



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, 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
POLICY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **October 12, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **City of Las Cruces Council Chambers**, 700 North Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](#).

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** *Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.* _____ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 4.1. September 14, 2016 _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Missouri Study Corridor _____ **BHI**
 - 5.2. NMDOT update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **POLICY COMMITTEE**

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held September 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.
6 in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
9 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
10 Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
11 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
12 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
13 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
14 Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
15

16 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
17 Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
18

19 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
20 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
21 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
22 Dominic Loya (MPO staff)
23

24 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Jolene Herrera
25 Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
26

27 **1. CALL TO ORDER (1:02 p.m.)**
28

29 Sorg: Mr. Murphy do we have a quorum?
30

31 Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair, we do.
32

33 Sorg: Then I call the meeting to order.
34

35 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**
36

37 Sorg: First item on the agenda is the Conflict of Interest. Is there any Member of
38 the Committee or staff that has a known conflict of interest of an item on
39 the agenda? Hearing none.
40

41 ALL NONE.
42

43 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**
44

45 Sorg: We'll go straight to Public Comment. Is there any member of the public
46 that wants to speak to the Policy Committee? Seeing none.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 August 10, 2016

Sorg: We'll move on to approved minutes, oops, Approval of Minutes.

Hancock: Motion to approve.

Eakman: Second.

Murphy: Mr. Chair. We, we do have two, two separate meeting minutes on the, on the agenda for approval.

Sorg: Okay. So we'll need an, a, a motion to approve each one.

Hancock: Mr. Chair. My motion is on August the 10th 2016.

Eakman: My second also.

Sorg: Okay. Moved by Commissioner Hancock and a second by Councilor Eakman. Is there any corrections or additions or comments about the minutes? Seeing none, Mr. Murphy would you take a poll.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Yes.

Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

1 Garrett: Yes.
2
3 Murphy: And the Chair.
4
5 Sorg: Yes.
6
7 **4.2 August 24, 2016 Special Meeting**
8
9 Sorg: Then there's the minutes of the meeting of August 24th.
10
11 Hancock: Motion to approve.
12
13 Eakman: Second.
14
15 Sorg: Moved again by Commissioner Hancock and second by Commissioner
16 Hand, Garret, no, excuse me, Councilor Eakman. Is there any changes in
17 that minutes, those minutes or comments? Seeing none we can take a
18 vote.
19
20 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
21
22 Doolittle: Yes.
23
24 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
25
26 Flores: Yes.
27
28 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
29
30 Benavidez: Yes.
31
32 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
33
34 Eakman: Yes.
35
36 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
37
38 Hancock: Yes.
39
40 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
41
42 Garrett: Yes.
43
44 Murphy: And the Chair.
45
46 Sorg: Yes.

1
2 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

3
4 **5.1 Resolution 16-11: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a**
5 **Memorandum of Understanding between the MPO and the Camino**
6 **Real Consortium**
7

8 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle, do you have the microphone figured out yet? Okay. Very
9 good. I see you struggling there. Okay. The next is the Action Item 5.1,
10 Resolution 16-11: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a
11 Memorandum of Understanding between the MPO and the real, Camino
12 Real Consortium.
13

14 Hancock: Mr. Chair. Motion to approve.
15

16 Sorg: Is there a second?
17

18 Flores: I'll second it.
19

20 Sorg: Okay. Moved by Commissioner Hancock again and, and a second
21 Trustee Flores. Mr. Murphy.
22

23 Murphy: Mr. Chair. This is a Memorandum of Understanding between us and the,
24 and the group that's known as the Camino Real Consortium which brought
25 us the, the Viva Dona Ana Project and the Camino Real Corridor study,
26 several other, the Unified Development Code. What this MOU does for
27 the MPO, it commits us to participating in this, in this group where the,
28 where many regional agencies gather, share information about, about
29 their projects and, and you know generally coordinate to better involve the
30 public in, you know in the planning process. Several, several of you have
31 sat at that table although Commissioner Garrett and Trustee Flores have
32 been the main drivers through this and so I'd you know like to defer to
33 them if they would like to add anything to this, just with the last caveat that
34 this, this is just a Memorandum of Understanding. It does not take any of
35 the MPO's decision-making authority away from it. It just, it just, we just
36 agree to, to communicate with others in the region. And with that I will
37 stand ...
38

39 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Murphy. Is there a Member of the Committee would like to
40 speak to this MOU? Trustee Flores.
41

42 Flores: No, I, I just, yeah I ditto that and say that it's nice, it's another way to help
43 get community input. So that's the way I see it.
44

45 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
46

1 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
2
3 Garrett: Thank you and, and I appreciate the Policy Committee considering
4 continuation of the involvement with the, the Camino Real. The, one thing
5 that, that might be worth taking a look at it if you haven't had a chance to
6 do it at some point is the program goals and long-term desired outcomes
7 which are begun on page 55. I think it's important to recognize that for
8 about three and a half years or so we have been engaged largely in doing
9 planning and so the next phase is getting into implementation. That may
10 very well require some additional studies and plans, but it also could result
11 in actual construction of, of things and development of, of regulatory tools
12 and, and this is something that can help all of the entities that work within
13 the region that we're concerned with, and that's Dona Ana County.
14 A major part of the, of the concern of the, of the Consortium that
15 are expressed in, in our livability principles have to do with transportation
16 choices and with supporting good transportation development and the
17 good relationships between transportation and other functions. So I think
18 that it, that this is a, a very important venue for sharing ideas and
19 information and, and, and actually getting people to understand more
20 about what different organizations and entities are concerned with, but
21 because we have finished the, this, the Comprehensive Plan and, and
22 we've had this grant through the Sustainable Communities Program we're
23 actually in a good position now to support other grant applications by
24 partners of the Consortium. So for example this is potentially something
25 that could be used to support other transportation-related initiatives and
26 we don't, the reason this is an MOU is that there are, there're no
27 conditions here that have to do with money or, or contributions of in-kind
28 time on projects because we don't have any projects as such. Those
29 kinds of agreements will be made and they'll in effect be smaller contract
30 agreements underneath the, the umbrella of the MOU. So I think it's
31 important. We're, all we're really doing is reaching out, tying in at a
32 regional level and, and then being able to move forward from there.
33 Thank you.
34
35 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Garrett, or Commissioner Garrett. So is there any other
36 comments on this resolution, questions? Seeing none, oh.
37
38 Benavidez: I have a question.
39
40 Sorg: Yes Commissioner Benavidez.
41
42 Benavidez: Okay. It says on E, "more access to funding and investment opportunities
43 from public and private sources that recognize the value of coordinated
44 approaches to the regional challenges." Is, so are we saying that the El
45 Camino Consortium will assist us in that or how does that work?
46

