BARRAZA	Nora L.	novalbarraza@comcast.net	
2	FLores	Linda	lovist flores - aul. con	Ĉ
3	Num	Djn	docminally @coment.ne	Ł
4	HERRERA	JOLENE	Jolenen. herrena@state.nm.us	S
5	Mc ADA MS	MichAec	Masilla Valley MPO	5
6	LOVE	HAROLD	Harold, love @ state.nm, us	(
7	Hauston	Judy	uduk houston	3
8	Davidson	Maggi	maggidavidson@comcast.net	S
9	Davidson	Bill	wsdavidson@comcast.net	
10	TOOMEY	Dow	Flyach ting @ yahoo.com	



one 524-3262 × 106 on file 575-525-7358 575-528-3047 575-544-6897 575 640-575-523-0360 Ű. V (L 575-621.9850

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Comments

MA people in aftendance at the Conjuntion Center at NMS/1 @ would walk to Mesilla Town Square

Making marked cross walks for walkers to cross treet safely when multi use trail changes sides shouldn't be a problem

the church property wants hurch on corner of University + Aver here would their entrancessex

Please contact Denise Weston 7500 Jefferson St. NE Albuquerque, NM 87109 (505)923-3321 dweston@bhinc.com

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Comments

Mesilla to Bowman. : t Vay a d ſ South 5: Mesi No Cx Place no stoppin leresi ta Please contact Denise Weston

Please contact Denise Weston 7500 Jefferson St. NE Albuquerque, NM 87109 (505)923-3321 dweston@bhinc.com

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Comments

LEAVE	SIPE walks	Ar	AGENTETA	PE	Massille
		an de sus de la companya de la comp			
	·				
2-11-11-11-11-11-1-1-1					
	Please conto 7500 Jefferson St. NE (505)	Ict Denise Albuque 923-3321	e Weston erque, NM 87109		

## University Boulevard Corridor Study

## **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of the University Boulevard Corridor Study is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Boulevard between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

The **NEED** is based on the following:

 Safety concerns due to potential pedestrian / bicycle / vehicular conflicts

- Physical deficiencies due to lack of shoulders, pedestrian facilities, and bicycle facilities
- Potential for economic development opportunities as a result of completing the City-wide bicycle loop route





# Corridor Issues

# o Urban/ Rural Character

# O Safety

# **O** Bicycle Facilities

# **O** Pedestrian Facilities

## O Roadway Shoulder

# O Circulation at Zia Middle School

# O ROW Width

# O EBID Laterals

## O Parking

## O Gateway to Mesilla

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Conceptual Alternatives for Corridor







\*Typicals can be modified to include center turn-lane if applied in front of Zia Middle School

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Conceptual Alternatives for Corridor



6′ buffer	12' driving lane	12' driving lane	5     buf	' 10' fer   multi-use trail
curb gutte	မ er	50.5'	curb & gutter	



\*Typicals can be modified to include center turn-lane if applied in front of Zia Middle School

## University Boulevard Corridor Study Conceptual Alternatives for Corridor







\*Typicals can be modified to include center turn-lane if applied in front of Zia Middle School

## **University Boulevard Corridor Study** Conceptual Alternatives for Multi-Use Routes









18 Silla

University Boulevard Corridor Study Public Information Meeting

October 15, 2015

Sign In Sheet

(Please Print)		
Last Name	First Name	Email
SIMONIN	ANTHONY	JIM . SIMONIN@ GMAIL. COM
KEGEL	DAUID	· · ·
WILSON	DONALO	dwilson 0384 cameil .com
MYERS	CLARK	clark@kewarchitects.com
Wick	Michgel	boltofwick@hotmail-com
Armstrong	Shuler Mike	Shirmike7@MSh, Cary
CURRY	Ashleigh	acury elops. K12.nm.us
Church	Robert	xbchurch@comcost.net
Ellis	Liz + Michael	lizbethellise compast. net
RANKIN Rebby J.	Babby	bobbymargierankin Dusn.com





Phone
575-575-8197
575-647-4298
575.526.5886(#)
575-922-4590
575-202-1317
575-526-9774
575-64523-5384
575-524-2044






