



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 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **August 3, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **Las Cruces City Hall, 700 N. Main**, 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 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. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. May 4, 2017 _____
 - 3.2. June 1, 2017 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Amendments to the FFY 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
_____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. NACTO Draft Resolution for Policy Committee Approval _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
 - 6.1. City of Las Cruces, Doña Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, and SCRTD Project Updates _____ **Jurisdictional Staff**
 - 6.2. NMDOT Projects Update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 6.3. MPO Staff Update _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
3

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the
5 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held May 4, 2017
6 at 4:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845
7 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit) (arrived 4:09)
10 Dave Wallace proxy for Bill Childress (BLM)
11 Todd Gregory (LCPS)
12 Dale Harrell (NMSU)
13 Soo Gyu Lee (CLC)
14 Harold Love (NMDOT)
15 Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
16 Samuel Paz proxy for Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)
17 Lily Sensiba (EBID)
18 Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)
19 Natashia Billy proxy for Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)
20

21 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** David Armijo (SCRTD)
22 John Gwynne (DAC Flood Commission)
23 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
24 Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
25

26 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO Staff)
27 Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
28 Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)
29 Dominic Loya (MPO)
30

31 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
32

33 **1. CALL TO ORDER (4:06 PM)**
34

35 Love: Okay we're going to call the meeting to order of the monthly Mesilla Valley
36 Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee. We'll
37 start with a roll call, starting with my far left.
38

39 Paz: Samuel Paz, Dona Ana County, proxy for Luis Marmolejo.
40

41 Wallace: Dave Wallace, BLM, proxy for Bill Childress.
42

43 Lee: Soo Gyu Lee, City of Las Cruces.
44

45 Sensiba: Lily Sensiba, EBID.
46

1 Billy: Natashia Billy, City of Las Cruces Public Works, proxy for Tony Trevino.

2
3 Molina: Rene Molina, Dona Ana County Engineering.

4
5 Love: And I'm Harold Love with New Mexico DOT. I believe the first item on the
6 agenda is to elect an acting Chair. I'm willing to volunteer if that's in
7 agreement with everybody. All in favor.

8
9 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

10
11 Love: Okay.

12
13 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

14
15 Love: Our next item is approval of the agenda. Can I get a motion?

16
17 Molina: Motion to approve the agenda.

18
19 Wallace: Second.

20
21 Love: I've got a motion and a second, all in favor.

22
23 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

24
25 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

26
27 **3.1 April 6, 2017**

28
29 Love: Next item three, approval of the minutes from April 6, 2017. Do I hear a
30 motion?

31
32 Wallace: Mr. Chair, I move to accept the agenda as stands for the April 6, 2017
33 meeting.

34
35 Molina: Second.

36
37 Love: All in favor.

38
39 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

40
41 Love: Motion passed.

42
43 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

44
45 Love: Next item, number four, public comment. Seeing no public.

1 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

2
3 **5.1 Amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program**

4
5 Love: We'll move onto action items.

6
7 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

8
9 Love: Any questions? Motion to approve.

10
11 Wallace: Mr. Chair, I move to approve the TIP as so stated and identified on page
12 16.

13
14 Love: Do I hear a second?

15
16 Lee: Second.

17
18 Love: All in favor.

19
20 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

21
22 Love: Amendment passes.

23
24 **5.2 Amendments to the 2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program**

25
26 TOM MURPHY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

27
28 Love: I have a question. Would that substantially reduce your work plan?

29
30 Murphy: Mr. Chair. I don't believe that it will. I think it's certainly not going to hit
31 upon staffing. We may need to look at things; reducing any travel. Since
32 we run different fiscal calendar years and state fiscal year, federal fiscal
33 year, I intend to look at it when we put together the 2018 meeting
34 calendar. If we're not able to make that up I'll cancel some of the
35 meetings and reduce our advertising budget, but other than that I don't
36 think it'll affect program delivery.

37
38 Love: Any other questions? All right, I look for a motion to approve.

39
40 Molina: Motion to approve.

41
42 Bartholomew: I move we approve the adjustment.

43
44 Love: Was that a second Mike?

45
46 Bartholomew: Was that, you had a first already?

1
2 Love: Yeah.

3
4 Bartholomew: Okay I'll second it. Sorry.

5
6 Love: All in favor.

7
8 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

9
10 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

11
12 **6.1 Public Comment Period on 2018-2023 TIP**

13
14 Love: Item number six, discussion items. Public comment period from MPO
15 staff.

