



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **July 19, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mesillavalleympo.org).

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. May 17, 2016 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Amendment to 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. Multi-Use Loop Trail Alternative Selection _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. Crash Data Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
 - 7.1. MPO Staff Update _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 7.2. Local Projects update _____ **CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff**
 - 7.3. NMDOT Projects update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
3

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory
5 Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was
6 held May 17, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County
7 Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
10 Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla Citizen Rep)
11 Harold Love, proxy - Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
12 Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
13 James Nunez (City of Las Cruces Rep)
14 Lisa Willman, proxy - Gabriel Rochelle (Bicycle Com Rep)
15 Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County)
16 David Shearer (NMSU - Environmental Safety)
17 Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla)
18

19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Andrew Bencomo (Ped. Community Rep) (arrived 5:06)
20

21 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO)
22 Andrew Wray (MPO)
23 Michael McAdams (MPO)
24 Zach Taraschi (MPO)
25

26 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Aaron Sussman, Bohannon Houston
27 Albert Thomas, Bohannon Houston
28 Andy Hume, CLC
29 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
30

31 **1. CALL TO ORDER (5:02)**
32

33 Pearson: So it's 5:02 and we have a quorum present so I'll go ahead and call this
34 meeting of the MPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to
35 order. Um, why don't we go down the dais and introduce everybody, why
36 don't we start at the end with Harold and say your name and who you
37 represent.
38

39 Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT. I'm proxy for Jolene Herrera.
40

41 Nunez: James Nunez, City of Las Cruces.
42

43 Willman: Lisa Willman. I'm serving as proxy for Gabriel Rochelle.
44

45 Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Town of Mesilla Citizen Representative.
46

1 Shearer: David Shearer for NMSU Representative.
2
3 Billings: Maggie Billings, Bicycle Community Representative.
4
5 Paz: Samuel Paz, Dona Ana County.
6
7 Shepan: Lance Shepan, Town of Mesilla.
8
9 Pearson: George Pearson, City of Las Cruces Representative, and we have one
10 more member looking for a chair.
11
12 Leisher: Mark Leisher, the Dona Ana County Citizen's Rep.
13
14 Pearson: Okay.

16 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

17
18 Pearson: And first order of business is the Approval of the Agenda. I'll hear a motion
19 to approve the agenda as presented.
20
21 Shearer: I move to approve the agenda.
22
23 Curry: Second.
24
25 Pearson: There's a motion and a second to approve the agenda. All in favor, "aye."

26
27 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

28
29 Pearson: Any opposed? That approves the agenda.
30

31 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

33 3.1 April 19, 2016

34
35 Pearson: We're on to Approval of the Minutes for April 19th. Do we have some
36 discussion on the minutes? I recognize Ashleigh.
37
38 Curry: Thank you. I'm looking at page 8-9, line 3; it says University, it should say
39 Union. Looking at page 21-22, line 33 says arrow; it should say lane. Page
40 26-27, line 28; it says facility, it should say fatality. Line, Page 29-30, line
41 14; it says hear a comma, I think it should say hearing none. That's all.
42 Thank you.
43
44 Pearson: Staff catch all those?
45
46 Murphy: Yes sir.

1
2 Pearson: Any other comments on the agenda?

3
4 Curry: Minutes.

5
6 Pearson: Minutes, yeah, thank you. Um, I'll hear a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

7
8
9 Curry: I'll put forth a motion.

10
11 Pearson: Second?

12
13 Shearer: Second.

14
15 Pearson: Having a motion and a second to approve the minutes as amended, all in favor, "aye."

16
17
18 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

19
20 Pearson: Opposed?

21
22 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

23
24 Pearson: And we move on to our next item, Public Comment. This is an opportunity for the public to comment. Do we have any members of the public that wish to come forward and address us with whatever their issues are? Seeing none.

25
26
27
28
29 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

30
31 **5.1 Missouri/Roadrunner Study Corridor Presentation**

32
33 Pearson: We'll move on to Discussion Items. Item 5.1: Missouri/Roadrunner Study Corridor Presentation.

34
35
36 McAdams: Yes, we'd like to introduce Representative Aaron from, Sussman from BHI, Bohannon Huston to present the Missouri Avenue study.

37
38
39 AARON SUSSMAN GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

40
41 Nunez: I have a question. You mentioned about the roadway suitability or something along those lines a few slides back. Did you consider the lighting along those paths because I'm not familiar with the lighting, how far it goes on some of these roadways close to the high school.

1 Sussman: That's a good question. The short answer is no. The lighting is not a factor
2 in the bicycle suitability analysis nor is it a component of the level of service
3 but that is something that we could explore and certainly consider as part
4 of the, this set of recommendations for any of the preferred alternatives, is
5 that there be adequate lighting.
6

7 Nunez: The only reason I mention that or, or uh thinking about it is I wouldn't've
8 unless you'd mentioned the change in analysis of whatever the term you
9 used was um the, again towards that end of your presentation about, I was
10 just trying to think of what highschoolers could commute along that path.
11 And then the other part of your study, or what I was thinking was, is I saw
12 the red path along again I don't remember the name of the road that's close
13 to A Mountain there for a lot of people to be able to use that on their way
14 maybe to A Mount, A Mountain. I think that's a pretty popular destination
15 and because you pointed out this path that the only thing that you pointed
16 out is the destination is just, well other than enjoyment of going along those
17 roads is the high school. So what else is out there as a, as a goal or a
18 destination until it's developed more?
19

20 Sussman: Sure. Let me, so, speak to that final point. From a more local standpoint,
21 and really when we're talking about the bicycle and pedestrian access I think
22 sort of local access to the high school is, is more critical as, as critical as
23 anything. Providing the connections to Sonoma Ranch Boulevard is very
24 important from a regional connectivity standpoint. That's probably most
25 critical to motor vehicles. Though there are alternatives that exist obviously
26 along the existing roadway infrastructure, some of those paths are not
27 necessarily the most direct. One of the reasons why Missouri Avenue was
28 included not just in the long-range planning documents but as a, for the
29 alternatives for the study is that it's one of the few east-west corridors in Las
30 Cruces obviously that traverses the entire city. So that's, um extending that
31 connection and improving the regional motor vehicle connectivity is an
32 important part of that. But in terms of localized access, connections to the
33 high school from a bicycle and pedestrian standpoint I think would provide
34 an awful lot of benefit.
35

36 Nunez: All right. Thanks.
37

38 Curry: Well, yeah. I just, I don't have a question. I just have a comment. I think
39 it's great that you've done the level of service on it and I really wish that you
40 could just do that for our whole bike suitability map because I feel like that's
41 really hitting the nail on the head and I think that MPO and, and BPAC, we
42 should really look at, at doing that across the board for our next bike
43 suitability map update because I really think this is much more accurate
44 than, than what we have right now. So I just wanted to say thank you for
45 doing that assessment and it's maybe fuel for thought for our future map.
46