MESILLA

**University Boulevard Corridor Study Public Information Meeting** 

October 15, 2015

Sign In Sheet

(Please Print)			
Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone
Jeanette Sadler	Searette	bob. jeanette, sadler@gmail. com	
EDINGTON	EUERETT	guldingten	527 0535
CANUP	TERRY	terry comp O Compart. NET	636-5982
(Maggi+Bill) Davidson	Bill	you have this already -	
Albert + Dawn Stephens		0	
Kingen	Heather	hkingen@lcps. KIZ.nm.US	527-9475
Zimmerman	Doug	blubuff-1@Gmast.net	575-556-9009
Guerrero	Cecilia	Ceguerre Qamsu. edu	(575) 644-0386
TZochelle	Gabrel	gabrielcroch@ad.com	323 1038
Catherine Martinez		cathmart 73@yahoo, com	575-202-9463
Charbon	Marvid	marvid@pniofnewmex.co.com	642-6844
MiEllcAppars	MUMPO	MMCADANSa/AS -CRUES.US.	1-
	, 		











MESilla

**University Boulevard Corridor Study Public Information Meeting** 

October 15, 2015

Sign In Sheet

(Please Print)			
Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone
Weaver	Rom & Boh	RDW 2875 C. I Mail the com	
BRYDON	Janet	jbrydon @ comcast. net	
Noonchester	Miker Ann	michael. 1. noonchester @ gmail. com	
Howie	Stephen	Showie @ epid-NM. ORg	
Nose	El	equotie totace.com	
Pearson	Geore	george & nm bikeed.org	
NELSOX	LEONArd	lendor @ Comenst. net	
Montoya	Linda	LLMONTOYA@mac.com	





Federal Highway Administration Mesilla University Boulevard Corridor Study DP çity of Las Cruces. Comments October 15, 2015 SAVIE e Térré E. Com amai Mesilla Valley MPO is completing a corridor study on proposed multi-modal enhancements along University I 7500 Jefferson St. NE Albuquerque, NM 87109 (505)798-7843 kwoods@bhinc.com







Gethelpfrom BBLD

# University Boulevard Corridor Study Comments October 15, 2015 The under grin charges to

both Sides: (a) Bury the canalin undergroun 1. Widen Univ.on on the south sides - Luner below street level. Add walkway (sidewalk) pat a bike path on worth side as univ st. Make 3 lanes for car traffic noise + safety (25 mi/ht o e duce 2. slower +raf fic 4.

Boshy Rankein 3007 Bowman St

**City of Las Cruces** 

Mesilla

獓

City of Las Cruces







Gabe,

Please present this email to the hearing folks.

The proposed University improvement project seems to us (Bike and Chowder) as an important building block in making Las Cruces more bike friendly and attractive to active newcomers. Projects like this enhance the safety and simple enjoyment of one of our major streets. Western University Ave has become a key link in the bike route/path around the city.

Thanks,

Mike and Rosemary McKeown



獤

City of Las Cruces





# University Boulevard Corridor Study Comments October 15, 2015

50 hon as G Subryi W (omme Sim 11 Ma FLANE arrow OM



檾

City of Las Cruces





# University Boulevard Corridor Study Comments October 15, 2015

I am a 6th grader at Zia Middle School, and I would like side walks to keep me

Comment

Thank you for the presentation on 10/15/2015.

One of my first questions is how many accidents have occurred along this particular University corridor using state criteria standards for accident rates and how does the involvement breakdown as per severity, vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian? How does this rate compare with other roads in our area?

I have lived here since 1969 and while the traffic has increased in volume the greater concern seems centered around issues with Zia Middle School traffic. An interesting question is how has the student population grown over time. When my children were students at Zia Junior High School these issues didn't seem to be as great. I know there has been additions to this school, but has the student capacity increase that dramatically? One potential solution I've suggested several times is routing the traffic around the back of the school. One approach could be a one-way path with entrance via the teachers parking area on the east side of the school, a parking/pickup area on the northside or back of the school and an exit along the western boundary of the athletic field. Not having access to the topographic maps I don't know if its possible to include an extended "pickup buffer zone" on the back of the school. Additionally, is increased area available by covering the irrigation lateral on the backside of the school?

As I pointed during the meeting, during the original study many years ago, was impacted by the lack of widening ability because of the Reyes farm property and the "Historical" issues with the farm house north of University and west of Stanford St.