16
17 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

18
19 Love: Seeing no questions.

20
21 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

22
23 **7.1 City of Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces**
24 **Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, SCRTD Project Updates**

25
26 Love: We'll move on to item number seven, committee and staff comments.
27 Project updates, City of Las Cruces, you have anything for project updates
28 or any comments?

29
30 Billy: None at this time.

31
32 Love: Anyone here for Dona Ana, oh Rene.

33
34 Molina: No projects from Dona Ana County. Thank you.

35
36 Love: Is Mesilla represented?

37
38 Wray: Town of Mesilla is not here today.

39
40 Love: Las Cruces Public Schools is not represented. RoadRUNNER Transit.

41
42 Bartholomew: I really don't have any thing to update from the meeting of last month. I
43 believe I mentioned last month that we were trying to implement another
44 phase of our short-range transit plan and it was budget dependent
45 whether we would be able to move forward this summer but it still isn't off

1 the table yet, but it still isn't fully approved so it's still budget dependent at
2 this time.
3
4 Billy: Mr. Chairman.
5
6 Love: Yes.
7
8 Billy: City of Las Cruces Public Works. I actually do have an update on the
9 Palmar Subdivision that we've been working on. It's adjacent to Valley
10 Drive. We'll be going out to bid for that in the next couple of weeks. So
11 we'll be having some construction along Valley that coincides with the
12 Valley Drive reconstruction.
13
14 Love: Thank you.
15
16 Billy: Thank you.
17
18 Love: South Central RTD is not represented.
19
20 **7.2 NMDOT Projects Update**
21
22 Love: Okay we'll move onto 7.2, NMDOT project updates. And I'll try to wing this
23 since I didn't come prepared. Everybody knows that Spitz/Main/Solano is
24 in full construction right now so be careful when you go through that area.
25 We expect the project to last about a year.
26 And upcoming is the traffic signal that we're going to place at 17th
27 Street and Picacho, and I think we're getting ready to have a precon. or
28 did we already have one? Soo were you notified on that?
29
30 Lee: Mr. Chair, my understanding, precon. is already scheduled. I cannot
31 remember the exact date.
32
33 Love: Okay. And that's all I have for now. MPO staff update.
34
35 Lee: Mr. Chair.
36
37 Love: Oh yes.
38
39 Lee: I have a question. Could you provide the update for Valley Drive project?
40
41 Love: Provide an update. We're getting ready to come up on I think 90% plan
42 and review. So we're moving right along with the development of the
43 plans and looking to let it before the end of this year.
44
45 **7.3 MPO Staff Projects Update**
46

1 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. MPO staff does have a couple of updates. First is
2 that we have finished and published the 2016 traffic flow map. That's
3 available on the MPO website. We are having a little bit of difficulty in
4 getting hard copies printed and delivered. We're not going to be able to
5 get that out to those of you that we have promised to get it to at least until
6 next week. We have run out of paper, embarrassingly enough so we've
7 got to order more.

8 Another important note that we want to make is that the Town of
9 Mesilla and Las Cruces Public Schools both were awarded TAP funds out
10 of the TAP process. The Town of Mesilla award is for the multiuse path
11 stretching from La Llorona to the intersection with Mesilla Lateral and the
12 LCPS project is the SRTS program. Those funded '18 and '19. Town of
13 Mesilla Project, just to skip back, the design is scheduled for fiscal year
14 2018 and then construction for fiscal year 2019. So we are quite pleased
15 about that. So congratulations to those two entities. Is there anything ... I
16 don't believe we have anything else at this time.

17
18 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

19
20 Love: Well move onto public comment. Seeing none.

21
22 **9. ADJOURNMENT (4:28 PM)**

23
24 Love: I look for a motion to adjourn.

25
26 Molina: Motion to adjourn.

27
28 Bartholomew: Second.

29
30 Love: All in favor.

31
32 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

33
34 Love We are adjourned.

35
36
37
38
39 _____
40 Chairperson
41
42

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held June 1, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit) (arrived 4:09)
Bill Childress (BLM)
Todd Gregory (LCPS)
John Gwynne (DAC Flood Commission)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Soo Gyu Lee (CLC)
Harold Love (NMDOT)
Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
Albert Casillas proxy for Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)
Lily Sensiba (EBID)
Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)
Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Armijo (SCRTD)
Dale Harrell (NMSU)

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

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

1. CALL TO ORDER (4:03 PM)

Trevino: Okay we're going to call this meeting to order for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee. We'll start with roll call on the left of me.