1 Sussman: So um first of all thank you for um, for the comment. We are the, the level
2 of service analysis is based on um a tool that was developed as part of the
3 Transportation Research Board National Cooperative Highway Research
4 Program. It's a publicly-available set of algorithms that can be used to
5 calculate level of service. We, we'll make the offer at a future BPAC
6 meeting, we're working with the Mesilla Valley MPO to conduct a workshop
7 to utilize that tool. Again it is publicly available so we're building a tool that
8 will allow the user to enter the individual uh conditions along a particular
9 roadway. It's great as a diagnostic tool because it gives a sense of the
10 existing conditions and also if, if conditions were, were improved in, in any
11 number of different ways how the level of service might change. So we will
12 make that offer available and we're happy to, the next time that we present
13 to this Committee, follow up um and share any further analysis that we
14 conduct to that effect.
15
16 Curry: Thank you.
17
18 Shearer: I just have a few little questions on the level of service. What's the difference
19 again between the darker green and the dark green?
20
21 Sussman: The, so the, I'm, apologize for not kind of going through this in maybe as
22 much detail as I should have. The level of service from a bicycle standpoint
23 goes from A to D in this map, A being the, the highest quality infrastructure
24 is in the dark green. The lighter green, the kind of maybe highlighter green
25 is a level of service B, yellow is level of service C, and red is level of service
26 D. To give a sense for what a level of service D condition looks like, we're
27 talking about Roadrunner Parkway to the north of Lohman Avenue ...
28
29 Shearer: Right.
30
31 Sussman: Where I believe the traffic volumes are in the low 30 thousands, there's two
32 lanes in each direction, there are no bicycle lanes, no bicycle facilities so if
33 you were a bicyclist um it's probably not the most pleasant facility to bike up
34 and down. So it's technically possible but probably not advisable, whereas
35 a level of service um A such as the quality of the infrastructure near the
36 Farm and Ranch Museum, you're talking about five- or six-foot lanes, I think
37 a two- or three-foot bicycle buffer. The traffic volumes are not particularly
38 high. So all of those considerations function together. One of the reasons
39 that you'll see for example that Missouri Avenue is a level of service B as
40 opposed to a level of service A is the presence of, of on-street parking and
41 that can cause conflicts of course, um and so um that's a reality of going
42 through a neighborhood, that you're trying to accommodate lots of different
43 uses and needs but that conflict is, is one reason why that level of service
44 is lower in that particular location.
45
46 Shearer: Thank you.

1
2 Pearson: So on the level of service for bicycles do you consider topography at all?
3 Because like Missouri has that uphill piece there that can make it tougher.
4
5 Sussman: The short answer is no. I, I would consider that to be a, sort of an additional
6 consideration because now you're talking about not necessarily the, the
7 comfort level in terms of safety but in terms of the, the ease of use and ease
8 of use is not necessarily a consideration in this particular approach.
9
10 Pearson: Because when you're designing an, engineering a facility like, like Missouri
11 Avenue has that same kind of thing. On the downhill side you might just
12 make it a shared lane. On the uphill side you might make it a bike, a full
13 bike lane.
14
15 Sussman: Right.
16
17 Pearson: On the bicycle option, the Number 6, you had, can you bring up, where, you
18 just have the, the big blue line extending from Missouri all the way out to
19 Sonoma Ranch. Have you given any other consideration about maybe
20 dropping down on the backside of, on the west side of Centennial with being
21 able to connect more than one place there, maybe provide connection along
22 the Farm and Ranch Museum area or something?
23
24 Sussman: The short answer is no, but not because that's not an option but because
25 again this is more of a concept that has emerged ahead of the initial, ahead
26 of the consideration of alignments. So I think the next step in that particular
27 approach is to look at how to sort of maximize the connections so if you are
28 interested in improving the connections to the Farm and Ranch Museum for
29 example, that would be a necessity. Otherwise you're not providing any
30 change beyond the existing conditions.
31
32 Pearson: Right.
33
34 Sussman: So that's a very good question and that's something that we'll make sure
35 that um we consider as we, we flesh out this particular alternative more.
36
37 Pearson: Cause that, considering the destinations and how you want to connect
38 through them with the AdobeHenge in there that might become a focal
39 center and you don't necessarily want to drive all the way around in order
40 to get to it. You might want to just come out, connect from Dripping Springs
41 straight across to it someplace.
42
43 Sussman: Okay. Thank you.
44
45 Pearson: Any other comments?
46

1 Paz: I've, I have a comment. Is there any considerations to the level of service
2 but for pedestrians?

3
4 Sussman: That is possible through the tool that we have, that we have available. We
5 have not done that to date but that is possible.

6
7 Pearson: Okay. Anybody else? Thank you for the presentation. It's very informative
8 and we like your maps.

9
10 Sussman: Okay. Thank you. Thanks again.

11
12 Shearer: Quick question. What's the timeframe involved here with your study?

13
14 Sussman: Sure. We will present our um preferred alternative or preferred alternatives
15 in a public meeting probably sometime this fall and our timeframe is to
16 complete the Phase A study, the current study by the end of the year. And
17 let me mention since you asked, if there are any additional questions or
18 comments our e-mails are on, on the slides and then you may also contact
19 us through one of the handouts which has each of the alternatives laid out
20 for comments. We're, very much welcome any additional feedback that you
21 may have. Thanks again.

22 23 **5.2 City of Las Cruces Downtown Presentation**

24
25 McAdams: Thank you very much Aaron. And now we'd like to introduce Andy Hume
26 to discuss about things that are going on in downtown-related circulation.

27
28 ANDY HUME GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

29
30 Shearer: Well, excuse, was there, was there going to be medians on Water and
31 Church Street like ...

32
33 Hume: No sir.

34
35 Shearer: No. All right, just yellow paint, okay.

36
37 ANDY HUME CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.

38
39 Leisher: I had a question about the back-in parking.

40
41 Hume: Sure.

42
43 Leisher: Is, are there example facilities that use that currently, in that configuration?

44
45 Hume: Yes.

1 Curry: Tucson.
2
3 Leisher: In Tucson?
4
5 Hume: There are, I, I believe Tucson, um I think Denver, Indianapolis. They're
6 actually coming more and more popular ...
7
8 Leisher: Okay.
9
10 Hume: From the standpoint that a) you can get more parking than parallel, and it's,
11 it's got a lot of safety benefits.
12
13 Leisher: So they don't see a lot of misuse of the facilities by left-hand turners parking
14 ...
15
16 Hume: Well ...
17
18 Leisher: In those slots?
19
20 Hume: There is some, I, as, as I mentioned on the slide there's going to be, need
21 to be some driver education but at the same time there's also a level of
22 enforcement because you're parked in the wrong direction, you're parked
23 against the flow of traffic. And so from an enforcement standpoint there's
24 going to need to be that along with the education.
25
26 Leisher: Okay. Thanks.
27
28 Love: Andy, was any, has any thought been given to a roundabout on the south
29 end?
30
31 Hume: Actually a roundabout was modeled and actually worked quite well.
32 However when we looked at um the, when we looked at proposed
33 redevelopment opportunities, roundabouts take a, an immense amount of
34 right-of-way and so when we're balancing redevelopment opportunities with
35 the benefits of a roundabout, it really fell in the direction of having a, a four-
36 way intersection.
37
38 Pearson: Ashleigh.
39
40 Curry: Andy, I have a, a question for you. I was a little confused by kind of how
41 you ended with the, the bike lane piece. Um, so you talked about the new
42 bike lanes that were put in by NMDOT on Main and then you know
43 continuing south of the, south ...
44
45 Hume: Hopefully.
46