I like many others in attendance am against making University a four lane race track. I personally feel the largest issues surround the Zia Middle School traffic which occurs only twice each week day and even then only during the school session. Provide a reasonable economic solution to that problem and you've gone a long way toward solving the entire University corridor problems.

### Dear Ms. Woods:

The first priority for the University corridor must be the safety of Zia Middle School students. In that regard, safe pedestrian egress to the area neighborhoods from the school is essential. While in-road bike lanes on University Avenue would be desirable for adult cyclists like ourselves, they would not be preferred by parents of students cycling to school. Consequently, a multi-use path to Zia would be preferable for cycling students.

Comments made at the Mesilla open house regarding multi-use paths need to be clarified. The statement that multi-use paths are less safe than in-road bike lanes should have been made with conditions. Multi-use paths become a less safe option only when they are intersected by multiple driveways and roads. The Union Street multi-use path has many such intersections in a short space and therefore is avoided by many adult cyclists.

Therefore, given the limited right-of-way space, we would recommend sacrificing in-road bike lanes, if it would enable planners to place a sidewalk on the north side of University Avenue for the entire length of the corridor and place a multi-use path on the south side for the entire length of the corridor. (The south side has fewer intersections overall.) This, augmented by speed indicators and flashing light crossings at Zia, may offer the best solution to issues of the corridor. 1. Widen Univ on both sides: (a) Bury the Canal in underground culverts. The underground canal will be safer, cheaper to maintain and reduce waste of water. Get help from EBID. On the South sides - lumen below street level. Add a walkway (sidewalk) and put a bike path on north side of University St. make 3 lanes for car traffic. 2. Safety concerns for walkers and bikers on University. School age students using bike or sidewalks may increase if the paths or areas were established If they were to be established, it may decrease school traffic (vehicles) coming to pick up and drop off students. Satalite locationfor student pick up might be helpful to reduce the volume of school traffic; getting students through, safety still needs to be considered. As of right now, no siedwalks or safe path are in place to move students are in place. Consider the sidewalks/ paths when dealing w/

The proposed University imporvement project seems to us (Bike and Chowder) as an important building block in making Las Cruces more bike friendly and attractive to active newcomers. Projects like this enhance the safety and simple enjoyment of one of our major streets. Western University Ave.. has become a key link in the bike

Please put these poster boards on-line, so that I can refer to tehm as a write up some other comments which I will submit by mail. Thanks! Roy Arrowood

I am a 6th grader at Zia Middle School, and I would like sidewalks to keep me safe

We are a <u>Community</u>. Yes, I understand the concern people living on University have concerning noise, but it appears that, with proper planning, these can be resolved. Our <u>Community</u> will benefit with safer access along University. Many of senior citizens don't realize we need to provide for the younger, more active community.

fronting on University Ave, I submit the following comments.

1. Members of the Association are well aware of the traffic congestion at the Zia Middle School caused by the influx of parents picking up or dropping off their children along a narrow roadway. This situation is a serious and hazardous safety problem to children and those using University Ave.

2. Our members are very concerned about the unintended consequences from possible solutions to solve the current problems of pedestrians, bikes, and automotive traffic.

3. We have identified several issues that we hope will be addressed during the design process. They include:

a. Noise

b. Congestion

- c. Traffic speed and turning lanes
- d. Drainage
- e. Pedestrian and bike traffic safety
- f. Lighting

4. Traffic appears to flow quite well except during school starting and dismissal. Therefore, the L. C. School District must become a willing partner in this process. Non participation due to lack of funds is not an excuse at this early stage of planning. We anticipate this will be a lengthy process, and the district should be willing to offer short and long term solutions which might include: restricting parental drop off/pick up locations, transfer via bus to alternate drop off/pick up locations, or new on site traffic patterns to alleviate the current messy and hazardous process.

5. Based on the alternatives presented at the Thursday night meeting in the Mesilla Community Center, October 15, 2015, we prefer a road design concept similar to that of the present Avenue de Mesilla (Hwy 28) through the Town of Mesilla. In this design, speed remains at 35 mph, bike lanes and sidewalks are provided on each side of the roadway, and one lane of traffic in each direction with a center median and turning lanes where needed.

#### Dear Kristen,

I write in enthusiastic support of the proposed multi-million enhancements along University Boulevard. Such an investment in our community shows a vision of a better neighborhood and a a wise investment in our local small businesses.