1 Garrett: I'd be happy, I'd be happy to answer that. Where is that, what page
2 number?
3
4 Benavidez: It's on page 51 E right after "Benefits to Members."
5
6 Garrett: Okay, good. The Consortium can work with either entities internal to the,
7 to the Consortium or with members, or entities outside. Right now the, the
8 County for example is looking for projects that would help support and
9 implement parts of the, the Viva Dona Ana initiative. The COG also has
10 capacity to look for grants. There're a number of different entities that
11 have capacity to look for grants so I think it's, it's more, this is simply a
12 recognition that we're not looking just within our own entity, that by signing
13 on, if we see something that benefits what we're trying to do with this
14 overall initiative, we just flag it and let other people know about it. There,
15 there's no staff other than there's County staff and you know the, we've
16 got facilities there at the County. So the, this is sort of being nested in and
17 supported by the County but it's not just a County program. This is a
18 Consortium effort.
19
20 Benavidez: Thank you very much. I really appreciate that exploration. Thank you.
21
22 Sorg: Good. If there's no further discussion then we'll take a vote Mr. Murphy.
23
24 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
25
26 Doolittle: Yes.
27
28 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
29
30 Flores: Yes.
31
32 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
33
34 Benavidez: Yes.
35
36 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
37
38 Eakman: Yes.
39
40 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
41
42 Hancock: Yes.
43
44 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
45
46 Garrett: Yes.

1
2 Murphy: And Chair.
3
4 Sorg: Yes. I would like to point out there was, or it was pointed out to me I
5 should say that we didn't take a roll call today, but I asked if there was a
6 quorum and you said there was and so if it's okay with the Committee we'll
7 bypass that. We all signed in the sheet anyway.
8
9 Murphy: We do, and, and from the recorded votes we do have ...
10
11 Sorg: Yes.
12
13 Murphy: A member from each, each entity.
14
15 Sorg: Right.
16
17 Murphy: And, and five minimum.
18
19 Sorg: Very good.
20

21 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

22 23 **6.1 Missouri Study Corridor**

24
25 Sorg: So the next item on the agenda is Discussion Items, 6.1: Missouri Study
26 Corridor. Mr. Murphy.
27

28 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. As, as you are aware we have been under contract
29 with Bohannan Huston to, to study the Missouri corridor inclusive of
30 Roadrunner Parkway to, to the vicinity of Centennial High School. We're
31 getting ready for our final public meeting that we're going to have on
32 September 29th at the Farm and Ranch Museum. MPO staff and the
33 consultant have been working diligently with the Bicycle and Pedestrian
34 Advisory Committee as well as the Technical Advisory Committee on, on
35 aspects of this study and refining the results, and the consultant's ready to
36 present to the public one last time and we wanted to present, present their
37 update to you at this time.

38 So we undertook the, we undertook this study because of a
39 perceived need for connectivity and additional transportation options to the
40 Centennial High School site which at the time we started, we started down
41 this road was a, was a newly-constructed high school for the Las Cruces
42 Public School District.

43 We are doing this under the auspices of the NMDOT Location
44 Study Process. Since we're using PL funds on this we are strictly limited
45 to Phase A activities. We cannot do any, any sort of advanced
46 engineering on this study. We're looking at what kind of roadway

1 alternatives would potentially extend to the area of Centennial and
2 Sonoma Ranch. We're looking at the number of travel lanes, provision of
3 bicycle lanes, perhaps a multi-use path or in lieu of that solely a motor, a
4 non-motorized trail, or of course we're always required to entertain the no-
5 build scenario where we do not proceed any further.

6 So under this, the Alternative 1 is the no-build. The proposed
7 roadways would remain on the major, on the Future Roadway Map and at
8 such time in the future that it, that the need may become more
9 pronounced we can revisit it at that time.

10 Alternative 2 is looking at an extension of Missouri Avenue as just a
11 collector build, presumably two or three lanes from its end in the city, at
12 the city limits to a connection with Sonoma Ranch just north of the high
13 school site.

14 Alternative 3 would be, it would be instead a extension of
15 Roadrunner Parkway south of Lohman Avenue where the, the Walgreens
16 is located on that corner and that would extend southward and eventually
17 east to connect to that previous future Missouri alignment and connect
18 with Sonoma Ranch again.

19 The fourth alternative would be the, the Metropolitan Transportation
20 Plan full build-out where both, both of those facilities would be
21 constructed. Would note that back to the previous slide but on this slide
22 as well Roadrunner would be constructed as a minor arterial which could
23 be three or four lanes, a higher-speed, less-access facility.

24 Alternative 5 would be to move the connection to Sonoma Ranch
25 slightly north. The advantages of this one would've been fewer, fewer
26 drainage facilities constructed within the roadways, fewer arroyos to, to
27 cross, potentially lower-pay, or lower-cost projects.

28 Alternative 6 that the consultant looked at would be to just at this
29 time develop a pedestrian/bicycle connection, give non-motorized access
30 to the high school. Also it would blend into a, there's a, Farm and Ranch
31 is working with a group that is, not sure exactly how to describe it but it, it's
32 called AdobeHenge and it's, it, it's essentially an open space recreational
33 use within that land to the south of our proposed alignment and this would
34 create better access to that as well.

35 We've had the consultant do a, a preliminary drainage analysis,
36 we've conducted bicycle level of service, and we've ran our, our travel
37 demand model on, on the options. They're going to present the short list
38 of recommendations on September 28th and then with, considering the
39 comment coming back from that we'll, we'll be coming back to this group
40 on October 12th, give you a briefing and then hopefully have, have the
41 document finalized for your November meeting. We developed an
42 evaluation matrix which I left on my desk. I, each of the, each of the
43 alternatives have criteria that we, that was evaluated for, for further,
44 further study.