Gregory: Todd Gregory, Las Cruces Public Schools.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

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

Childress: Bill Childress, Bureau of Land Management.

1 Lee: Soo Gyu Lee, City of Las Cruces.
2
3 Trevino: Tony Trevino, City of Las Cruces.
4
5 Casillas: Albert Casillas, Dona Ana County, Proxy for Luis Marmolejo.
6
7 Gwynne: John Gwynne, Dona Ana County Flood Commission.
8
9 Lujan: Debbi Lujan, Town of Mesilla.
10
11 Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.
12
13 Shannon: Larry Shannon, Town of Mesilla.
14
15 Sensiba: Lily Sensiba, EBID.
16
17 Molina: Rene Molina, Dona Ana County Engineering.
18

19 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

20
21 Trevino: Okay. The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Everybody
22 get a chance to take a look at it? Are there any questions? Hearing
23 nothing, all in favor?
24
25 Wray: We need a motion and a second.
26
27 Trevino: Hear a motion?
28
29 Bartholomew: I move we accept the agenda.
30
31 Gwynne: So moved.
32
33 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
34

35 Trevino: Okay.
36

37 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

38 39 **3.1 May 4, 2017**

40
41 Trevino: Next item is the approval of the minutes from last month which was April
42 6, 2017. Do I hear a motion to accept the agenda, I mean the minutes?
43
44 Shannon: I'm sorry. Kind of quick question about the minutes. I wasn't here at the
45 last one but there appear to be some discrepancies in here. It looks like if
46 you look at the date on this it says April 6th and then the roll call there are

1 some people that appear in the minutes that are not in the roll call, so I
2 was just wondering if these minutes were the correct minutes with the
3 correct date.
4

5 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Shannon. That is a very good question. It's my belief that
6 the correct minutes were put in there but the dates do seem to be wrong.
7 I'm not sure if there is some error. We had, staff recommends that we
8 table the minutes and reevaluate them and then bring them back at the
9 next TAC meeting.
10

11 Trevino: We have a motion for that? Do I hear a motion to table minutes?
12

13 Bartholomew: I move we table the minutes till the next meeting.
14

15 Shannon: Second.
16

17 Trevino: All in favor?
18

19 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
20

21 Trevino: Motion to table the minutes passes.
22

23 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT** 24

25 Trevino: The next item on the agenda is public comment. Is there anybody out
26 there with comments? I see none.
27

28 **5. ACTION ITEMS** 29

30 **5.1 Recommendation of Approval to the Policy Committee of the FFY** 31 **2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** 32

33 Trevino: So we'll move on to action items.
34

35 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
36

37 Trevino: I see no questions.
38

39 Wray: We need a motion and second.
40

41 Trevino: Do I hear a motion to approve?
42

43 Bartholomew: I move we recommend the TIP to the Policy Committee.
44

45 Herrera: I second.
46

1 Trevino: All in favor?

2
3 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

4
5 Trevino: Motion passes unanimously.

6
7 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

8
9 **6.1 TAC Responsibilities Discussion**

10
11 Trevino: Next on the agenda is discussion items, 6.1 is the TAC Responsibilities
12 Discussion.

13
14 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

15
16 Trevino: Andrew. Can you go back a couple slides to where you had the, one
17 more I think, one more, right here where you say, very top bullet, 75% of
18 the Committee meetings in a 12-month calendar period, membership will
19 be terminated. Is that for the individual or is that for the municipality or the
20 ...

21
22 Wray: That's for the seat.

23
24 Trevino: The seat.

25
26 Wray: Yes. For the seat where your individuals are not represented on the TAC.
27 It's jurisdictions, specific departments within jurisdictions that are
28 represented. So it's not against a person per se but it's against the seat.

29
30 Trevino: Okay. Thank you.

31
32 Childress: Does that include proxies or if the proxy is appointed and approved to
33 attend the meeting it qualifies as an attendance, is that correct?

34
35 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Childress. Yes, that's correct. There's no language in the
36 bylaws specifically saying that. That's just been the historical practice.
37 That's one of the changes that we're going to be presumably looking at
38 including specific language to that effect in the bylaws.

39
40 Childress: Thank you.

41
42 Gwynne: Andrew. When it comes to the proxies, I believe there's a process, isn't
43 there, for appointing a proxy?