1 Curry: Hopefully at some point. And you talked about right now not having bike
2 facilities, being a share, you know share the road situation but then
3 ultimately maybe acquiring right-of-way to ultimately put in bike lanes again.
4
5 Hume: That, that option would be considered if we get additional right-of-way, yes.
6
7 Curry: So what I'm hearing is that ultimately you'd really like to see bike lanes.
8
9 Hume: I think bike lanes would be a good addition in the downtown area on Church
10 and Water.
11
12 Curry: So why not do it now?
13
14 Hume: Because right-of-way acquisition is incredibly expensive and the, the money
15 that we have right now has to go to the current phase that we have.
16
17 Curry: Okay. I understand that. So why not do it, the Option 2 where you have
18 parallel parking and bike lanes rather than back-in parking?
19
20 Hume: See if I ...
21
22 Curry: I think early on you showed us a, Option 2 ...
23
24 Hume: Yep.
25
26 Curry: That had bike lanes as well.
27
28 Hume: Yep. Here we go. I think that, well I'm, I'm going to, I'm going to, I'm going
29 to cheat on my first answer and that's what the Tax Increment Development
30 District Board went with as far as our options go. That's my cheat answer.
31 So what I'll do from, from a, that's an excellent question and I grapple with
32 that all the time, because I've had so many conversations with this Board
33 and individuals separately about inconsistency in bicycle facilities and you
34 know a, a good example is Triviz. We couldn't get bike lanes but share the
35 road on both directions was not really the way to go, especially on
36 southbound when you're going up hills and stuff like that, and so we went
37 with a, an asymmetrical facility. But from the standpoint of consistency it
38 tied in on the north end with bicycle lanes and it tied in on the south end
39 with bicycle lanes. It wasn't a, it wasn't a facility that just sort of began and
40 ended with no rhyme or reason to it and staff's perspective is that right now
41 that would be the situation, that we sort of would have bike lanes all of a
42 sudden appear in Church and Water and then disappear with no connection
43 to either end and so that was the, that was a big reason why.
44
45 Curry: But I thought that there were bike lanes now on North Main Street.
46

1 Hume: North of Picacho.
2
3 Curry: Right. So north of Picacho, so which portion, so it, to me it sounds almost
4 inconsistent that you have the bike lanes north of Picacho then coming into
5 Water and Church with no bike lanes.
6
7 Hume: Well but we also have a very large stretch between Picacho and the
8 roundabout that'll also not have bike lanes.
9
10 Curry: And so that's another question. Why would you not put in bike lanes in front
11 of City Hall?
12
13 Hume: I am, I am grappling with that on final design. I, I, I ...
14
15 Curry: Please put in bike lanes.
16
17 Hume: I'm going to try.
18
19 Curry: That, I mean just, that's a, a piece that I bike a lot and it would be really nice,
20 especially coming out of the roundabout and I think people are, their heads
21 are a bit dizzy and then they don't realize that there's also a bicycle there.
22 So it'd be a really nice place to have a, you know.
23
24 Hume: Let me, let me ask a question of the Board on this cause this was another
25 aspect, it, this is sort of bringing back the, the conversations that we had.
26 One of the things in, that, that we sort of grappled with too is the proximity
27 of on-street parallel parking and the, and the bike lane being so close and
28 they, essentially halfway into the door zone. We do, we don't have room to,
29 to, to give a wider bike lane or a wider parallel parking lane so that was a,
30 sort of another aspect so you're, you're going along, you're right next to
31 traffic cause the bike lane I believe is only four feet. It's a, it's a minimal
32 sized bike lane, and you're right next to the door zone of vehicles going, you
33 know that are parallel parked. So you know that sort of factored in, again
34 I'm trying to pull from my knowledge from my MPO days and a, and having
35 talked with cyclists about being that close to parallel parking as well so that
36 was, that was another aspect as well. I, I'm not ruling it out. I'm just saying
37 the, the, the TIDD preferred Option 1.
38
39 Curry: Right.
40
41 Hume: In final design there may be other things that, that fall into the mix that ...
42
43 Curry: Well and, and I think the truth of the matter is I feel really comfortable, Main
44 Street is a really lovely street to bike down cause it's 15 miles an hour so
45 you can just kind of take the lane and enjoy that scene, I mean really there
46 are multiple options here so I don't think it has to be ...

1
2 Hume: True.
3
4 Curry: Super important because there is a way through with a, with a really nice
5 bike-able area.
6
7 Hume: And, and a, a question I'll ask, you know you, you Mr. Chair, I mean I, I
8 realize this is a discussion item but if there is some sort of consensus that
9 comes out of it that you would like to provide direction to me through final
10 design, I'm not going to guarantee that it'll actually necessarily happen but
11 we can introduce it into the discussion of final design. So if there is a
12 consensus that maybe Option 2 which is that option, the other, you know
13 what the other thing I'll, I'll mention too is there's like 60 fewer parking
14 spaces available and you know with redevelopment in the area especially
15 of a lot of the parking lots, parking is going to become increasingly a
16 premium, so that was another consideration.
17
18 Pearson: Right. The parking lots at Water and Griggs area, those have been
19 dedicated to private ownership at this point, right? Or possibility of
20 development that, but those get removed as public parking.
21
22 Hume: Correct. Actually all the public parking lots are identified for future
23 redevelopment so ...
24
25 Pearson: Right.
26
27 Hume: That's, that's just one of them. Good questions though, that's, that, we, we
28 really, we really, I can tell you, I'm, I'm not exaggerating when I say we spent
29 multiple meetings grappling with this issue. I've not even, that's not an
30 exaggeration.
31
32 Nunez: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hume. Think, I, I think you asked the key questions and, but
33 I did have some other ideas before you brought out these key ones that,
34 that we're talking about now. But the, what I was thinking of was, is the, the
35 direction of, I, I, I do like the green, the dark green that shows where your,
36 the paths that, I don't know if you've seen some of those that some of the
37 places have come with to show and direct paths for the bicycle. I mean
38 here you, you, we, we, we paint the lines and we paint them white and we
39 show, but, but when I'm thinking of this I was thinking about the callecitas.
40 This, well let me just ask the question. I was still wondering what the plan
41 is for the Farmer's Market and how you would end up, cause you didn't get
42 into it too much. Actually you've, you talked about it and then I was thinking
43 about how you gonna develop those callecitas or you gonna to try to be, I,
44 it's not the principal route for the bicycles or maybe it is but pedestrians are
45 for, is it more for parking for the, the people who actually have businesses