Our Mesilla and Mesilla park neighborhood can only be enhanced by such a proposal. A walking and bike route connecting them is a clear path to taking these two communities to the next level in social emgagement. The fact that such a route does not already exist is shocking. Improvements to our health and wealth are assured by these enhancements to our area.

Our small businesses in the area rely on community spirit. As an example, look at the success of biking in this area. The bean coffee shop is heaving with cyclists at the weekend. The spotted dog hosts a running club and a walk-in music evening. Investing in a simple and direct connection between Mesilla and Mesilla park can only help these small businesses succeed in our area.

We have a closely guarded gem in Mesilla. Let us do all we can to make things even better. I support this Thanks for sending emails notifying of the meeting last week. Our house backs up on University on the north side just east of Hwy 28 (our address is 2880 Teresita st), and we have been in this house since 2008. Our comments are:

1) University has had increased traffic, and we would like to see less, not more traffic. Do not make it a 4 lane road. Limiting truck traffic would be a plus.

2) Speeding and noise are more than we like, and would opt for a lower speed limit and anything that might mitigate noise.

3) We (and our neighbors would like to keep the sidewalks at Mesilla Farms (north side of University from Hwy 28 to the Lateral).

4) We don't think we need sidewalks on both sides of the street, but that there ought to be one the length of the avenue, with protected crosswalks at intersections.

5) we favor bike lanes (there is more bike traffic then some of the curmudgeons at the meeting stated, and Ms. Kristen Woods Good afternoon:

I came to the earlier Public Meeting and the one on October15th abouche University Cooridor. After hearing the presentation and comments, I would like to change my comments. Earlier I said that I would like a mixed modal path for both bikes and pedistrians. Now, although I would really like to have seperate bike and Pedestrian paths, I would like to see the pedestrian paths on both sides of University and the bike lanes along the roadway. I would choose this to limit tax payer dollars spent on ROW. I would like to see landscaping, lighting(preferably solo powered ), a water fountain( that can be used to fill waterbottles), and the type of rough line made on the freeways to alert people that they are going off the road when cars cross into the bike lane -not just a painted line to mark the bike lanes.

Thank you for your part in the meeting. I was very pleased with the level of professionalism everyone showed.

1. The Southern edge of new roadway should be no closer to the housing subdivision than the existing roadway.
2. Should the EBID ditch, "the berm," be removed a rock wall fence should eb built to at least the physical height of my porperty'd (325 Capri Arc) chain link fence. A rock wall of that height should probably be built on the street side of the berm even if it stays as is. The rock wall fence will make an excellent sound barrier. 3. We think (my wife, Mary, and I) the plan of a bike path and pedestrian walkway should be located on each side of the new roadway. 4. We would appreciate being notified of further meetings concerning this project. 5. We thing the Thank you for accepting input into the University Boulevard Corridor Study. From 1964-1969 I lived on Capri Arc. I walked to school at Mesilla Park Elementary. Our family moved to Watson Lane and I rode my bicycle to Zia Junior High. I would ride down Union and then across McDowell to Zia. I would never think of riding a bicycle on University because of the traffic. During the Tour de Las Cruces the 30 KM route takes riders down University all the way to Snow Road. During the Toys for Tots Bicycle rally, we ride from Milagro Coffee down University to Avenida de Mesilla. These instances occur on weekends and the Toys for Tots Ride is escorted by police that shut down traffic. I am certain that if bike lanes were provided as part of the University Corridor redesign that bicycle traffic would increase. As it is now, Union Avenue is a poor but safer choice for getting from Main to Avenida de Mesilla. A well designed bicycle route along University would open that area up to bicycles.

I had one "out of the box" thought about the project. Instead of trying to have University Blvd be all things to all people, why don't you make it a destination road and shut it off as a through corridor. Cars and trucks seeking access to Mesilla can be routed in through Avenida de Mesilla at Valley Road. Plan a giant round about in front of Zia Middle School. Incorporate a drop off lane into the design of the round about. Basically, traffic that came in from Avenida would be returned to Avenida and traffic that came in from Main would be returned to Main. This would certainly slow things down and make the entire corridor safer for pedestrians, motorists and bicyclists and would reduce the impact of the corridor on the quality of life of the homeowners along the way.