44
45 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Gwynne. The process is basically staff needs written
46 notification from the individual that they will not be in attendance and the

1 name of the individual that we should expect to attend the meeting in their
2 place. As far as language that would go in the bylaws to that effect,
3 effectively it would have to be written notification.
4

5 Gwynne: Thank you.
6

7 Wray: And "written notification" covers e-mail as well so that'd be adequate.
8

9 Gwynne: Okay.
10

11 Trevino: I see no other questions so go on to discussion item 6.2.
12

13 Bartholomew: I did have a question, I'm sorry.
14

15 Trevino: Oh. Sorry.
16

17 Bartholomew: Is the other, is the BPAC having the same issue too, or is it mainly the
18 TAC that's ...
19

20 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bartholomew. It's been a bit uneven. BPAC recently has
21 had better attendance than this Committee has but both have had their
22 issues in the past.
23

24 Bartholomew: Okay. And maybe somehow even, whether it's outlined in the bylaws or
25 another way, maybe if there is a seat that's having an issue or something
26 maybe there can be, it can be brought up at a meeting that, so that we're
27 aware. We can talk to our peers and say, "Hey, you know, come here
28 and."
29

30 Wray: We're going to be looking at a number of options to try to improve the
31 situation.
32

33 Bartholomew: And my last question on the Technical Advisory Committee, the
34 membership, it does, the TAC can add members according to the bylaws
35 but it does list all the membership too, in Part A. So I was wondering if
36 there is an update to the bylaws if the, is it the SCRTD, right, is the other
37 one that's not listed in the bylaws right now.
38

39 Wray: Yes. That would be part of the addition.
40

41 Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you.
42

43 **6.2 NACTO Bicycle Design Standards** 44

45 Wray: Anyway. I would like to introduce at this time Mr. Michael McAdams who's
46 going to give the presentation on the NACTO Standards.

1
2 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
3

4 Bartholomew: Mr. Chair. Are there any guidelines in this NACTO about transit bike lane
5 interaction?
6

7 McAdams: There is not specifically, there's a separate document for transit facilities
8 but (*inaudible*) there's a second, another guide. This guide is particularly
9 just for bicycles and pedestrians, primarily bicyclists.
10

11 Bartholomew: The reason I was asking is in places like on Solano or where we've had
12 bus stops or other areas that there are bike lanes designated on our
13 streets right now and the complaints I've heard we've had is you know our
14 bus pulls in, pull over to a stop and block the bike lane. And I'm just
15 wondering from a design standard if there's better ways to handle that.
16

17 McAdams: Well one way that, just off the cuff, one way to accommodate that is by a
18 bulb where you put the sidewalk a little bit out, that will do some of that as
19 well, sort of prevent you know that kind of motion. I'm not really sure. I
20 didn't look into that more carefully but I think there's probably some things
21 to be done. Oh well, there's one which is actually a designated stop area.
22 It says that no, you know that's where the bus will stop in a combination
23 with that, a little bit of I guess in-the-center parking, the designated box for
24 the buses.
25

26 Bartholomew: So like a, basically a pullout for a bus.
27

28 McAdams: Exactly. And so it's a pullout but on the street but designated by markings.
29 So that's a partial solution but I can't address that fully because I think
30 you'll have to look to the guide for that, but I'm sure there's some ways to
31 accommodate bicycles and buses and motor vehicles.
32

33 Bartholomew: Thank you.
34

35 McAdams: Thank you.
36

37 Trevino: I got a question. One of the main I guess roadblocks that we have with
38 redesigning some, or rehabilitating some of the roads in Las Cruces is
39 restricted by the right-of-way, especially these residential areas where
40 they are requiring still their parking, a lot of these want the parking right
41 adjacent to the curb and allowing for two-way traffic on here. So just,
42 when this goes to get adopted by City of Las Cruces, wherever, that you
43 do get the input from Public Works and which would be streets and
44 everybody. Because a lot of these do not fit a lot of our rehabs and a lot
45 of our existing cross-sections for our roadways, whether it be local, some
46 collectors, or even arterials is the way stuff is working out. In regards to

1 the bus pullouts, again that's been a right-of-way issue and everything,
2 trying to make, accommodate both of them for both things. So just before
3 kind of we start to implement a lot of these more restrictions on roadway
4 and cross-sections that we do get everybody's input to see the feasibility
5 of a lot of the stuff.
6

7 McAdams: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Mr. Trevino. These are guidelines and they're not in
8 ordinances so it's, the one thing that's always put is a caveat in the
9 guideline is that it's up to the engineers or other judgment. So it's really
10 saying, "You can go beyond," or gives the engineers the ability to go
11 beyond normal standards. And so it's a guideline and that's it, but it's, if
12 you want to accommodate this would be the ideal, you know. Because it's
13 really, and some roads do not accommodate bicyclists in that manner.
14