1 there that are going to have additional parking along those callecitas? I
2 guess I'm asking a few questions at once but ...
3
4 Hume: So this is an artist's rendition of, of the callecita we looked at at, between
5 Coas and Woolworth. So let me see if I can, I can answer your question.
6 We are, we are not immediately proposing any vehicular traffic or parking.
7 We are proposing that they remain right now at least open to walking and
8 biking, bicycling only at this point. Obviously there has to be access for
9 emergency vehicles and so on and so forth.
10
11 Nunez: No the ...
12
13 Hume: The, the ...
14
15 Nunez: That image helps a lot.
16
17 Hume: Yeah.
18
19 Nunez: I, I missed that.
20
21 Hume: Okay. Well no, no, no. I didn't show you the image. Yeah, that's, that was,
22 that, I, I sort of, I sort of kind of glossed over the callecitas to, to talk more
23 about Church and Water but um basically what we want them to become
24 are active spaces. So if you have, and in this particular example you can
25 see, um it may be difficult to see but this is a doorway in the side of what is
26 Coas. Perhaps this is a coffee shop or a little cafe, somebody can you know
27 get their coffee, come outside, sit, there may be opportunities for, like right
28 now the Main Street Bistro has the outdoor seating. Some of you probably
29 have been there before. They actually rent that from the City so, so that
30 there are opportunities to lease those spaces, maybe if you want to have
31 like a little outdoor cafe where you serve alcohol, you have to have that
32 fenced off. But basically what we want them to do is we, we want them to
33 be spaces where people meet and greet and gather. Let me, let me see if
34 I can answer really quickly your Farmers and Crafts Market question.
35 Saturday they're going to stay where they're at. They have like over 300
36 vendors and so they're not really, we don't really have space for them to go
37 anywhere else. On Wednesday they will, they will probably occupy the
38 plaza.
39
40 Nunez: Very good, thanks. And then um kind of a sub-question, I was trying to
41 visualize, I'm sure you're handling it with the engineers or whatever but the
42 drainage through there, I'm kind of curious how it is. Is it okay? Is it a
43 drainage issue? Well you, well go ahead.
44
45 Hume: Yeah. There, there's, there are drainage issues. It's sheet flow, I mean it's
46 so, yes, it's, probably everybody knows it's basically pretty much flat in that

1 area being the river bottom, or former river bottom. So um you know we're
2 going to have to, as we work through this, actually if, if memory serves the
3 design that the, um that is being proposed by a local architect is the area
4 that sort of looks like the river going through that, which it's supposed to
5 signify the river was going to be slightly tapered so that water will probably
6 go through that area um predominantly so it'll leave the other, the rest of the
7 area a little drier. We were also looking for opportunities for green
8 infrastructure in these areas as well, storm water capture and the like.

9
10 Nunez: Very good. Thank you.

11
12 Pearson: Any other Committee Members?

13
14 Willman: Have you considered parking that would be away from the curb so, um I just
15 finished a book by Janette Sadik-Khan. She was the planner that
16 redesigned the New York City streets and her idea was to put the parallel
17 parking eight feet from the curb and put the bike lane between the curb and
18 the parking and then the two drive lanes. Is there a possibility of doing
19 something that radical?

20
21 Hume: The, you know the, what you're talking about is very similar to what is done
22 all over Europe, called a cycle track. It's very similar to that where you,
23 where you have that additional buffer away from traffic but you also have
24 some separation from the pedestrian traffic. Um I would have to say at this
25 point in time again given the right-of-way constraints that we have, probably
26 not, but as we look forward to hopefully getting additional right-of-way we
27 want to make sure that we provide the best possible environments,
28 particularly for pedestrian, the, this was a very interesting conversation I had
29 with the engineers working on the project. If you design for pedestrians first,
30 everything else will be great. You won't have to worry about a single other
31 thing. Design for pedestrians first. So with that in mind that's sort of the
32 way that we're trying to approach this entire project. That particular item
33 has not come up in discussion but I can certainly bring it up in our, in our
34 final design discussions.

35
36 Willman: Thank you.

37
38 Shearer: You mentioned 25 mile an hour at times, but I think at times I thought you
39 also said 20 mile an hour. Is there a consideration for that speed limit?

40
41 Hume: That's one of the things that we're looking at is a lower design speed so that
42 the design speed is actually 20 miles an hour instead of 25. Just even that
43 five mile an hour difference would make a huge change in the pedestrian
44 and bicycle environment, and also a huge environment in people who want
45 to sit along an outdoor cafe and, and enjoy the evening. I'd, I don't know
46 again if you, if you've been to Main Street Bistro it's really the best example

1 that I have, the only example I have. When cars are actually going 15, you
2 can carry on a conversation just fine. When they're even going a little bit
3 faster than that the wheel noise goes up, the engine noise goes up, and it's
4 very hard to hear the person sitting next to you. So uh anything that we can
5 do in that, in that sense to uh work with a lower design speed is what we're
6 going to be shooting for.
7

8 Shearer: Okay. You're also changing the circle as you go towards the south end.
9 Are there going to be additional traffic lights on Lohman and Amador or ...
10

11 Hume: There will not be additional traffic lights on Lohman and Amador. Those
12 will, those lights will remain. The, there were two scenarios in the, in the
13 traffic study. There was the "Opening Day" scenario which will happen
14 probably mid-2018 and then there was the, the "20 or 25 Year" scenario. In
15 the "Opening Day" scenario there will be stop-controlled intersections as,
16 on Bowman as you come to Main. Main will be the through street at
17 Bowman kind of like it is now and then you would have stop control coming
18 in. Eventually we may need to do a four-way stop at that intersection but
19 we're, we're really working hard to try and remain, keep people um in the
20 same conditions that they're used to driving at this point in time and that will,
21 we think "Opening Day" that that will be the configuration.
22

23 Shearer: Okay.
24

25 Billings: I just have a quick comment. I think this is really wonderful. I bike downtown
26 frequently and I think that with Las Cruces or not Las Cruces Street, Main
27 Street being so bike-accessible I'm not too worried as a bicyclist about
28 Church and Water being super-accessible so I think that the more parking
29 would make more sense just because if you don't have that parking then
30 people will start parking in places like that anyway and will just block bike
31 access. So I think that it's a really good option but I don't think that bike
32 access on Church and Water is too horribly important.
33

34 Hume: Okay. Thank you.
35

36 Pearson: Right. I think, when I first saw the design for the bicycle I saw a door-zone
37 bike lane and so that worried me. As an experienced cyclist I know that well
38 that means I'm going to have to ride out on the lane line next to traffic
39 anyways and inexperienced cyclists are going to be in danger of being
40 doored by the, the doors so this, doing the traffic calming with the back-in
41 parking and because of the destinations involved too and the choices, that
42 all makes sense to me that Church and Water with the Option 1 that was
43 selected is a, a good, good choice and maybe look at the 20-mile-an-hour
44 design. The parts that concern me a little bit more are North Main Street
45 roundabout section where just as you described we have a wonderful new
46 facility, NMDOT bicycle facilities on Main Street and then what happens. I

1 think it's very important that we do bicycle design of some sort,
2 accommodation for bicyclists up to the roundabout, whether that means
3 traffic calming, whether that means bike lanes, whatever. We need to
4 consider that that's where the bicycle, that's going to be the problem area
5 for bicycles.
6