45 What we're looking, and barring any surprises at the last public
46 hearing we expect that the consultant's going to come back with the

1 recommendations for further study would be a non-motorized path which
2 is Alternative 6 or simply the Missouri extension for Alternative, Alternative
3 2 and then the, these three alternatives are being removed from
4 consideration for the, for any future Phase B that may be, may be
5 conducted.
6 We kind of touched on these throughout the, throughout the
7 presentation so I, at this I will hope to answer any of your questions.
8
9 Sorg: Any questions by the Committee? Councilor Eakman.
10
11 Eakman: Yes. It would be helpful for me to look over the matrix again that you had.
12 It would explain many things to me. I, I don't think we need to do it now
13 but I'd appreciate a copy of that matrix that I could study.
14
15 Murphy: I, I will, I did print it out. I just failed to bring it into this room. While, I'll, I'll
16 pass it out while the next, while the next presentation is going on. But
17 we're not voting on anything today. We don't anticipate you voting until
18 November so I'll pass it out, you'll have, you'll have sufficient time to, to
19 look at it and ask any questions.
20
21 Sorg: Could you e-mail the digital copy?
22
23 Murphy: Yes.
24
25 Sorg: Okay. That would be nice. Commissioner Hancock.
26
27 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. How does Choice 6 fit with the broader bicycle plan
28 and pedestrian plans for the entire area?
29
30 Murphy: We have, we do, on the, on the Trails Plan and on, on the Bicycle
31 Priorities Plan. I, we do show a, a, a bicycle connection to the high school
32 area. This would, you know this would forward that making that
33 connection with the, with the thought being that you know the high school
34 students that travel there would be a, a population that could take
35 advantage of non-motorized transportation.
36
37 Hancock: And does that also fit with the, the plans that run along, going up north?
38 Isn't there a path that runs to the north for bicycling and then back down?
39
40 Murphy: I, along Roadrunner Parkway?
41
42 Hancock: I believe it goes up off of, let's see what the name of the road is, where
43 University Avenue goes on for, Baylor Canyon, Dripping Springs Road,
44 there it is. Dripping Springs Road. Isn't there, isn't there a plan for bicycle
45 lanes along Drip, Dripping Springs?
46

1 Murphy: We have, we have called out for bicycle lanes on Dripping Springs ...
2
3 Hancock: Yeah.
4
5 Murphy: On our long-range plan.
6
7 Hancock: Right.
8
9 Murphy: I know as projects are, are developed in those areas I, I do believe you
10 know the County is, is working on extending, extending the bike lane
11 through that area.
12
13 Hancock: Okay. So it, it would be possible then to connect, this would then connect
14 over to Sonoma Ranch would then, would then connect into Dripping
15 Springs and ...
16
17 Murphy: That's, that's correct.
18
19 Hancock: Tie in overall.
20
21 Murphy: And, and we also, our plan also calls for Sonoma Ranch to have bicycle
22 lanes on it as well so we're, we do, we do look at the overall connectivity
23 for, for bicycles ...
24
25 Hancock: Good.
26
27 Murphy: In our planning.
28
29 Hancock: Good. I know that's very popular. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.
30
31 Sorg: Yes. Staff has just passed out the alternatives evaluation matrix draft so I
32 think we can cancel that, unless somebody wants a digital copy anyway.
33
34 Eakman: Mr. Chair.
35
36 Sorg: Yes Commissioner Eakman.
37
38 Eakman: Could we get a smaller font please?
39
40 Sorg: Thank you.
41
42 Eakman: We're, we're ...
43
44 Sorg: Councilor.
45
46 Eakman: Wasting paper here.

1
2 Sorg: Yes. We are. Okay. New glasses are in order. So anyway that's that.
3 Commission, Commissioner Garrett.
4
5 Garrett: Thank you. And I appreciate the, it's been a while since we've talked
6 about this, at least as my, my recollection in terms of the, the Committee.
7 Could you basically recap why the proposed alternatives that were
8 dropped were dropped?
9
10 Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. And the, the matrix passed out will
11 also help answer that. Essentially the short answer on the Roadrunner
12 extension, it was going to be a more, it was going to be a higher-cost
13 facility to, to build. The travel demand model shows that it did not take as
14 much traffic to the, to the high school as, as was stated out in the purpose
15 and need. Most of the traffic, no most of the demand we saw traveling on
16 that was essentially using you know, it was, it was going to the north and
17 the east and was essentially just moving traffic over from existing Sonoma
18 Ranch over to, over to Roadrunner, so it didn't really provide any new
19 connectivity in that regard. The northern alignments were, were dropped
20 because, because of the associated costs with, I, the, the, it, it didn't, it
21 didn't get it you know closer to the, close to the high school and the cost
22 differences with the, with the difference in drainage facilities did not make,
23 did not make sense to the, to the team and to the project team analyzing
24 it. And then the MTP scenario didn't, essentially that was a cost one and
25 it, and it really did not provide that much added benefit building both of
26 them at this time.
27
28 Garrett: Could, could you go to Alternative 4? And, and 5 is simply, yeah it's, it, it,
29 it just runs a little bit higher up. I think part of what I'm, I'm interested in is
30 number one, there's, the extension of Roadrunner would not take any
31 pressure off of the intersection of Telshor and Lohman? I mean the ...
32
33 Murphy: Yes.
34
35 Garrett: One of the things that's interesting about this whole thing is that you know
36 there's going to be continued development out to the east and I'm a lot
37 less concerned with what's happening right now than I am with what this
38 might look like in ten years and the idea of sort of cul-de-sac-ing
39 Roadrunner and so you can't go any further south and you terminate
40 Missouri which is, I mean we keep talking about how there, the problems
41 with north-south transportation on the east side of the, of the city. And this
42 is, it's going to put more traffic if, if we don't do this kind of thing it's going
43 to put more traffic on Dripping Springs and more traffic on Lohman. So I
44 mean if you just, and you know and, and you know we've got AdobeHenge
45 but if you go to Option 4 again you know what's going to happen in sort of
46 the, the area north of the, I don't know fuchsia line above the high school?

1 There's a pretty big area there. Is that going to be a park? Is that going to
2 be undeveloped or is that likely to be developed?
3

4 Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Those are great observations and
5 just to actually, and to, to point out by going with the, if Alternative 2 were
6 to be the one advanced, Roadrunner Parkway would not come off the
7 Future Roadway Map. The, we looked at the travel demand model with
8 the year 2040 projected socioeconomics and although it was outside the
9 scope of our consultant's contract to look at Telshor/Missouri it did have a,
10 it did have a small effect on that intersection at that time, probably not
11 enough to justify advancing it at this, at this time. We're, we're putting it
12 first in line for, for the next build. But I think we just need to, just to remain
13 cognizant that we are not saying that Roadrunner will never be built. It
14 just does not need to be built first on, you know based, you know based
15 on the projected 2040 numbers that we used. As we update our
16 Transportation Plan every five years and if we start experiencing a
17 different level of growth where the traffic is projected to, to increase
18 significantly over what we're, what we're projecting today, we can always
19 readjust our priorities at this point. But based on, based on our current
20 understanding you know that it does not rise to the immediate, the
21 immediate need.
22

23 Garrett: So do right-of-ways exist for these alignments yet or would one of the
24 things, would this process nail down some alignments and, and, and right-
25 of-ways on those alignments?
26