15 Trevino: Okay. Thank you.
16

17 Lee: Mr. Chair. I have some comments. The first comment is have you ever,
18 looking at the operation impact ...
19

20 McAdams: Yeah.
21

22 Lee: Operational impact to the operational cost. How much do you think is
23 going to be impact to the operational cost?
24

25 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Soo Gyu. The guidelines do not really address operational
26 cost. It just, they're basically, "Here's the street. If we add this, you know
27 bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, this is the design standard." But it does
28 not address operational cost.
29

30 Lee: I understand your point but whenever we add more stuff then we have to
31 also think about the life cycle cost. Once we add any new stuff, for
32 example any green bicycle marking, do you know that cost is almost three,
33 four times expensive than the normal pavement marking? Then it's going
34 to directly impact the other, the operational aspect which means it's going
35 to directly impact not only the, your bicycle but as you know we have to
36 look at overall use which means that we have to consider vehicle and
37 pedestrian and the bicycle and the transit. So I understand that this is a
38 guideline but I'd like you to make sure to look at the other aspect will
39 impact your decision.
40

41 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Soo Gyu. These are really, again I emphasize these are
42 engineering type of decisions. They're not covered in guideline. But
43 they're, we know that there's advantage of green bike lanes with designate
44 so people don't do things like cross over them, often they do, or park in
45 them. And so these are reinforced or to protect bicyclists more or to make
46 people aware. But as far as our operational cost and maintenance, that's

1 really, it's not covered. But I agree with you. There are additional
2 operational costs to do that but I think that's really up to the City and the
3 Town of Mesilla and the County to really address when it's appropriate to
4 have green bike lanes or bike boxes or any kind of treatment that's related
5 to bicyclists.
6

7 Lee: The other comment is that from my perspective the best way we can
8 implement any NACTO guideline or any recommended pavement marking
9 or sign or any kind of more bicycle-friendly facility is with better change our
10 City Design Code and it will directly impact future projects and as long as
11 the right-of-way condition and the funding is available I definitely agree
12 about the NACTO. But some of their, you know the location, like Tony
13 mentioned, it's going to be almost impossible to utilize this one. But at
14 least as long as we change our City Design Code and it's going to impact
15 any new subdivision or any new street. So I think it's a really good idea to
16 go by the NACTO on that area plus any area in the Downtown area or any
17 street that's more like a, the good example is Main, you know the North
18 Main Street on the Downtown area, I believe that's a good, the place we
19 can start to test some the new stuff in the City and also the University
20 area. But the only concern about the University Corridor, my
21 understanding is it is the arterial so we have to be balanced between the
22 bicycle and the pedestrian and then also the vehicle and the transit.
23

24 McAdams: I agree.
25

26 Love: Mr. Chair. Is this guide supposed to supersede all the other existing
27 guides that came before it, like the AASHTO guidelines or the MUTCD?
28

29 McAdams: No. They're compatible with the MUTCD and AASHTO. What it does is
30 simply urban context and say, "Well maybe there'd be more suitable for
31 urban setting." The AASHTO's our general guidelines as you know. But
32 it's not discounting the AASHTO or the MUTCD. In fact I said before the
33 MUTCD has really been endorsed, or the NACTO guide have been
34 endorsed by the FHWA. So I don't see them as superseding but
35 supplementing, or supplemental.
36

37 Bartholomew: Mr. Chair. I had one more question. Was it these kind of guidelines,
38 wasn't there, I saw something about a demonstration that might've, I think
39 it was canceled that was planned for sometime last year on University
40 Avenue. Was that doing an aspect of this just as a demonstration? Could
41 you kind of expand that?
42

43 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bartholomew. That's true. We were planning on a
44 demonstration project but there was complications. But that, was the
45 green bike lanes were example of a thing that, of items related in the
46 NACTO standards. So demonstrative of a, at a really good, one of the

1 most dangerous intersections for bicyclists, Locust and University, but also
2 as a test to see how people reacted to the green bike lanes. So yes, the
3 green bike lanes proposed demonstration were in compliance with the
4 NACTO standards.

5
6 Bartholomew: Is there any, whatever the complications were, is there any, is it going to
7 happen in the future that there might be a demo like that somewhere?