7 Hume: As a former rider through there, completely agree with you.
8

9 Pearson: So if you need some support from this Committee on that, I think we could
10 probably come up with that.
11

12 Hume: Okay. Thank you.
13

14 Pearson: The other area that hasn't really been talked about that concerns me is Las
15 Cruces Avenue. The M, Transportation Plan includes the Hadley Avenue
16 Bike Boulevard, so that extends all the way from Triviz to Motel Boulevard
17 in concept. And that's all it is, is right now is in concept. And right through
18 downtown on Main, on Las Cruces Avenue is where you're going to have
19 bicyclists because it's going to be the only choice for connectivity. That's
20 how, I ride it twice a day when I'm going to work because that's the only
21 choice. And that was one of the main reasons, connecting the two
22 neighborhoods. It'd be wonderful if the City considers, does the bike
23 boulevard aspects of the design whether, I know maybe the Hadley
24 Boulevard, Bike Boulevard they can't implement it yet but if they do the
25 design work and make the decisions that this is where this should be, it
26 seems like it's going to end up at Mesquite and Mesquite's going to go down
27 to Las Cruces and cross through until it connects back up to Hadley. And
28 if we implemented that as part of this design process it seems important to
29 me.
30

31 Hume: Thank you very much for that comment Mr. Chair and, and that actually was
32 a comment that MPO provided to us as well in the preliminary design
33 process. Um, one thing that I'll ask and, and this is a perfect opportunity to
34 ask this. What would you suggest different than the, the typical design that
35 would, that is being offered here? Because usually a bike boulevard does
36 not have specific bike lanes. It does have narrower travel lanes. The other
37 part of this is that the sidewalks are going to be widened so the entire, the
38 actual roadway part of the right-of-way is going to be dramatically narrowed
39 from what it is today. And, and Mr. Chair I would be happy to take back any
40 ideas that you would have that would help better implement that. Again it,
41 it falls within the context of the entire plan bringing people to downtown
42 rather than through downtown.
43

44 Pearson: Right. Well riding it as it, in its current configuration there's generally not
45 parking, people are generally not parking in the parking on Las Cruces
46 Avenue. That of course changes on market days.

1
2 Hume: Sure.
3
4 Pearson: But during the typical times that I'm riding through there there's enough
5 wiggle room and then you get to the four-way stop at, at Main Street and
6 La, Las Cruces Avenue. Um, depending on how wide you want to make
7 those sidewalks I would take consideration of maybe no parking on Las
8 Cruces Avenue from, between Church and Water.
9
10 Hume: Okay.
11
12 Pearson: I had thought previously that Main Street is 15 miles an hour, Las Cruces
13 Avenue should be 15 miles an hour between Campo and Alameda or
14 something like that.
15
16 Hume: Okay.
17
18 Pearson: And that'll also accommodate, use traffic calming for bicyclists but that's
19 where not being an engineer we do need a ...
20
21 Hume: Sure.
22
23 Pearson: Good design philosophy on how to handle that but that's, accommodating
24 bicycles on Las Cruces Avenue and the Hadley, the North Main and
25 roundabout sections of the project I think are the two things that you really
26 need to concentrate on.
27
28 Hume: Absolutely. I, I appreciate those comments. One of the things that I'll, I'll
29 submit to you all, I know Silver for instance is a bicycle boulevard in
30 Albuquerque. What we can do is we can take a look at that and see you
31 know what design elements are different than what we're proposing for Las
32 Cruces there may be other more, more refined designs that are available.
33 So we'll work with MPO as well as with the um engineers on the project to,
34 to refine that.
35
36 Pearson: Okay. Any other ...
37
38 Curry: Yes. Andy I have, I have just one thought. This is, um it's maybe easier to,
39 to see it in sort of a sketch but this is one of the things that they do in the,
40 I've seen in, done in Zimbabwe in Africa is that the parking is, is in the middle
41 of, in the middle of the street and so you'd have cars, bicycles, pedestrians
42 and then that parking is accessed from either side here and I don't know
43 how much width that takes but you'd fit in a lot of parking because it is similar
44 to the, not to the parallel but to the back-in parking, that you just line the
45 middle of the street with parking.
46

1 Hume: Okay.
2
3 Curry: And then you have a travel lane, bicycles, and they're not anywhere near
4 the cars parking. They're between the cars driving, I don't know. Have you
5 ever seen anything like that?
6
7 Hume: Um, I have never seen something like that. So we'll take a look at that and
8 see what, maybe that option would be available.
9
10 Curry: I don't know. I, it, it just seems like then cars can access that center parking
11 from either, from either direction and it keeps the bicycles really out of
12 anything to do with parking.
13
14 Hume: Okay.
15
16 Leisher: But then the passengers have to cross traffic to get over.
17
18 Curry: Yes, they do. And if you're going at 15 miles an hour that's okay.
19
20 Leisher: Yes, could be.
21
22 Curry: But that's true. Yeah.
23
24 Pearson: And my other comment that may not be directly part of the project or not but
25 bicycle parking in the downtown area. We need sufficient bicycle parking.
26 I, anecdotally of course but having attended the Zombie Walk and the, the
27 New Year's Eve celebration, coming home from those, walking through the
28 callecita area, there's a pile of bicycles just kind of in the corner there cause
29 there's no place else to park. So we need appropriate bicycle parking it
30 seems. My suggest, my thoughts are that every business should have room
31 for two or four bicycles so, to be parked. When I go to ...
32
33 Hume: Okay.
34
35 Pearson: Go to the Enterprise Center where you have your presentations I end up
36 parking on the bike, on the, on the seating, the ...
37
38 Hume: Okay.
39
40 Pearson: The benches there because there's no bike parking and the mentality of the
41 cyclist is, "I'm riding my bicycle. I want to be able to park close to my
42 destination."
43
44 Hume: Sure.
45
46 Pearson: And that "close" means within viewing distance of the destination.

1
2 Hume: Mr. Chair. I, I appreciate those comments very much. There, there's a,
3 there's a couple of schools of thought on that. One is do you put a, a parking
4 spot in front of every single business or do you cluster them at various points
5 along the way. I think that's, that's something that I would love to work with
6 if, if there's maybe some individuals who'd like to provide some input on that
7 or, or help out with some of that. The other thing is how, it, it, it's, it's
8 somewhat a similar situation as we get into with automobile parking. How
9 much do we provide, at what points in, at, at, where, where do we provide
10 them, and you know I, I, I think, I think it would be a really cool thing is we,
11 if we could for special events bring out parking that is movable ...
12
13 Pearson: Right.
14
15 Hume: To, to an extent. It's like heavy, you're not going to actually take the bikes
16 with you. But because if, a lot of times if you go down during the day there
17 are no bicycles parked. When we have special events a lot of bicycles are
18 parked. So is there some opportunity for flexibility? So those are sort of
19 two schools of thought that are going on right now um and I'd be, I'd really
20 enjoy input if possible from ...
21
22 Pearson: Right. One ...
23
24 Hume: A, a, a Membership of this Committee.
25
26 Pearson: A thought is the, the bike corral kind of thing that's portable, it just takes up
27 a bike's ...
28
29 Hume: Sure.
30
31 Pearson: Parking space instead of one car you've got room for 12 bicycles to park. I
32 had another thought but now I don't remember.
33
34 Billings: I think the bicycle corral would be a really good idea or my vote for bike
35 parking, for permanent bike parking would be parking at every business,
36 just a few bikes because you, or like a few spots because just generally you
37 don't want to leave your bike too far from where you are because it gives
38 somebody more time to you know. You get worried about people stealing
39 or something. So on NMSU's campus they have sort of a similar thing, like
40 there are bike, there are places to park your bike outside of every hall,
41 lecture hall and I think that that works really well so I think something like
42 that downtown would be really nice.
43
44 Pearson: Right. I think the other thing that I thought of, I'd seen the demonstration
45 that that also extends to the motorcyclists because I've seen parked on the
46 sidewalk in front of the Main Street Bistro's the motorcycles all lined up.