Dear Mrs. Woods:

As a Mesilla resident for the past ten years and property owner it has been brought to my attention of the study to improve the traffic safety of University Ave. In particular adding cycling lanes between South Main St. and Avenida de Mesilla. As an amateur cyclist for the past few years it would be great to help promote any traffic safety improvements in our Community.

Bike lanes are community amenities. They are an inexpensive way to improve quality of life by providing safe street space for the Community to bicycle. Bike lanes reduce speeding by narrowing the road, without removing travel or parking lanes. We all know that cycling is a quiet, safe and healthy form of neighborhood transportation. School children, shoppers and neighborhood residents will use South Main St. to Avenida De Mesilla bike lanes.

In lean fiscal times, bike lanes are a cost-effective way for the city to improve our Community's quality of life. New bike lanes require little capital investment and are often added to streets that are being repaved or resurfaced. Adding new bike lanes from South Main St. to Avenida de Mesilla would not change the traffic









### Purpose and Need

The **purpose** of the **University Boulevard Corridor Study** is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Boulevard between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

- The **NEED** is based on the following:
- ▲ Safety concerns due to potential pedestrian/ bicycle/ vehicular conflicts
- ▲ Physical deficiencies due to lack of shoulders, pedestrian facilities and bicycle facilities
- ▲ Potential for economic development opportunities as a result of completing the City-wide bicycle loop route

Bohannan 🛦 Huston





























## Purpose and Need

The **purpose** of the **University Boulevard Corridor Study** is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Boulevard between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

- The **NEED** is based on the following:
- ▲ Safety concerns due to potential pedestrian/ bicycle/ vehicular conflicts
- ▲ Physical deficiencies due to lack of shoulders, pedestrian facilities and bicycle facilities
- ▲ Potential for economic development opportunities as a result of completing the City-wide bicycle loop route

Bohannan 🛦 Huston

























## Purpose and Need

The **purpose** of the **University Boulevard Corridor Study** is to provide an enhanced multi-modal transportation corridor along University Boulevard between Main Street and Avenida de Mesilla.

- The **NEED** is based on the following:
- ▲ Safety concerns due to potential pedestrian/ bicycle/ vehicular conflicts
- ▲ Physical deficiencies due to lack of shoulders, pedestrian facilities and bicycle facilities
- ▲ Potential for economic development opportunities as a result of completing the City-wide bicycle loop route

Bohannan 🛦 Huston

















Comment

Thank you for the presentation on 10/15/2015.

One of my first questions is how many accidents have occurred along this particular University corridor using state criteria standards for accident rates and how does the involvement breakdown as per severity, vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian? How does this rate compare with other roads in our area?

I have lived here since 1969 and while the traffic has increased in volume the greater concern seems centered around issues with Zia Middle School traffic. An interesting question is how has the student population grown over time. When my children were students at Zia Junior High School these issues didn't seem to be as great. I know there has been additions to this school, but has the student capacity increase that dramatically? One potential solution I've suggested several times is routing the traffic around the back of the school. One approach could be a one-way path with entrance via the teachers parking area on the east side of the school, a parking/pickup area on the northside or back of the school and an exit along the western boundary of the athletic field. Not having access to the topographic maps I don't know if its possible to include an extended "pickup buffer zone" on the back of the school. Additionally, is increased area available by covering the irrigation lateral on the backside of the school?

As I pointed during the meeting, during the original study many years ago, was impacted by the lack of widening ability because of the Reyes farm property and the "Historical" issues with the farm house north of University and west of Stanford St.

I like many others in attendance am against making University a four lane race track. I personally feel the largest issues surround the Zia Middle School traffic which occurs only twice each week day and even then only during the school session. Provide a reasonable economic solution to that problem and you've gone a long way toward solving the entire University corridor problems.

### Dear Ms. Woods:

The first priority for the University corridor must be the safety of Zia Middle School students. In that regard, safe pedestrian egress to the area neighborhoods from the school is essential. While in-road bike lanes on University Avenue would be desirable for adult cyclists like ourselves, they would not be preferred by parents of students cycling to school. Consequently, a multi-use path to Zia would be preferable for cycling students.

Comments made at the Mesilla open house regarding multi-use paths need to be clarified. The statement that multi-use paths are less safe than in-road bike lanes should have been made with conditions. Multi-use paths become a less safe option only when they are intersected by multiple driveways and roads. The Union Street multi-use path has many such intersections in a short space and therefore is avoided by many adult cyclists.