8
9 McAdams: I would hope so. I would like to see it done and I think it'd be a good
10 demonstration to the public of potential for that kind of treatment. But I
11 think it's on hold but I would really like to see it done.

12
13 Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you.

14
15 Trevino: And I would really push maybe, yes and get a section that'd be an
16 example of that green bike lane so City staff can see the lifespan of that,
17 the deterioration of that, and kind of the expectancy of that so we can kind
18 of start to put that into our operational budget and cost. But I think having
19 an example set forth so we can have a baseline set to see if it is feasible
20 in the City would be a great opportunity for both parties. Thank you. I see
21 no other questions.

22 23 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

24 25 **7.1 City of Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces** 26 **Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, SCRTD Project Updates**

27
28 Trevino: Move on to Committee and staff comments. Start with the City of Las
29 Cruces. There are no updates on our projects at this point. Dona Ana
30 County.

31
32 Molina: Dona Ana County does not have any updates on any projects as well.
33 Thanks.

34
35 Trevino: Town of Mesilla.

36
37 Shannon: Town of Mesilla does not have any updates.

38
39 Trevino: Las Cruces Public Schools.

40
41 Gregory: Yes. Update, just our Safe Routes to School program, again this year 20
42 elementaries had regular walk and bike trains, walking, school buses or
43 bike trains. We also were able to do the bike and pedestrian education
44 curriculum in 22 of the elementary schools and we're currently working on
45 expanding that from the first and third grade to probably the fifth grade
46 using the PE teachers in all the elementary schools.

1 International Walk to School Day was 100% participation in
2 September through October. We also had the Family Bike Fiesta which
3 was at Young Park in April and we fixed a lot of bikes, handed out a lot of
4 helmets, and had a lot of volunteers that assisted during that day.

5 And then National Bike to School Day, 22 elementary schools
6 participated. We also had a, kind of a bike and then camp night on May
7 20th. They rode some of the bike paths throughout, around Llorona Park,
8 through I think Mesilla, and then back towards Mayfield in the Bruins Lane
9 area, and then they camped at Mayfield overnight with the parents and the
10 kids, and Ashleigh Curry coordinated that. We also continued our bus
11 driver education for the bike laws, pedestrian laws related to school buses.
12 And then we just finished collecting a lot of our evaluation from the
13 schools and interviews with principals so that we can finish up a pretty
14 thorough evaluation of the program on this year's as well as previous
15 years'. So and that's kind of where we stand right now.

16
17 Trevino: Thank you. RoadRUNNER Transit.

18
19 Bartholomew: The City's Transit Section's been working with the MPO on doing an
20 inventory of all of our bus stops out there, what's there, pictures of the bus
21 stops, ADA aspects of the bus stops out there. This was started in this
22 past fiscal year by an intern who developed a mobile app who could go
23 out and start taking some of the data, and we're looking at expanding that
24 to include more of the, especially the ADA stuff. The City's working on its
25 ADA Transition Plan and this is one of the aspects that Transit is doing, is
26 looking at all of our bus stops for accessibility of our bus stops and what
27 we could or couldn't do at these bus stops. And we really appreciate the
28 help that we're getting. Thank you.

29
30 Trevino: I hope I get this right. South Central Regional Transit. Are they present?
31 No?

32
33 Bartholomew: I can say that, I know that they're having their grant audit today, so that's
34 probably why he's not here.

35 36 **7.2 NMDOT Projects Update**

37
38 Trevino: NMDOT project update.

39
40 Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have just a couple of projects in construction
41 now. The big one is the intersection of Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses and
42 US-70. That one is going well so far. We're just a month or so in. We
43 have about another 11 months to go. It should take about a year to
44 complete that project but so far traffic has been moving smoothly through
45 the area. We do have monthly public meetings. If there are any
46 concerns, it's the third Thursday of the month at 6:00 p.m. at the Solano

1 yard. The NMDOT office is there. And I believe the MPO is sending out
2 the public notices or posting them on their website as we get the public
3 notices out there.

4 The other project that we have right now is the intersection of 17th
5 Street and Picacho. We are installing traffic signals there and that project
6 will be pretty quick. We wanted to wait until school was out so that the
7 buses wouldn't be impacted and the contractor has told us that it will be
8 done by the time school starts again. So just a couple of months to get
9 that project all completed.