1
2 Hume: Yeah.

3
4 Pearson: So that should be bike parking instead.

5
6 Hume: Fair enough.

7
8 Pearson: Any other comments? Thank you.

9
10 Hume: Thank you all very much.

11
12 McAdams: Thank you Andy, thank you Andy for that wonderful presentation.

13
14 **5.3 Committee Training - Committee Responsibilities**

15
16 McAdams: And let me go to my, mine right now too.

17
18 Pearson: So we're at Committee Training - Committee Responsibilities.

19
20 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

21
22 Nunez: Mr. Chair. I was, you did mention the vehicles. Is, do you guys deal with
23 the rail?

24
25 McAdams: We, well, indirect, not rail as far as rail transportation you know, you know
26 inner, inter-city like, no we, in interactions like that we look at how, like for
27 example the railroad crossing, bike trails and you know the bike lanes the
28 DOT generally deals with those through, and (*inaudible*) cities do. We're
29 dealing, we have liaison with the RTD, that's talking about the commuter
30 rail, it's (*inaudible*), you know we provide support but we're not in direct, you
31 know in that study as far as directing the study. But I think we do in, and
32 we have the other things like trucks, we, one thing we're looking at is the
33 travel demand modeling and (*inaudible*) travel and that's very important. So
34 we have a lot of responsibility being, and I guess I could get, multimodal
35 also includes rail I think and also trucks as well. Okay.

36
37 Nunez: All right. Thanks.

38
39 McAdams: You're welcome.

40
41 Pearson: Any other comments? Okay. Thank you for that.

42
43 McAdams: Thank you too.

44
45 **6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

1 **6.1 MPO Staff Update**

2
3 Pearson: We're on to Item 6.1: MPO Staff Update.

4
5 Murphy: We don't have any updates.

6
7 **6.2 Local Projects Update**

8
9 Pearson: Local Project Updates. City of Las Cruces.

10
11 Nunez: I was looking at our list and just as I reported last month is uh we're mainly
12 doing maintenance. So it, and we're pretty much done with a lot of those
13 roads as many of you have, may noticed. So they're just restriping those
14 and they're, they haven't really changed any of the striping actually. We
15 think we discussed that last month also. And then they are building the dam
16 trails. They're on that project. I don't know if any of you've seen any of that
17 progress but I know they started that construction.

18
19 Pearson: Yeah. Maybe we could get a map of that by the time that that project's
20 completed.

21
22 Nunez: I know I've seen the drawings, you mean a map? Oh, I see what you're
23 getting at I think. Go ahead, can you expand on that? The map, you talking
24 about the, kind of the bicycle maps ...

25
26 Pearson: No, just of the ...

27
28 Nunez: Saved for the ...

29
30 Pearson: Project for the, the dam trail ...

31
32 Nunez: Oh, okay.

33
34 Pearson: Things, facility cause I, well, well I think I saw it during the TAP application
35 process but by the time the project's done and we're ready to announce that
36 it's open, have a map so that it shows where to go, how to get to it.

37
38 Nunez: Okay. Good.

39
40 Pearson: Okay. Town of Mesilla have any updates for us?

41
42 Shepan: No sir.

43
44 Pearson: NMSU? Okay.

45
46 **6.3 NMDOT Projects Update**

1
2 Pearson: NMDOT. You have to turn it on.
3

4 Love: Okay. I, I can give you what I, I know off the top of my head. I-25/Missouri,
5 contractor's looking, pushing to complete that project by the end of this
6 month, substantial completion. I-25, no I-10 over Union and Ramp E the
7 bridges replacement; contractor's looking at completing that project by the
8 end of June and then Mountain States is currently continuing the paving on
9 I-10 basically from up at the Love's, the Airport interchange all the way to
10 the Texas state line. That work is continuing, that pavement preservation
11 work.
12

13 Pearson: And that work's mostly being done at night?
14

15 Love: Yes. And, and we just had a, which probably everybody'd be interested on
16 this Committee, we just had a kickoff meeting for our study on US-70/Main
17 Street from Solano all the way to I-25 and one of the things we're looking at
18 is whether it needs to be six-laned or the feasibility of six-laning it. So that's
19 a study that just, just got, we just had a kickoff meeting and of course we'll
20 be looking for all the public input and, and input from committees like this.
21 And that's it.
22

23 Pearson: Okay on the Missouri project now that it's, the lanes are mostly done, notice
24 that it's quite narrow. I wonder about if we need some "Bicycle May Use
25 Full Lane" especially on Triviz or if there, have any comments on, on that.
26 Because at some point that's going to get turned over to the City also so I
27 don't know if it's an NMDOT issue or a City issue to look about that.
28

29 Love: Um, I'm not quite sure what you mean by "narrow."
30

31 Pearson: Well, Triviz heading north for example, it, as you cross Missouri it's probably
32 a 12-foot travel lane between the, the curb and gutter.
33

34 Love: Yes.
35

36 Pearson: And so that's not enough room for a bicycle and a vehicle to share.
37

38 Love: I, I think it was the understanding to my, correct me if I'm wrong, that the
39 multiuse path was for bicycles and pedestrians.
40

41 Pearson: But there's an in-the-road facility that picks up immediately after that area
42 so you're going to have people, bicycles in the roadway there. So I wonder,
43 I'm wondering about warning drivers that bicycles belong.
44

45 Love: I'll, I'll pass that on to the project manager.
46

1 Pearson: Okay. Andy.

2
3 Hume: Mr. Chair. Um that stretch of Triviz is going to be under City operations and
4 so that's something also that the City can look at if, if that's, if there's a
5 warning sign that's needed at that point.
6

7 Pearson: Okay.
8

9 **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

10
11 Pearson: Okay. So now we're on to item seven: Public Comment. Any further
12 public? Go ahead.
13

14 Hume: Real quick, the City of Las Cruces is looking at the potential for a TAP
15 funding project. One of the ideas that we're looking at is a bike sharing
16 program. We're just very much in the initial discussions of that and we want
17 to make sure to cooperate with anything that NMSU is doing, especially
18 looking at connecting NMSU with downtown. So just wanted to let you all
19 know that, that we're working with our, our colleagues over at NMSU so.
20

21 Pearson: Okay, good. Yeah, I think one of the things through my Facebook pages or
22 whatever is the ideal is you pick your bike share stations now as part of the
23 design of whatever infrastructure you're adding to the area so that's very
24 opportune time now I think for that. Okay. I guess, do we have any other
25 Committee comments, Committee Members? Ashleigh.
26

27 Curry: I wanted just to note last BPAC meeting we talked at length about the City
28 Loop Trail and it was brought to our attention from the MPO that the Town
29 of Mesilla and the County were at an impasse with working with EBID and
30 so what we had previously seen as an option, specifically going north-south
31 through the Town of Mesilla, um we had liked the options that were being
32 proposed in earlier meetings that we could use the EBID laterals, and we
33 were told at the last meeting that we could not use that and that was no
34 longer really an, on the table as an option. And so I met with the Town of
35 Mesilla with one of the Trustees and with the Mayor and also with Debbi
36 Lujan and they, there was a misunderstanding there. They said that they
37 were very happy to work with EBID, they really hadn't looked into it in detail
38 but I did get an e-mail yesterday from Linda Flores that she had got the
39 contract between the City and EBID to look over herself and would take it
40 to the Mesilla lawyers just to kind of make sure that the Town of Mesilla
41 would like to continue to use that as an option.