27 Murphy: If we were to, if we're, say proceed with Alternative 2 we would, or
28 depending on who builds it, the City or the County would then work with
29 BLM, the land owner to you know, to secure the right-of-ways for that.
30 The existence of these corridors on the MPO's Future Roadway Map so if
31 the, ensures that if, if the land is turned over to a private entity and it is,
32 get developed we get the, or the, the government gets the right-of-way at
33 the time of subdivisions because it is placed on the MPO's map. Although
34 not, not constructed and this, Roadrunner from Lohman down to this, if
35 you guys see the, see the mouse ...
36

37 Garrett: Right.
38

39 Murphy: At the corner of the city limits that land on either side has been subdivided
40 and the right-of-way has been acquired for that portion. It just has not
41 been constructed at this time so, so the right-of-way preservation will, will
42 be ensured through continuance of the corridors on the MPO's maps.
43

44 Garrett: Very good. And just to, to make sure that I'm, I'm clear about this the
45 Roadrunner Parkway extension south from Wal-Mart (*Walgreens*) to the
46 corner there that you are showing where the, what, the far, yeah and I'm

1 sorry, the, the pharmacy that's, that's at the intersection of Lohman and,
2 right, from that south to the limits, the city limit right there, there's sufficient
3 easement already in place to, to put the, the road in?
4
5 Murphy: I, I've seen the subdivision plats where there's 100 feet of right-of-way
6 dedicated.
7
8 Garrett: That's all I need. Okay. Thank you.
9
10 Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett and Mr. Murphy. Is there any others?
11 Commissioner Benavidez.
12
13 Benavidez: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Okay. Alternative Number 2 as we see right
14 now and Alternative 6 the, the bicycle pathway, does that go around the,
15 the, the same path?
16
17 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Benavidez. I do believe in these illustrations
18 they do though they don't necessarily have to depending upon what we
19 learn going down the road.
20
21 Benavidez: Okay. And the bicycle path, does it go further south towards the high
22 school or is there a path there on Sonoma?
23
24 Murphy: I can't recall it, if there are currently bike lanes on Sonoma but, I, I'm
25 getting acknowledgement that yes, there are bike lanes on Sonoma and
26 any widening of Sonoma would, would continue those bike lanes per the
27 MPO's Bicycle Facilities Plan.
28
29 Benavidez: Great. Thank you. Thank you very much.
30
31 Sorg: Any others? If not I, I, I have to ask a question. On Alternative 2, the
32 Missouri build-out, would the bike path and walking path be equivalent to
33 Alternative 6 or size-wise, the path be as big or has that been determined
34 yet?
35
36 Murphy: Mr. Chair. It's not been determined.
37
38 Sorg: Okay.
39
40 Murphy: But through discussions with the, the consultant their, their vision of it is, is
41 some, is something that they could be combined, done together or one
42 could, you know or, or the path could go ahead of the roadway.
43
44 Sorg: First and then the road second.
45
46 Murphy: Yes.

1
2 Sorg: At ...
3
4 Murphy: But, but not ...
5
6 Sorg: A later date.
7
8 Murphy: But keep it so that one does not preclude the other.
9
10 Sorg: Yeah. Okay. Well I wasn't going to say very much tonight, today but I
11 can't help it. I spent a little time in the Netherlands and Germany here
12 late, recently and I, I was amazed at their bike paths and their sidewalks,
13 huge. And the number of people using them are huge numbers. They
14 have enough cars too but they have a lot of bike paths and they're well-
15 used and I'll never forget my son's comment in Amsterdam. Without me
16 prodding he said, "I'm amazed how, how fit people look here." Everybody
17 that was running around or walking around or biking around, whatever,
18 very fit. There wasn't much obesity we saw over there. And of course we
19 know that having public transportation as well as bike paths and more
20 walking paths contribute to that and we've been saying that in the City
21 Council too. So I, I, I hope we can have on the Missouri extension if that's
22 the choice we have, we have a significant bike path and, and a, a walking
23 path for those students going to the high school there and, and, and
24 others. Yes. That's it. If there's no other questions or comments.

25 26 **6.2 Committee Training**

27
28 Sorg: We'll go on to the next item on the agenda, another Discussion Item 6.2,
29 more training. Mr. Wray.
30
31 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Staff is going to use the
32 opportunity today to, to begin a conversation that this Committee is going
33 to have multiple times over the next several months and, and in the years
34 to follow. MPO staff began this project which is a, a, a crash, a crash
35 analysis project some months ago and we're presenting some preliminary
36 results to this Committee today.

37 The purpose of the project was to analyze areas within the Las
38 Cruces urbanized area, areas that have a recurrent pattern of crashes.
39 Specifically this particular analysis focused on a, signalized intersection
40 was, was kind of the, the, the unit of measurement that was utilized.
41 We're, we're hoping to be able to, to use this analysis to, to move forward
42 to perhaps isolate some areas where there is a significant pattern of
43 crashes where there, we might be able to identify infrastructure problems
44 that could be remediated through various means. Also, this year the
45 Federal Highway Administration released their, their guidelines for
46 performance measures for safety. In fact they did that just within the past

1 couple of weeks. And that is a project that this Committee is going to
2 have to take on in the very near future, to be determining the performance
3 measures that will be adopted by this MPO but I will go into a little bit more
4 detail as to what is going to be required by that process as the
5 presentation goes on. This particular analysis that I'm, that I'm going to
6 discuss today is specific to the years 2012, 2013, and 2014. There are
7 121 signalized intersections that were examined as part of this analysis.
8 Staff did combine the results with AADT volumes to calculate the
9 intersection crash rate and I'll go over that in more detail in just a minute,
10 but just overall the crash rate is a very useful tool to, to determine the
11 relative safety of an intersection as opposed to just the raw crash total and
12 I'll go into some specifics about why that's so just a little bit later on.

13 Just a little bit of terminology that I want to cover: AADT and
14 everyone's probably familiar with it but it stands for Annual Average Daily
15 Traffic. It's the average traffic that flowing over a particular road segment,
16 that's the, the data that our, that the MPO Traffic Count Program, it
17 collects and submits up to NMDOT. The Intersection Crash Rate
18 measures the, the number of crashes controlled for the number of vehicles
19 present on the road. It's calculated as follows on the screen. I'm not
20 going to recite the formula cause you can read it faster than I can, than I
21 can read it off for you. But that is the formula that was utilized to
22 determine the crash rate. Some other terminology: Property damage only
23 crashes are crashes that involve damage only to vehicles involved. Injury
24 crashes, excuse me, injury crashes are crashes that involve personal
25 injury to the parties involved and fatal crashes are crashes that result in
26 the death of at least one party involved.