10 Another project that's coming up probably in the next three or four
11 months is on US-70 over the Pass and we are widening shoulders from
12 basically Organ to the White Sands interchange. And so that's just to
13 make it a little bit safer and more comfortable for cyclists to ride on that
14 section of road and then it also helps us get rid of that gap in our State
15 Bike Route 7 that goes all the way from, oh I don't know where it starts,
16 somewhere over by the airport and goes all the way through Alamogordo
17 to Roswell. So that was the only little gap and we're addressing that. It
18 just let this past month so we should see construction out there probably
19 fall of this year.

20 In design we have the Valley Drive project. That one the plans are
21 supposed to be turned in in three weeks so we're very near the end of
22 design on that. We should be letting here probably in the late summer
23 with construction starting early next year. And that's all I have. If there's
24 any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

25
26 Bartholomew: Mr. Chair. Actually the discussion on the Picacho/17th light, I did have a
27 question of the City and how's the, what's the timeline looking like for the
28 traffic light at Melendres and Amador?

29
30 Trevino: I believe now. This is not my project but the environmental got approved
31 about a couple weeks ago so I think plans are very near to be finalized so
32 we can get that out. So I think they're just waiting on the proper
33 paperwork for all the environmental stuff and so, think probably about the
34 end of summer should probably go out to bid.

35
36 Bartholomew: It'll be let at the, do you think it'll be done by the end of the calendar year,
37 that light'll be in?

38
39 Trevino: You know I am not familiar with the extents of the construction. I know it's
40 some median cuts and some curb so I'm guessing probably about eight
41 months or so.

42
43 Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you.

44
45 Sensiba: Excuse me, hi. The Melendres and Amador light, that's right next to the
46 EBID office and they've started construction today. Our main entrance

1 where the curb is has been torn up and we're having to go in through the
2 back route, and they said they would be done with the curb construction
3 near our office by Monday. So they've already started that project and are
4 moving slowly towards the street there.
5

6 Lee: Let me give a little more information about what activity you saw today.
7 There's two separate projects, one for the actual installation of the traffic
8 signal at the intersection and then also we call it "interconnect
9 construction." So there's a separate contract I'm managing right now. In
10 the contract they already put the pathway from Melendres and the El
11 Molino to the intersection. So they're going to finish that little section I
12 believe within a week or two weeks. So that's a complete separate project
13 but it is together.
14

15 **7.3 MPO Staff Projects Update**

16
17 Trevino: And so we move onto MPO staff update.
18

19 McAdams: Just a few ones. Our next meeting will be on August 3rd. It will not be
20 here. It will be in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers so if you come
21 here you won't find anybody here.

22 And also we're expecting delivery of the software Rideshare Plus
23 which will integrate with automatic passenger counts. We discussed that
24 last time. And we expect that hopefully before June 30th and this will help
25 us with looking at operations better, planning purposes, and for
26 monitoring. And that's all I have.
27

28 Lee: Mr. Chair. I have a question to the staff. You know last time you guys
29 mentioned about the 2016 flow map. Is it still not ready?
30

31 McAdams: No, it's on our website at this moment. You can download it. If you need
32 it printed out we'll be glad to do that.
33

34 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

35
36 Trevino: Okay. We'll move on to public comment. I see none.
37

38 **9. ADJOURNMENT (4:46 PM)**

39
40 Trevino: So I'm going to look for a motion to adjourn.
41

42 Bartholomew: I second.
43

44 Trevino: All in favor?
45

46 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

1
2 Trevino: We are adjourned.

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://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 3, 2017

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT
TIP Amendment Table

DISCUSSION:

On June 14, 2017, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

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

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00250	2018	NMDOT	University Interchange	Bridge Replacement, Ramp modifications/reconstruction, roadway reconstruction, and extension of multi-use path	Moving \$775,000 from construction to preliminary design in FFY 2018
G10040	2018	Doña Ana County	Soledad Canyon - Dripping Springs to End of Soledad Canyon	Preliminary Engineering, Construction Engineering, Construction	New \$10,166,500 Project
LC00300	2019	NMDOT	US 70 – Elks to Del Rey	Bridge & Pavement Preservation	Change in project termini and scope

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

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 1:25 PM
To: Andrew Wray
Subject: TIP Admin Mod for LC00250

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good afternoon Andrew,

Please set aside \$775K from construction for preliminary design in FY2018. This change can be made administratively since there is no net change in the project total.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N. Solano Dr.
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O. (575) 525-7358
C. (575) 202-4698

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 12:45 PM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Tom Murphy
Subject: Fwd: LC00300 New STIP

Good afternoon Andrew,

Please see below regarding a TIP amendment for LC00300. Although the package went out for BPAC next week can we do a floor amendment to get this approved?