42 And I know that the MPO staff is aware of this but I just wanted to
43 make the rest of the BPAC Committee aware of that. And I have had e-
44 mails trying to set up a meeting with the County with Chuck McMahon the
45 Assistant Manager and we haven't yet met but um I did mention it also at
46 the Bike Month Proclamation in front of the County Commissioners that we

1 would like to revisit the idea and not have this topic closed off, to be able to
2 use the EBID laterals and they said that that was part of their long-range
3 plan as well and so they didn't seem shut off to that. So I think that there
4 was a miscommunication at some point along that, but I'd really like to make
5 sure that we don't move ahead with the City Loop planning without, without
6 considering the EBID idea. I think several Members of the Committee at, I
7 think last time really felt that the loop isn't complete if it's in-road, if it's using
8 in-road facilities where theoretically we would be able to use laterals like the
9 City's used for the Outfall Channel and the La Llorona and the Triviz pieces.
10 So I just, I, I know that some people are aware of that but just to bring it to
11 the attention of the Committee that that, that I did have that discussion with
12 the Town of Mesilla. Thank you.

13
14 Pearson: Right. And I did feel that maybe we should revisit the Trail Plan, maybe
15 what we adopted or suggested, forwarded as a suggestion from, recommendation
16 from this Committee was constrained by the thought process of where we could build something. I think we should do the Trail
17 Plan without those constraints and say, "Where, where would the ideal Trail
18 Plan be?" And then later we can come back and visit, revisit real life but
19 um I think without, we need a Trail Plan that would be the best view from
20 this Committee and from what citizens could use because promoting
21 bicycles we, you know we've got the, what was our phrase for the, the
22 advanced cyclists. But it's, those people'd be out there on the bicycles no
23 matter what, it's the people that, "Well I don't want to go out on a bicycle
24 because it's dangerous." And these are the kinds of facilities ...

25
26
27 Curry: Enthused and confident.

28
29 Pearson: That, enthused and confident. We want the unsure and untrustworthy of
30 motorists kind of thing, we want them to get on their bike and start riding
31 their bicycles and once they do they'll, they can move into the more
32 enthused and more confident category. Any other Committee Members
33 have a comment? The other thing I wanted to ...

34
35 William: George.

36
37 Pearson: Okay, go ahead.

38
39 Willman: I've got a question for Mr. Love. I have, I host cross-country bicycle tours
40 pretty regularly and the Adventure Cycling route goes from, up Highway 28
41 and then north on um 85 up to Hatch. So most of my guests are on that
42 route, but there's about 25% of the bicycle riders that come into town from
43 the west or they're going west along I-10. And I have heard stories from
44 every single one of my guests about pieces of steel that are on the side of
45 the road, so there, there is no other road to ride on so they're on the shoulder

1 of I-10 and it is littered with debris. So my question is: How often is that
2 shoulder swept and is there a way to possibly prioritize that maintenance?
3

4 Love: That's the never-ending problem we have with our roadway facilities,
5 especially the interstate is keeping it free of debris not only litter but also
6 keeping it, because we are aware that the, you're allowed to bicycle on the
7 rural interstates. So, so that is one of the things that's part of our
8 maintenance and it's, it's just, we're always playing catch-up. It's just a, we,
9 we just don't have the money and enough sweepers and enough manpower
10 to keep it up the way it probably should be kept up.
11

12 Willman: Thank you. I have another question.
13

14 Pearson: Okay.
15

16 Willman: Mr. Nunez, I um ride the Missouri bike trail multiple times daily and it's really
17 quite uncomfortable going over those ridges that are abutted against the
18 concrete that was, is all of the um I guess drainage infrastructure. So my
19 question to you, is there a chance that there could be a project to smooth
20 out those bumps? I mean they're really an aggravation.
21

22 Nunez: I think even Andy could help. I've been at the City for a little over a year
23 now. I know that our maintenance crew handles a number of things and I
24 think a couple months back they were even addressed and Mr. Murphy
25 helped with the scheduling of the sweeping of the streets. But in terms of
26 the actual reforming of the asphalt around the drainage structures, I don't
27 believe that question's come up since I've been coming. But maybe Andy
28 can help me field this one, but that's with our, oh go ahead Andy.
29

30 Hume: Mr. Chair, Lisa. Are, are there specific stretches where that's a problem, on
31 Missouri between various streets or ...
32

33 Willman: It, it's on Triviz between Missouri and Picacho. Or no, actually I would say
34 it goes all the way north up to the turnoff to get to the outflow channel. So
35 it's between Missouri and the outflow channel.
36

37 Billings: And if I could add, Espina also has that problem horribly, and that's a really
38 popular bike route and it's just like it's really bumpy in the same way.
39

40 Hume: Okay.
41

42 Billings: So it's the same problem.
43

44 Hume: And, and just so I'm clear, did you mean Missouri or Triviz?
45

46 Willman: The trail is along Triviz. I'm describing the multiuse path ...

1
2 Hume: Triviz, okay.
3
4 Willman: Between Missouri ...
5
6 Hume: Got you.
7
8 Willman: And the outflow channel.
9
10 Hume: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I was in the right spot.
11
12 Curry: It's, it's where the concrete meets the asphalt.
13
14 Hume: Sure. And, and so the, basically what's happened is the concrete has sort
15 of lifted up.
16
17 Pearson: The asphalt, not ...
18
19 Curry: The asphalt.
20
21 Willman: The asphalt.
22
23 Hume: Or the asphalt, yeah okay. Yeah that's, that's, that happens in 100-degree
24 weather so that, what we can do is we can bring that to the attention, now
25 um the multiuse path is operated by Parks so we may need to coordinate
26 between Parks and Streets on that one. As far as Espina goes that would
27 be Streets. What we can do is we can make a note of, of some of those
28 things and have Streets go out there and take a look at it. We had a similar
29 situation actually on NM-28 quite a number of years ago. The, it was the
30 opposite case where the, the collar, the, the, the concrete collar around it
31 was set too low and so what they did was they tapered that, the approach
32 and the, and the, the, the approaches on both sides so there is a machine
33 that can sort of grind down the, the asphalt if we get some, um Espina
34 between ...
35
36 Billings: I think it's between Lohman and Amador and just where the University picks
37 up.
38
39 Hume: Oh perfect, oh excellent, yes, comment form. If you can, if you want to scan
40 and e-mail that either to the MPO or to me directly or to James, however
41 you want to route that conduit, let us know and we can forward that
42 information on to um, to the appropriate department.
43
44 Pearson: Okay.
45
46 Willman: Thank you.