27 Now this is the, the overall map and I, I realize that it has a lot of
28 information on it and we, we will delve into more detail about it. The red
29 portion of the map on the left side, that is the, the, the total number of
30 crashes and the blue is the crash rate and what I, what I want to highlight
31 on this particular map is that it, it does, the crashes do follow predictable
32 corridors. We have Valley here, University, Lohman, some along Madrid,
33 and then Main Street and very similar, very similar patterns of occurrence
34 along the crash rate. But as we'll see in just a moment, rate does not
35 necessarily correlate strictly with total crashes.

36 These, these are the highest spots within the, the, the areas of
37 analysis. We have this, Lohman and Walton which is the highest, highest
38 total crashes but there are some differences as to what the highest crash
39 rates are. And we will go into a little more detail on the next couple of
40 slides. And I want to ask the Committee's indulgence as we're going to be
41 going back and forth across these next couple of slides a bit, and certainly
42 stop me at any time if you have any questions or want some clarification
43 about it, but I do want to, to highlight Lohman and Walton. We will see
44 that particular intersection a number of times throughout this analysis. It
45 has the highest total crashes within the area that we analyzed for this
46 process. It had 112 total crashes during the total time of the analysis.

1 Lohman and Telshor had the second highest with 105. But if we go to
2 crash rate there is a, a vast drop-off between the two highest which is not
3 the, does not correlate directly with some of the, the highest total crashes.
4 But again Lohman and Walton is the third highest, has the third highest
5 crash rate but we see Lohman and Telshor has a relatively low crash rate
6 which we attribute to the safety improvements that the City of Las Cruces
7 did within the past several years but before the period of analysis that this
8 particular study covered. Now I'd, I do want to spend a little bit of time
9 talking about the, the Bataan Memorial West and Del Rey, and Bataan
10 Memorial East and Mesa Grande because there is a, a very distinct drop-
11 off between these two highest and the rest and while staff does not have
12 the information present at this time really to make any sort of
13 recommendations regarding this, we do strongly encourage that further
14 study is done on these two particular intersections because the crash rate
15 is so very high.

16 These are the property damage only crashes. Again Lohman and
17 Walton is very high on that list. Lohman and Telshor does have the
18 highest property damage crashes but that's to be expected as that does
19 have a relatively high absolute number of crashes when, when looked at.
20 Also you see here, if my cursor will come back, Elks, Main, and Triviz also
21 appears very high on the property damage only crashes which it also was
22 the third highest of the total crashes.

23 Total injury crashes, again Lohman and Walton. This one is at the
24 very top of the injury crashes. Again this, while, while Lohman and Walton
25 is not at the top of every single metric there it, it is in the top three of all of
26 them. That intersection is one that, that very obviously is going to need
27 some, some further study and analysis and hopefully some, some
28 remediation will be possible to improve the situation there. Again Lohman
29 and Walnut is another very high injury crashes, and then here we have
30 Bataan Memorial West and Del Rey as having the third highest rate of
31 injury crashes during the period of study.

32 And we did have one fatal crash. The location of that was actually
33 a little bit of an outlier. It, it was at the intersection of Triviz and University
34 which did not rate that high on either crash rate or, or total crashes but
35 that was the location of the fatal accident that we had during this particular
36 period of study.

37 Moving on to, to, to some bicycle and pedestrian issues, you see
38 before you on the chart the list of the top bicycle-involved crashes. I do
39 want to, to kind of pause at this time and say that there are some issues
40 that we have regarding the collection of bicycle crash data. The, the
41 methodology in our estimation is a bit flawed but for the years that we, that
42 we have the data, this is the data that we have. Just want to, to highlight
43 Alameda and El Paseo and Main as one of the three highest which we, we
44 know from previous conversations that that is a little bit of a problematic
45 area for cycling in the area.

1 And here's the pedestrian-involved crashes. You see Locust and
2 University, a lot of student traffic. That one is, was the highest for the area
3 and then Hadley and Valley which was a, a little bit unexpected for staff
4 was the second highest. We were, we, we did not think that that one
5 would be the one that would be the second highest of incidents. And
6 again pedestrian-involved crashes have the, have a, a similar collection
7 and reporting problem as bicycle crashes. We're ...
8

9 Eakman: May I, may, may I mention something right now?

10
11 Wray: Certainly.

12
13 Eakman: I see Valley Drive mentioned often there ...

14
15 Wray: There, yes.

16
17 Eakman: And we're going to have improvements to Valley Drive next year. I was
18 wondering if we're mitigating some of those issues that we're seeing here
19 with pedestrian safety or if, if they can be a part of that study.
20

21 Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. We're not really at a position to, to say as,
22 as a part of this study. We didn't delve down into the data as deeply as
23 that to analyze all the specific causes. I will say that we certainly hope
24 that it will be remediated but we will be, we will definitely be looking,
25 looking for or looking ahead and do, and looking at some of that exact
26 analysis as we go forward, as we will need to do so for the FHWA
27 performance, performance measures.
28

29 Eakman: But there is no manner for a pedestrian to cross Valley.

30
31 Wray: That is, that is correct sir. Yes.

32
33 Sorg: Excuse me, there is no what across Valley?

34
35 Eakman: There is no signals at all for a, a pedestrian to cross Valley.

36
37 Sorg: Really? Oh. I was going to ask if Mr. Trent from DOT would have any
38 comments or not? Maybe not.
39

40 Doolittle: So I kind of agree with Andrew that it's a little premature to say whether
41 we are or aren't going to address that. We're currently in the design
42 phase, very early on. I know that we are doing some intersection
43 improvements through that corridor. I can't remember if Hadley is
44 specifically one that we're adding signals to. But of course pedestrian, as
45 part of the design they have to look at accident history.
46