Therefore, given the limited right-of-way space, we would recommend sacrificing in-road bike lanes, if it would enable planners to place a sidewalk on the north side of University Avenue for the entire length of the corridor and place a multi-use path on the south side for the entire length of the corridor. (The south side has fewer intersections overall.) This, augmented by speed indicators and flashing light crossings at Zia, may offer the best solution to issues of the corridor. 1. Widen Univ on both sides: (a) Bury the Canal in underground culverts. The underground canal will be safer, cheaper to maintain and reduce waste of water. Get help from EBID. On the South sides - lumen below street level. Add a walkway (sidewalk) and put a bike path on north side of University St. make 3 lanes for car traffic. 2. Safety concerns for walkers and bikers on University. School age students using bike or sidewalks may increase if the paths or areas were established If they were to be established, it may decrease school traffic (vehicles) coming to pick up and drop off students. Satalite locationfor student pick up might be helpful to reduce the volume of school traffic; getting students through, safety still needs to be considered. As of right now, no siedwalks or safe path are in place to move students are in place. Consider the sidewalks/ paths when dealing w/

The proposed University imporvement project seems to us (Bike and Chowder) as an important building block in making Las Cruces more bike friendly and attractive to active newcomers. Projects like this enhance the safety and simple enjoyment of one of our major streets. Western University Ave.. has become a key link in the bike

Please put these poster boards on-line, so that I can refer to tehm as a write up some other comments which I will submit by mail. Thanks! Roy Arrowood

I am a 6th grader at Zia Middle School, and I would like sidewalks to keep me safe

We are a <u>Community</u>. Yes, I understand the concern people living on University have concerning noise, but it appears that, with proper planning, these can be resolved. Our <u>Community</u> will benefit with safer access along University. Many of senior citizens don't realize we need to provide for the younger, more active community.

fronting on University Ave, I submit the following comments.

1. Members of the Association are well aware of the traffic congestion at the Zia Middle School caused by the influx of parents picking up or dropping off their children along a narrow roadway. This situation is a serious and hazardous safety problem to children and those using University Ave.

2. Our members are very concerned about the unintended consequences from possible solutions to solve the current problems of pedestrians, bikes, and automotive traffic.

3. We have identified several issues that we hope will be addressed during the design process. They include:

a. Noise

b. Congestion

- c. Traffic speed and turning lanes
- d. Drainage
- e. Pedestrian and bike traffic safety
- f. Lighting

4. Traffic appears to flow quite well except during school starting and dismissal. Therefore, the L. C. School District must become a willing partner in this process. Non participation due to lack of funds is not an excuse at this early stage of planning. We anticipate this will be a lengthy process, and the district should be willing to offer short and long term solutions which might include: restricting parental drop off/pick up locations, transfer via bus to alternate drop off/pick up locations, or new on site traffic patterns to alleviate the current messy and hazardous process.

5. Based on the alternatives presented at the Thursday night meeting in the Mesilla Community Center, October 15, 2015, we prefer a road design concept similar to that of the present Avenue de Mesilla (Hwy 28) through the Town of Mesilla. In this design, speed remains at 35 mph, bike lanes and sidewalks are provided on each side of the roadway, and one lane of traffic in each direction with a center median and turning lanes where needed.

#### Dear Kristen,

I write in enthusiastic support of the proposed multi-million enhancements along University Boulevard. Such an investment in our community shows a vision of a better neighborhood and a a wise investment in our local small businesses.

Our Mesilla and Mesilla park neighborhood can only be enhanced by such a proposal. A walking and bike route connecting them is a clear path to taking these two communities to the next level in social emgagement. The fact that such a route does not already exist is shocking. Improvements to our health and wealth are assured by these enhancements to our area.

Our small businesses in the area rely on community spirit. As an example, look at the success of biking in this area. The bean coffee shop is heaving with cyclists at the weekend. The spotted dog hosts a running club and a walk-in music evening. Investing in a simple and direct connection between Mesilla and Mesilla park can only help these small businesses succeed in our area.

We have a closely guarded gem in Mesilla. Let us do all we can to make things even better. I support this Thanks for sending emails notifying of the meeting last week. Our house backs up on University on the north side just east of Hwy 28 (our address is 2880 Teresita st), and we have been in this house since 2008. Our comments are:

1) University has had increased traffic, and we would like to see less, not more traffic. Do not make it a 4 lane road. Limiting truck traffic would be a plus.

2) Speeding and noise are more than we like, and would opt for a lower speed limit and anything that might mitigate noise.

3) We (and our neighbors would like to keep the sidewalks at Mesilla Farms (north side of University from Hwy 28 to the Lateral).

4) We don't think we need sidewalks on both sides of the street, but that there ought to be one the length of the avenue, with protected crosswalks at intersections.

5) we favor bike lanes (there is more bike traffic then some of the curmudgeons at the meeting stated, and Ms. Kristen Woods Good afternoon:

I came to the earlier Public Meeting and the one on October15th abouche University Cooridor. After hearing the presentation and comments, I would like to change my comments. Earlier I said that I would like a mixed modal path for both bikes and pedistrians. Now, although I would really like to have seperate bike and Pedestrian paths, I would like to see the pedestrian paths on both sides of University and the bike lanes along the roadway. I would choose this to limit tax payer dollars spent on ROW. I would like to see landscaping, lighting(preferably solo powered ), a water fountain( that can be used to fill waterbottles), and the type of rough line made on the freeways to alert people that they are going off the road when cars cross into the bike lane -not just a painted line to mark the bike lanes.

Thank you for your part in the meeting. I was very pleased with the level of professionalism everyone showed.

1. The Southern edge of new roadway should be no closer to the housing subdivision than the existing roadway.
2. Should the EBID ditch, "the berm," be removed a rock wall fence should eb built to at least the physical height of my porperty'd (325 Capri Arc) chain link fence. A rock wall of that height should probably be built on the street side of the berm even if it stays as is. The rock wall fence will make an excellent sound barrier. 3. We think (my wife, Mary, and I) the plan of a bike path and pedestrian walkway should be located on each side of the new roadway. 4. We would appreciate being notified of further meetings concerning this project. 5. We thing the Thank you for accepting input into the University Boulevard Corridor Study. From 1964-1969 I lived on Capri Arc. I walked to school at Mesilla Park Elementary. Our family moved to Watson Lane and I rode my bicycle to Zia Junior High. I would ride down Union and then across McDowell to Zia. I would never think of riding a bicycle on University because of the traffic. During the Tour de Las Cruces the 30 KM route takes riders down University all the way to Snow Road. During the Toys for Tots Bicycle rally, we ride from Milagro Coffee down University to Avenida de Mesilla. These instances occur on weekends and the Toys for Tots Ride is escorted by police that shut down traffic. I am certain that if bike lanes were provided as part of the University Corridor redesign that bicycle traffic would increase. As it is now, Union Avenue is a poor but safer choice for getting from Main to Avenida de Mesilla. A well designed bicycle route along University would open that area up to bicycles.

I had one "out of the box" thought about the project. Instead of trying to have University Blvd be all things to all people, why don't you make it a destination road and shut it off as a through corridor. Cars and trucks seeking access to Mesilla can be routed in through Avenida de Mesilla at Valley Road. Plan a giant round about in front of Zia Middle School. Incorporate a drop off lane into the design of the round about. Basically, traffic that came in from Avenida would be returned to Avenida and traffic that came in from Main would be returned to Main. This would certainly slow things down and make the entire corridor safer for pedestrians, motorists and bicyclists and would reduce the impact of the corridor on the quality of life of the homeowners along the way.

Dear Mrs. Woods:

As a Mesilla resident for the past ten years and property owner it has been brought to my attention of the study to improve the traffic safety of University Ave. In particular adding cycling lanes between South Main St. and Avenida de Mesilla. As an amateur cyclist for the past few years it would be great to help promote any traffic safety improvements in our Community.

Bike lanes are community amenities. They are an inexpensive way to improve quality of life by providing safe street space for the Community to bicycle. Bike lanes reduce speeding by narrowing the road, without removing travel or parking lanes. We all know that cycling is a quiet, safe and healthy form of neighborhood transportation. School children, shoppers and neighborhood residents will use South Main St. to Avenida De Mesilla bike lanes.

In lean fiscal times, bike lanes are a cost-effective way for the city to improve our Community's quality of life. New bike lanes require little capital investment and are often added to streets that are being repaved or resurfaced. Adding new bike lanes from South Main St. to Avenida de Mesilla would not change the traffic **APPENDIX C – ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH** 