1
2 Pearson: Okay.

3
4 Murphy: My staff yelled at me for not uh mentioning that during the staff comments.
5 What we're going, what we're starting to do is we're going to be bringing out
6 the comment, comment form that it be picked up at all MPO meetings. And
7 it's really designed to address specific concerns like this. If you have a you
8 know, a specific item of concern on a facility um you can fill out the details
9 of that and that'll give us a, you know time to um follow up with the correct
10 agency whether it's City Parks, City Streets, County Engineering, whoever.
11 That, that way we can get, get the responsible agency to give, give a very
12 direct answer I guess, you know even you know DOT if Harold wasn't here,
13 you know we could've had that down on that comment sheet. So we want
14 to do is be able to provide you that outlet that you can, that you can get a,
15 get a response. We'll have a record of it and then uh we'll be able to forward
16 that off to the proper agency.

17
18 Pearson: Do you have a specific e-mail address that you want to use?

19
20 Murphy: You can send that at the mpo@las-cruces.org or any one of the MPO staff
21 will ...

22
23 Pearson: Okay.

24
25 Murphy: As well.

26
27 Pearson: Yeah. You might add an e-mail address when you update your form. Okay.
28 The other comment on things that are happening tomorrow night is the Ride
29 of Silence in Mesilla. So everybody's encouraged to attend that. I think it's
30 a very good event where we can honor the cyclists that have been lost or
31 injured, through no fault of their own often. And also on Saturday at 10:00
32 at City Hall is the Mayor's Bike Ride. So that's hopeful to be a fun event.

33
34 **8. ADJOURNMENT (7:12)**

35
36 Pearson: And I'll hear a motion to adjourn.

37
38 Curry: I'll put forth a motion to adjourn.

39
40 Shepan: *(waves hands)*

41
42 Pearson: Lance says he, he seconds. All in favor, "aye."

43
44 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

45
46 Pearson: We're adjourned.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Chairperson



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mvmmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 19, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Email from Mike Bartholomew, RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator

DISCUSSION:

On June 10, 2015, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

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

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
TL0016 (Proposed)	2016	RoadRUNNER Transit	5339 Funds for Rolling Stock	FTA 5339 \$172,335 Local Match \$30,413 Total \$202,748	New Project

This amendment will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

From: Michael Bartholomew
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Tom Murphy; David Maestas; Gabriel Sapien; Amy Bassford
Subject: New TIP project
Attachments: Signed NMDOT 5339 Letter 5-6-16.pdf

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Andrew –

The NMDOT is the designated recipient of ongoing capital funding for small urban systems under FTA's Section 5339 program. The NMDOT has been directly applying to FTA for the grants for these allocations and then they enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with each of the state's small urban systems to implement the projects in the grant.

Beginning this year NMDOT is formally sub-allocating the apportionment to each of the state's small urban systems and requiring each small urban to directly apply to FTA for these projects. This means that these projects will have to be in our TIP/STIP. The actual sub-allocation is in the email below and I have attached the sub-allocation agreement letter that NMDOT has provided to FTA. These funds are actually available for us to apply for now. Depending on the TIP cycle and the fact there is not much time left in the current federal fiscal year, I defer to your recommendation as to whether these should be added as a FY16 or FY17 project.

We need to have a new project added to the TIP to reflect this new source of funding.

The project would be for revenue vehicle rolling stock at an 85/15 match

FTA Section 5339 sub-allocated by NMDOT:	\$172,335	85%
Local match:	\$ 30,413	15%
Total Project:	\$202,748	


Because at this time this source of funding seems to be ongoing, we probably could replicate the project amount in future "in" years in the TIP, but again I defer to your recommendation on this.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Mike Bartholomew

Transit Administrator/Transportation Department/Transit Section

Direct: 575-541-2537 Main: 575-541-2500, mbartholomew@las-cruces.org



----- Original message -----

From: "Harris, David C, NMDOT" <DavidC.Harris@state.nm.us>

Date: 4/29/16 8:59 AM (GMT-07:00)

To: "City of Las Cruces Roadrunner Transit (MBARTHOLOMEW@las-cruces.org)" <MBARTHOLOMEW@las-cruces.org>

Cc: "Eppler, Marsha, NMDOT" <Marsha.Eppler@state.nm.us>, "Bach, Deborah, NMDOT" <Deborah.Bach@state.nm.us>

Subject: Las Cruces FY16 Section 5339 Suballocation Letter

Hi Mike,

The FY 2016 FTA Section 5339 small urban appropriations were published and can be found at: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/apportionments/table-12-fiscal-year-2016-section-5339-bus-and-bus-facilities-apportionments>

Similar to the prior years, we will continue to distribute Section 5339 funds by utilizing the Section 5307 formula distribution. Unlike prior years, Las Cruces will apply directly to FTA for these funds.

Please sign the attached suballocation letter and return it to me for my signature as soon as possible. We will be sending the complete packet along with your signed letters to FTA Region VI.

Dave

.....
David C. Harris, AICP

Transit Manager, [Transit and Rail Division](#)
[New Mexico Department of Transportation](#)
505.699.4350
davidc.harris@state.nm.us

Funding will be rounded to the nearest dollar.





METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 19, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 Multi-Use Loop Trail Alternative Selection

DISCUSSION:

For several years, the MPO has been working with its member agencies to develop a multi-use trail loop around the urban core of Las Cruces. The loop currently exists on the western, northern, and eastern sides of Las Cruces. Currently the loop is incomplete on the southern leg.


Through 2016, MPO Staff has engaged in a process to evaluate alternatives for the southern leg. Staff has solicited feedback from the Policy Committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, Elephant Butte Irrigation District, New Mexico State University, Town of Mesilla, Doña Ana County, and the City of Las Cruces during this process.

At their June meeting, the Policy Committee directed Staff to return to the advisory committees with refined alternatives. The BPAC may endorse its previous selection or make an alternate selection.

The Policy Committee intends to resume selection on this item at its August meeting.

All Options Proposed Multi-Use Connection

Triviz Trail Extension
Transportation Improvement
Plan # LC00250



0 0.25 0.5 1 Miles

Legend

- Railroad
- Streets Background
- Current Multi-Use Facility
- Rio Grande River
- Mesilla Boundary
- Municipal Boundary
- NMSU Boundary
- County Boundary

Proposed Multi-Use Facilities

- Main Trail Route
- Option A Route
- Option B Route
- Option C Route
- Option D Route
- Option E Route

Mesilla Valley
Metropolitan
Planning Organization





METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF July 17, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Crash Data Discussion

DISCUSSION:

MPO Staff will discuss crash data from 2012-2014 in terms of crash rate, severity and type, including bicycles and pedestrians.