1 Sorg: Okay. Thank ...
2
3 Doolittle: So I would say that we're going to address it one way or the other. I just
4 don't know the specifics.
5
6 Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Trent. You can proceed then ...
7
8 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
9
10 Sorg: Oh. Commissioner Garrett.
11
12 Garrett: Be, before, before we leave that, I think that I'm correct in saying that the
13 walk to school program for, yeah Safe Routes to School for MacArthur
14 begins at the grocery store on the west side of Valley and then it's, it,
15 basically you go right through the Valley and, and Hadley intersection in
16 order to walk to the school. And when I saw that it, it caused me to think,
17 "What's the area that is being served by that school and how many of
18 them are, of the kids are on the west side of Valley and have to cross?"
19 So I, I, I just would say if, if they're, cause there's some residential areas in
20 that area and I think it might be worthwhile just double-checking that
21 location just, just to follow-up on the point that Councilor Eakman was
22 making.
23
24 Sorg: Thank you Mr., Commissioner Garrett. Yeah. Of course we want all new
25 projects to emphasize pedestrian safety.
26
27 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
28
29 Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.
30
31 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. It strikes me, when on the previous slides there
32 was, seemed to be some common factors and is there a way to look at the
33 characteristics of those intersections to see if there's a common factor? It
34 struck me that there are double turn lanes at all of those intersections and,
35 and some of them have turn lanes to the right and turn lanes, double turn
36 lanes to the left or double turn lanes to the right and double, and a single
37 turn lane to the left but I'm just, it just jumped off at me and I'm wondering
38 if that is a factor that, that could be considered.
39
40 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. That, that, that is one, that's a good
41 idea of how we could look at. I think our initial thoughts on this, we would
42 be identifying the problem intersections, the ones that have the ultra-high
43 occurrence and then we would use, use that as, you know as a vehicle for,
44 to look at each of those intersections more in-depth, perhaps you know
45 request road safety audits and then each, each intersection find solutions
46 for those. But that, you know that would be an excellent idea for us to look

1 for commonality among types and, and perhaps adjust our, our design
2 standards on how we build those intersections so I, I thank you for that
3 idea.
4

5 Wray: Moving on then Mr. Chair. As I mentioned earlier in the presentation the,
6 the FHWA has now sent out their, their guidelines for the performance
7 measures. The, the, the five measures are on the screen: The number of
8 fatalities, rate of fatalities, number of serious injuries, rate of serious
9 injuries, and number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious
10 injuries. These are the items that FHWA expects the performance
11 measures adopted by the states and the MPOs to deal with. We're not
12 necessarily limited to those but as you see before you on the chart there,
13 we have two options to, to, to potentially pursue and we're in the very early
14 stages of information gathering, but effectively the MPO can choose to
15 agree to support the State, the State performance measures as you can
16 see on the chart what that would require, or the MPO can establish its own
17 HSIP which is Highway Safety Improvement Program performance
18 measures. We're, we're nowhere near a point at, at, at this moment in
19 time where we can make a determination as to whether we want to
20 support the State standards or whether we, we want to, to develop our
21 own because the State has not yet really begun the process to my
22 knowledge of developing what their own standards are going to be so until
23 they do so it's a bit difficult for us to, to, to state with any certainty what,
24 what we should or should not do. However leading up to this staff is
25 certainly going to be engaged in process of continuing to do this analysis
26 so that we are prepared for the time when, comes when we do know what
27 those measurements are going to be. Specifically things that we know
28 that we need to address is that we are going to have to expand the scope
29 of our analysis beyond just look, tying crashes to signalized intersections.
30 We're going to have look beyond that analysis and then apply the VMT
31 considerations to that. Again we're also going to have to determine
32 whether or not, and this is more of a broad, this Committee is going to
33 have to determine whether or not the MPO is going to support the NMDOT
34 HSIP targets or whether this MPO is going to have its own HSIP targets.
35 And I'll stand now for any questions and I'm certainly happy to go back to
36 any slides that the Committee wishes to, to look at and I, I want to state at
37 this moment that this presentation is going to be posted on our website at
38 the Calendar Item for this meeting before the end of the day today so.
39

40 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Wray. Is there any questions or comments? I see
41 Commissioner Hancock's light is on.
42

43 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Is there something to prevent us from having higher
44 standards?
45

46 Wray: No. No. No.

1
2 Hancock: So whether the State initiates or not, we can set the standards at a, a, a
3 value level for the health and safety and welfare of our constituents that
4 we deem appropriate.
5
6 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. Yes, we may, we may set our own
7 measures at, at the level that we deem, where we want it. With, we do
8 need to be, keep, keep in mind that the, you know through the legislation
9 Congress has mandated that if you set a, you set a, you set a target that
10 it's a target that you can make. There will be financial penalties
11 associated with not hitting your targets so while we could set them to what
12 we like, we better hit them.
13
14 Hancock: Is there also benefits? In other words if you, if you choose the higher
15 standards and they have penalties, are there extra benefits for choosing
16 higher standards?
17
18 Murphy: I, I do believe that there would, there would be some incentives to, to
19 making, to making them, to, especially when, when those regions that
20 don't make their goals lose out on the money it's got to go somewhere but
21 again we need to be careful that we're realistic.
22
23 Sorg: Trustee Flores first and then ...
24
25 Flores: I just had a ...
26
27 Sorg: Councilor Eakman.
28
29 Flores: Concern seeing as there was one fatality, would some, with a number
30 that's so low it just concerns me because you only need one idiot with
31 more than one person in a car and I can see how that can be very
32 destructive when we have such a low number so I just, I don't know how
33 you deal with that. I mean you can only take, you can only try and
34 improve a design so much but in the end you only need one idiot.
35
36 Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, Trustee Flores. And that, you know in our area we're,
37 we're fortunate enough to you know, we have the one, we, we only had
38 the one. That, that might speak you know that it, we contribute to this, you
39 know be part of the State's targets because we are very you know subject
40 to shocks a lot in those numbers. Also I'd, I do think that FHWA is
41 cognizant of that type of situation and we're continuing to get guidance
42 you know day, you know day by day as, as they release stuff. It, it'll be
43 turned out to be a, a five-year rolling average to help, to help minimize any
44 kind of you know shock effect based on that but you know your, your point
45 is absolutely right on. You know one, one incident can drastically change
46 those numbers.

1
2 Eakman: Thank you Mr. Chair. My experience had, has been in health care
3 administration and this is a classic epidemiological study that you're
4 having right here, absolutely classic. It reminds me of the incidence and
5 prevalence rates of about a 500-bed hospital and my experience is you
6 can drill down so far that everything is meaningless and I think you have
7 some great basic information here. I'm looking forward to, it looks like
8 there are so many opportunities for accidents that maybe we should be
9 congratulating ourselves for the few number of accidents we have rather
10 than looking at these in a truly negative way, but we don't know because
11 we haven't discovered enough at this time. My only advice as you
12 continue is to drill down and if you need help from an epidemiologist I'd
13 really suggest it because then we would really have good information.
14 Thank you.
15
16 Sorg: Thank you Councilor Eakman. May I ask you or anyone here: Do you
17 mean comparing us to other places in, as an epidemiologist, as a, the
18 epidemiology study, would we be comparing ourselves to other cities,
19 other places and so forth?
20
21 Eakman: Only if you're looking for self-improvement and perhaps that is our goal ...
22
23 Sorg: Okay.
24
25 Eakman: Is self-improvement. Rather than comparing ourselves to other folks I
26 would at this point recommend we stay with self-improvement and
27 improve the safety here in our local communities. No, I don't think other
28 communities might be doing this type of study and I congratulate our staff
29 for doing it.
30
31 Sorg: Are other communities doing the same studies?
32
33 Wray: I couldn't answer that.
34
35 Sorg: Okay. If they did, is it possible to obtain that information?
36
37 Wray: I'm, I'm sure we could.
38
39 Sorg: And compare crash rates and so forth.
40
41 Wray: I'm sure we could.
42
43 Sorg: Okay. I'm not saying we have to do it but it might be useful. Any other
44 questions then? Commissioner Benavidez.
45

1 Benavidez: Thank you. The accident that happened on the corner of Triviz and
2 Spruce, that falls into a different time period, correct? That's the, it was a
3 fatal, fatal crash that happened there.
4
5 Wray: Oh, was that the one earlier this year?
6
7 Benavidez: Yes.
8
9 Wray: Yes. That was, that's outside of this study.
10
11 Benavidez: Okay. And what about the other fatal crashes that happened in, one of
12 them in Highway, high, Highway 25 and the other one high, Highway
13 night, 70 that was, I guess, and I don't know if it's in the city limits so
14 would, that would fall, in ...
15
16 Wray: I, I believe, I believe that, that crash happened a year or two before the
17 start of this study if I'm, if I'm thinking of the same, the same crash that
18 you are. I believe that happened in, in 2010 or somewhere in ...
19
20 Benavidez: It, the one on Highway 70 but what about the one on Highway 25, the one
21 that, right off of, right after the exit of Las Cruces?
22
23 Wray: I, I don't know which accident that one is but the only one that happened in
24 the time period that we're looking at was the one at the intersection of
25 University and Triviz.
26
27 Benavidez: Okay. There was another one on Highway 25 earlier this year where,
28 remember that lady that abruptly stopped and another car crashed behind
29 her and it burst into flames.
30
31 Wray: Okay. That, that was outside the time period of this study.
32
33 Benavidez: Okay. So that's out, okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.
34
35 Sorg: Commissioner I think that was a, a, a non-signal type of accident. It
36 wasn't at a signaled intersection. It was right on the interstate.
37
38 Benavidez: Right. It was right on the interstate.
39
40 Sorg: Yeah. So it wouldn't been in the study then. This is only signaled
41 intersections.
42
43 Benavidez: Okay. And I was just wondering because it was, I don't know if it was, had
44 to do anything that was within the limits of Las Cruces or, but that, you
45 said it would, it had to be a signal area right? Correct?
46

1 Wray: The, the accidents were tied to, to the signalized intersections for the
2 purposes of the analysis. That's something that we're going to have to
3 change as we go forward to do more analysis because that's not going to
4 be as in-depth as is going to be required for, for, for the future work.
5
6 Benavidez: Okay.
7
8 Wray: Oh, and Tom just let me know that we were looking at county-wide data
9 for the purposes of this.
10
11 Benavidez: Oh. Okay. Sounds good. Thank you.
12
13 Sorg: Mr. Trent and then Commissioner Garrett.
14
15 Doolittle: Actually Andrew just ask, answered my question. I was wondering, he, in
16 one of his slides he specifically mentioned the Las Cruces urbanized area
17 but Dona Ana County has signals outside of Las Cruces, Town of Mesilla
18 has a few, so that answered my question. Thank you.
19
20 Garrett: Thank you. And, and in a sense this is to follow-up on Commissioner
21 Eakman's question. What kinds of demographic information and I guess
22 information about drivers are you going to be gathering in addition to the
23 particulars about the condition of the crash?
24
25 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Our data source from this is the crash
26 statistics developed by the, the UNM Data Center. And what they do is
27 they compile the law enforcement reports from around the state. They
28 place them into a, a, a geographical information system or GIS file, and
29 then they release them to agencies around the state to conduct this
30 analysis. That's one of the primary reasons that we stopped looking, or,
31 stopped looking that data at 2014 because essentially that's the latest data
32 available. That being said, we're having, we, us and the Santa Fe
33 Planning Office, other MPOs around the state are, are having continued
34 conversations with how those, you know what, what those reports capture.
35 But right now it's essentially the, you know the, the responding officer fills
36 out their report and then they turn that in and, and then UNM codes that
37 into a file. That's the information that we have available in regard to these
38 incidents. So short, short answer to the, is that there's not demographic
39 data associated with it.
40
41 Garrett: All right. I, it might be interesting and important to do a literary, literature
42 search to find out whether anyone is looking at human factors that are
43 related to crashes and then how that could change the way that designs
44 and standards are put together. I was thinking in particular about people
45 who might be visiting the area, let's say in the wintertime who used to
46 driving in other kinds of places and come here and it's a different way of

1 driving. We all, anybody that has driven around the country knows that
2 there's different driving styles in different parts of the country. I'd be
3 curious about whether younger drivers, older drivers, you know drivers
4 you know with kids in the car, whether those ended up being contributing
5 factors in, in certain situations and how that might factor into thinking
6 about the kinds of, of work that we could do and in, and sometimes I'm not
7 so sure that it's necessarily about putting something in the roadway as
8 much as it is driver education programs in particular locations where
9 you're actually targeting the, the audience that you know has a higher risk
10 of being involved in an accident right down the road because of the, of an
11 intersection. So this might not be fitting exactly what your model is
12 currently but I'm saying would it be possible to do a literature search to
13 see if you know like in cooperation with public health agencies and, and
14 other groups, there are some additional factors that are being looked at
15 and, and programs being developed.

16
17 Murphy: I, I think those are, are great suggestions. I know that I, to have, my
18 finger's slipping. We're going to have to have, the planners around the
19 state are going to have that conversation with the law enforcement
20 agencies, you know previous slides the, Andrew had mentioned or it was
21 serious, one of the terminology was serious injuries versus just injury
22 crashes so, and FHWA is developing a guideline of what constitutes that
23 serious injury so we're going to have to ask them, you know law
24 enforcement to revisit how those reports are developed. I think you know,
25 in, you know in addition to the shortcomings that you pointed out we've
26 also heard from some of our law enforcement community that something
27 like bicycle crashes are under-reported because unless a motor vehicle is
28 involved an incident is not going to get into that. We know about many
29 crash, bicycle crashes through cyclists later going to the Emergency
30 Room and through the medical reports but it, it does not get through the
31 law enforcement data. So I, I, it's helpful to find out where all the
32 shortcomings are and you know we, you know literature search I think is
33 going to be something we need to do to try and improve this, this
34 particular data set. You know that, that being said you know not all data is
35 perfect but this one, it, this one is kind of, it has the advantage that it's,
36 that it's universal, it's, it's compelled by law to be completed so it's useful
37 in that regard. Would we like it to be more complete, would we like more
38 information in it? Absolutely and, and we will have to work with other,
39 other partners in order to achieve that but I think you've, you've given use
40 some, some excellent suggestions of, of things to pursue as well.

41
42 Garrett: Thank you. If I could just follow up because I know Michael was at the
43 luncheon on the Health in All Policies rollout and the idea of one agency
44 being able to work with another agency where we are actually able to put
45 different databases together and coordinate different kinds of both
46 perspectives and information is what that initiative is all about. So there

1 may be an opportunity through, through that effort to find some other
2 partners who have a common, common goals and complementary
3 information and approaches. Thank you Mr. Chair.

4
5 Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

6
7 Eakman: One thing does come to mind but first congratulations for doing the study.
8 We really appreciate it. That's why we have so many questions. At our, at
9 our most high-intensity intersections in town, it just popped into my mind
10 what would happen if we 24/7 videotaped some of them for a while and
11 saw what was actually happening? We'd really get some information that
12 way.

13
14 Sorg: Thank you. Not a, an interesting idea, very much so. Any other questions
15 or comments on this discussion topic? If not.

16
17 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

18
19 Sorg: We'll go on to other staff or Committee comments. Anyone have another
20 comment? Mr. Murphy.

21
22 Murphy: Yes. I'd like to introduce MPO's newest staff member, Dominic Loya
23 who's our new Planning Technician and he's going to be working with the
24 Co-Ops on the Traffic Count Program and was, you know which was
25 instrumental in this last presentation and provides, provides us with a lot of
26 data help.

27
28 Sorg: Thank you. And welcome Dominic. Any others? Commissioner Hancock.

29
30 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. I know staff was and is involved in the 5339 grant
31 application that was just awarded of \$1 million-something for more buses.
32 Congratulations on bringing home the bacon. That's a pretty big deal. I
33 don't remember whether it was 5339 or 5311 but they, the award was, 11?

34
35 Murphy: Eleven.

36
37 Hancock: Yeah. That, that's a, a, a nice achievement. I'm also wondering if it would
38 be appropriate for an MOU from the South Central Regional
39 Transportation District similar to the Regional Consortium, the Camino
40 Real Consortium because transportation is such an, a, a key element. It
41 would be appropriate I would think that the Transit District do an MOU
42 also. Thank you Mr. Chair.

43
44 Sorg: Very good. Any other comments? Trustee Flores.

1 Flores: I just want to invite everybody, we're having our 16 de Septiembre
2 celebrations this weekend. They're free. We have a parade starting
3 Saturday, September 17th at 11 a.m. along Avenida de Mesilla. We're
4 going to be doing some type of commemoration for Juan Carreon who
5 was a famous singer who just passed away in Los Angeles. He's from
6 Mexico, I believe from Juarez. And we have an upcoming Pecan Festival
7 on October 8th and 9th and I got a something on Facebook basically
8 asking if I wanted to do some type of competition against County
9 Commissioners. I don't know if, if City Councilors would also be included
10 but I said I was in. So I think the, the, they were suggesting we do, what is
11 it, corn hull toss and a, or a horseshoe toss or something like that. But
12 anyway, so just letting you know, save the dates.
13

14 Sorg: Thank you. Councilor Eakman, did you have any more?
15

16 Eakman: That inspired me to mention the Plaza de Las Cruces dedication this
17 Saturday. Welcome everybody to that. I think it is officially at two p.m. but
18 we have festivities and activities all day long so feel free to come. We'd
19 appreciate seeing you there.
20

21 Sorg: Thank you Councilor. Very good. Any other comments? Trustee Flores.
22

23 Flores: Also I'm, I'm sure everybody here is aware that they've been, there's a
24 group that's been promoting getting people out to vote. I didn't know but
25 you could basically register online so, because my husband's been saying
26 that nurses have been complaining at work about, "Oh well you know I
27 want to go vote, I want to go vote," but they haven't actually gotten around
28 so I sent him some flyers and said, "You tell them they can register
29 online." So, and anybody that has a group that would welcome them
30 they're, they're willing to go out and basically let you know about voting
31 and where to go and all that.
32

33 Sorg: Thank you Trustee Flores. Commissioner Hancock.
34

35 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. As I mentioned at the last meeting on, the County is
36 going to be having a work session for all of the Boards that
37 Commissioners sit on. That is going to take place on December the 6th,
38 December 6th, nine to 12. So if you're involved, any one of us are
39 involved in different committees, please let your Chair of those committees
40 know that we need to have a representative so that we can be sure that
41 information is passed along to the newly-electeds so that they understand
42 what these committees are about, what each committee does, and the,
43 and how easy it is. We don't have to do anything, we just show up. You
44 know we want to make sure that they, they, everybody just competes to
45 get on the committees so.
46

1 Sorg: That, was December?
2
3 Hancock: December the 6th.
4
5 Sorg: Sixth. Okay.
6
7 Hancock: Thank you.
8
9 Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Hancock. All right. Mr. Doolittle.
10
11 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to let everybody know I'm not blatantly
12 not giving a report this month but we are practically finished with all
13 projects in the Mesilla Valley MPO area for now. Don't, don't start
14 clapping yet. We're going to disrupt your lives come spring. So what I'll
15 do is probably next month as well, it'll be fairly quiet as we start getting
16 closer to the Spitz/Three Crosses, the mill and inlay on US-70 from
17 Aguirre Springs to the county line. As we get some updates on studies I'll
18 give that as, as we have them but for now we, we are finished for the most
19 part in this area. So that's good news for the traveling public but.
20
21 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Trent. Okay.
22

23 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

24
25 Sorg: It, I see it, there's no one from the public so I don't expect any comments
26 from the public then. We only have Jolene from the NMDOT so if there's,
27 it ...
28

29 **9. ADJOURNMENT (2:16 p.m.)**

30
31 Sorg: There appears to be we're at the end of the meeting and so I'll call for a
32 motion to adjourn.
33

34 Flores: So moved.

35
36 Hancock: Second.

37
38 Sorg: Moved and second. All in favor say "aye."
39

40 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

41
42 Sorg: We are adjourned.
43
44

45
46 _____
Chairperson

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



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://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 12, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 Presentation on the Missouri Ave./Roadrunner Pkwy. Study Corridor

DISCUSSION:

Bohannon-Huston Staff will give a presentation on the ongoing Missouri Ave./Roadrunner Pkwy Study Corridor.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



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://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 12, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

6.2 NMDOT Update

DISCUSSION:

NMDOT will provide an update on their current activities in the MPO area.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