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
NMDOT Urban & Regional Planner
Cell: (575) 202-4698
Jolenem.herrera@state.nm.us

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

From: "Linnan, Andreas, NMDOT"
Date: 07/13/2017 12:35 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: "Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT"
Cc: "Contreras-Apodaca, Gabriela, NMDOT" , "Chavarria, Aaron, NMDOT" , "Franks, Earl, NMDOT"
Subject: LC00300 New STIP

Good morning Jolene,

As briefly discussed this morning, please make sure that in the new STIP, we not only change the project scope, but also adjust the Project Termini as shown below.

CN: LC00300	Plan: 20162021-WRK-8	MPO/RPO: LAS CRUCES MPO - ID: 110.00	NMDOT Dist.: 1	County: V	
Fed/State ID: LC00300	Demo IDs:		Lead Agency:		
RT: US0070	Project Location: US 70 - ELKS TO DEL REY - FROM ELKS TO DEL REY			Beg/Er	
Category: Reconstruction- No Added Capacity				PDE:	
Project Scope: BRIDGE & PAVEMENT PRESERVATION & ADA IMPROVEMENTS					
Proj. Phases: <input type="checkbox"/> Environ. Document <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prel. Engr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Other FHWA Wo					
Remarks: AMENDED 2/8/17 TO MOVE TO FY 2019					
PROGRAMMED FUNDS					
FUND SOURCE	IMP TYP	2016	2017	2018	2019
State Match		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Highway Performance Program	04	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4
TOTALS:		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5

Thanks,

Andreas

Andreas Linnan, P.E., MBA

Project Development Engineer

NMDOT South Region Design

ASCE-NM Southern Branch President

750 N. Solano Dr.

Las Cruces, NM 88001

Work: 575-525-7316

Fax: 575-524-6060



Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided under the New Mexico Inspection of Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message.

FFY 2018-2023 TIP							
CN	FFY	Location	Termini	Scope	Current Funds	New Total	Change
LC00250	2018	University Avenue & Triviz	I-25 Interchange	Bridge Replacement & Interchange Modifications	\$27,800,000	\$27,000,000	Moving \$775K from construction to preliminary design in FFY 2018
G10040	2018	Soledad Canyon	Dripping Springs to End of Soledad Canyon	Preliminary Engineering, Construction Engineering, Construction	N/A	\$10,166,500	New Project
LC00300	2019	US 70 - Elks to Del Rey	MP 149.8 - 151	Bridge & Pavement Preservation	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	Change in project termini and scope



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 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 3, 2017

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 NACTO Draft Resolution for Policy Committee Resolution

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and recommendation of approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

NACTO Draft Resolution for Policy Committee Approval

DISCUSSION:

At the May 16, 2017 BPAC meeting it was recommended that the MPO staff develop a draft resolution for review by the BPAC and if approved transmitted to the Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Committee for review and possible approval.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended approval of the resolution at their July 18 meeting.

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 17-xx

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE ADOPTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS URBAN STREET DESIGN GUIDE BY MPO MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the transportation planning agency for the City of Las Cruces, the Town of Mesilla and the urbanized portion of Doña Ana County; and

WHEREAS, the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization 2040 Transportation Plan states as two of its goals to: “provide and improve multi-modal and intermodal options for all users and increase transportation safety for all uses starting with the most vulnerable modes”; and,

WHEREAS, The Urban Street Design Guide offers well-articulated and visual approaches for improving the safety and livability of our streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, and transit users; and

WHEREAS, Urban city streets demand a unique approach unmet by most conventional design guidelines and

WHEREAS, The MPO views the Guide as an important reference in planning modern urban city streets that not only complements our member agencies’ own design guidance, but is a companion with other international national and local resources that is in use widely available to encourage well connected modes of transportation for all people; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended the use of the Guide by all member MPO agencies at their June 18, 2017 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended the use of the Guide by all member MPO agencies at their (month) (date), 2017 meeting, and;

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of all appropriate implementing agencies to adopt the Guide.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

THAT the Policy Committee recommends that all appropriate implementing agencies adopt the Guide.

DONE and **APPROVED** this ____ day of __ , 2017.

APPROVED:

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Flores	
Vice Chair Vasquez	
Mayor Barraza	
Trustee Bernal	
Mr. Doolittle	
Commissioner Rawson	
Commissioner Solis	
Councillor Eakman	
Councillor Pedroza	
Councillor Sorg	

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney