



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 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **November 21, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers**, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mesillavalleympo.org).

The MVMPO 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 MVMPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the MVMPO 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** _____
 - 3.1. October 17, 2017 _____ **Chair**
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Trail Plan Evaluation Matrix _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. Recommended Trails for Evaluation Matrix _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
 - 7.1. MPO Update _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 7.2. Local Projects Update _____ **Jurisdictional Staff**
 - 7.3. NMDOT Projects Update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 7.4. Committee Members Update _____ **BPAC**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

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

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
5 Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
6 which was held October 18, 2017 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana
7 County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
10 Andrew Bencomo (Pedestrian Community Rep)
11 Maggie Billings (Bicycle Community Citizen Rep)
12 Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla Citizen Rep)
13 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
14 Jack Kirby (NMSU Staff Rep)
15 Cathy Mathews proxy James Nunez (CLC Staff Rep)
16 Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County Rep)
17 Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla Staff Rep)
18

19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
20 Jess Waller (Bicycle Com. Rep.)
21

22 **STAFF PRESENT:** Andrew Wray (MPO)
23 Michael McAdams (MPO)
24 Dominic Loya (MPO)
25

26 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Margaret Brown Vega
27 Brian Byrd
28 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
29

30 **1. CALL TO ORDER (5:00 p.m.)**
31

32 Pearson: So it's 5:00, so I'll call the meeting to order. We have at least one new
33 member and maybe a proxy, so we'll just go down with the introductions,
34 we can start at the far end over here.
35

36 Mathews: Good evening. Name is Catherine Burr-Mathews. I'm substituting this
37 evening for James Nunez from the City.
38

39 Pas: Samuel Paz, Dona Ana County.
40

41 Kirby: Jack Kirby, New Mexico State University.
42

43 Bencomo: Andrew Bencomo, pedestrian representative.
44

45 Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Town of Mesilla representative.
46

1 Shepan: Lance Shepan, Mesilla Marshalls Office.

2
3 Billings: Maggie Billings, bicycle community representative.

4
5 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

6
7 Pearson: And I'm George Pearson, the Chair and the City of Las Cruces citizen
8 representative.

9
10 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

11
12 Pearson: Next we have approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the
13 agenda? Hear a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

14
15 Bencomo: So moved.

16
17 Shepan: Second.

18
19 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to approve the agenda as presented. All
20 in favor "aye."

21
22 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

23
24 Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none. That passes.

25
26 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

27
28 **3.1 August 15, 2017**

29
30 Pearson: Next we have approval of the minutes. We have any comments on our
31 previously minutes for August 15th? Hearing none, I'll hear a motion to
32 approve the minutes as presented.

33
34 Bencomo: So moved.

35
36 Herrera: Second.

37
38 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to approve the minutes as presented. All
39 in favor "aye."

40
41 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

42
43 Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none. The minutes are approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Now we're on to public comment. Do we have any members of the public that wish to make a comment at this time? Please come up to the microphone.

Brown-Vega: Hi. I'm Margaret Brown-Vega. I actually don't have a copy of the minutes from last time that are being approved but I did look at some prior minutes on the webpage and I noticed that in some of them there indicates that there are no public comments. I don't know if it's just that they're not typically recorded. But it was a little concerning to me because sometimes it says "none seen" and I know in at least two instances there were public comments but they don't seem to be recorded on some of the minutes. So I just wanted to kind of raise that issue as maybe something to look into.

Pearson: Okay. Generally none seen is when I look out and see no body raising their hand in the public.

Brown-Vega: Right.

Pearson: So typically our minutes are done very well so I'd be surprised that there was public comment that wasn't so.

Brown-Vega: Right. I'm sorry I don't have the specific dates of those but I was looking through them so I guess what I'll try to do is kind of pull those out that I know are discrepancies and just kind of see if we might resolve them somehow.

Pearson: Okay.

Brown-Vega: But I just wanted to raise the point. Thank you.

Pearson: Okay. Anybody else from the public? Seeing none.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Pearson: We'll move on to action items. Five-point-one, we have a TIP amendment.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE THE PRESENTATION.

Pearson: Okay, on the bridge replacement, that's over the Rio Grande on Berino Road.

1 Wray: I believe so, yes.
2
3 Pearson: That's a fairly narrow bridge right now. Will it be a wider bridge when it's
4 replaced?
5
6 Herrera: We're trying to make it wider. There are some right-of-way issues, we've
7 identified some irrigation structures that could be historic, so we're working
8 through the right-of-way process right now. Our hope is that, yes we will
9 make it wider.
10
11 Pearson: Yeah, because it's barely wide enough for two cars. I don't know what the
12 width is, maybe 11 feet or something for each lane.
13
14 Herrera: Yeah. That's our intention is to widen it out and make it.
15
16 Pearson: And you're on there with a bicycle with cars coming it get's interesting.
17
18 Herrera: Yes, it does.
19
20 Bencomo: Mr. Chair.
21
22 Pearson: Yes.
23
24 Bencomo: And this question may be for Mr. Herrera also. So you had mentioned
25 Andrew that the bridge was originally thought to be in the El Paso MPO
26 and now it's in the Mesilla Valley MPO, so obviously the taking on of that
27 is a cost that wasn't there however long ago this was identified. So what
28 does that mean to other projects? Did it cause anything else to be like put
29 behind schedule or moved down the road or what?
30
31 Herrera: No, it did not. Because we already had the project programmed in our
32 STIP at the same dollar amount, it's just a matter of changing which TIP
33 it's in and the control number. So we had already accounted for it with
34 NMDOT money. So it didn't take any funding away from El Paso MPO
35 and it doesn't put any extra burden I guess on the Mesilla Valley MPO.
36
37 Bencomo: Okay. Thank you.
38
39 Pearson: Any other questions from Committee Members? I'll hear a motion to
40 approve the TIP amendments as presented.
41
42 Curry: Mr. Chair. Can I just ask a question? Sorry, I missed. The very first one,
43 the TL00100, how did that sort of double in cost from current to amended?
44
45 Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. You'd have to ask Federal Transit Administration.
46 What this is is we do this every October effectively because this is when

1 Mr. Bartholomew receives his updated apportionments from FTA as far as
2 what processes go on within that organization to develop the shares that
3 go out to the local jurisdictions. I couldn't answer that question.
4
5 Curry: Okay. So Mr. Wray same question as Mr. Bencomo had earlier, does this
6 affect any other projects?
7
8 Wray: No.
9
10 Curry: Okay so that funding was set aside anyway.
11
12 Wray: Yes.
13
14 Curry: Okay. Thank you.
15
16 Wray: It's not taking away anything from anything within this MPO. This is only
17 an addition.
18
19 Curry; Thank you.
20
21 Herrera: And if I can just add to that. This happens every year because they put, I
22 don't want to call it a placeholder, but they estimate out what the FTA
23 funds will be over a time period and then once Congress approves the
24 apportionment which is the same thing we do for Federal Highway, then
25 the TIP has to be amended to match that. So that's basically what they're
26 doing is just kind of housekeeping. It's not adding anything.
27
28 Curry: Thank you.
29
30 Pearson: Okay. Anything further? Motion to approve.
31
32 Curry: I'll put forth a motion to approve.
33
34 Bencomo: Second.
35
36 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to approve the TIP amendments as
37 presented. All in favor "aye."
38
39 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
40
41 Pearson: Any opposed? So it passes.
42
43 **5.2 NMDOT Safety Targets**
44
45 Pearson: We're onto NMDOT safety targets.
46

1 ANDREW WRAY GAVE THE PRESENTATION.

2
3 Pearson: So the fatality, is that statewide?

4
5 Wray: The numbers that are in the table are statewide, yes.

6
7 Pearson: So that includes inside urban areas.

8
9 Wray: Yes.

10
11 Pearson: So not necessarily roadways that are covered by ...

12
13 Wray: This is comprehensive for the entire State of New Mexico.

14
15 Pearson: So safety plan is that intended to cover every roadway in the state then?
16 Or how do you coordinate between ...

17
18 Wray: Well it does depends because you do have differing levels of jurisdiction,
19 different breakdowns because there are obviously a lot of facilities in the
20 State of New Mexico that are not held by the state. There are going to be
21 coordination between the local jurisdictions and NMDOT. This is indeed
22 part of that process that we are doing right now this very moment tonight.
23 Everything in one shape or another is going to be impacted by this.

24
25 Pearson: So any mitigation practices you state we'll try to coordinate with local
26 jurisdictions.

27
28 Wray: And also the targeting safety projects, that sort of thing.

29
30 Pearson: Any other questions?

31
32 Curry: Yeah Mr. Chair, Mr. Wray. I'm having a hard time understanding why
33 we're voting for an increase in total fatalities. I mean if you just take the
34 limit away there, we're saying that we're going to increase total fatalities by
35 6.4%. I mean isn't that backwards. Shouldn't we be trying to decrease
36 total fatalities? Can you explain that to me?

37
38 Wray: Trying to limit the rate of increase to 6.4. I'll go into the rationale a little bit
39 more later on in the presentation. But just a brief statement now is these
40 targets are all stick and no carrot. There is only punishment for failing to
41 meet them. So if we don't set realistic targets, the only thing that we're
42 setting ourselves up to do is to fail. There is no benefit. So we have to be
43 realistic in our assessment and the goals that we set. But I will speak
44 more to that topic later on in the presentation.

45
46 Curry: Okay. Thank you.

1
2 Pearson: Okay.

3
4 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED THE PRESENTATION.

5
6 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I just have a question, maybe I should know this already
7 because there's a Class A on there but, what is a serious injury, what's the
8 definition of that? Time in the hospital, recovery time?
9

10 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. That is actually a very good question and I'm
11 afraid to say that we haven't completely come up with, even to ourselves,
12 an acceptable standard of definition for that. This is really delving in to
13 kind of the weeds, getting into what goes into things as fundamental as
14 police reports, how the officer takes down the information. Because that's
15 ultimately the fundamental source, the data that we're looking at is what's
16 recorded by the police officer on the scene in the reports. So that's where
17 ultimately this information's all drawn from. So you're getting into a lot of
18 vagaries of what the officer may or may not put down and that's sort of
19 thing. We did use the Class A categorization as the standard from which
20 these numbers were drawn but to my knowledge I don't believe that
21 there's really been any, I'd have to refer to Ms. Herrera, but I don't really
22 believe there's been any substantive guidance as to the definition of
23 serious injuries. It may even be that each state is allowed to define the
24 term themselves.
25

26 Herrera: Mr. Chair. There's actually Federal guidance on what is considered a
27 serious injury. I don't have that with me unfortunately. You can find it in
28 our State Highway Safety Plan if you just google search nmdotshsp. I
29 think the intro explains all of that and the difference between, there's
30 several different types of injuries. So there's like the Class A, the Class B
31 and they're all very different, but they're defined by FHWA what each one
32 of those is and we have to report on them as a state every year.
33

34 Bencomo: Okay. Do you have like the basics of what that is based on like a medical
35 type injury or is it based on like a police report do you know?
36

37 Herrera: Basically it's if you have to be taken away in an ambulance it's considered
38 a serious injury.
39

40 Bencomo: Because that's a lot people it's not a serious injury, it's a "I want to go get
41 checked." And precautionary check. And so that's something that may
42 have to be looked at. I mean that's a bigger issue. That's huge, way
43 beyond what we're doing but that's a big "Uh oh" when I hear that. Alright.
44 Just curious. Thank you.
45

1 Pearson: Okay, my question I think you've answered. So the information's coming
2 from the uniform crash reports and not from other information like querying
3 hospitals as to accidents or admittances for different reasons.
4

5 Wray: That's correct Mr. Chair.
6

7 Pearson: So that kind of goes back to some discussion that we've had in making
8 sure that that uniform crash report has as much information as it could.
9

10 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry, I've got one more question just popped in my head.
11 So these injuries, they are all crashes, are they broken out in any way,
12 shape, or form by pedestrian, bicycle, vehicle.
13

14 Wray: Yes, these are. And we will be getting into the pedestrian/bicycle data a
15 little later on in the presentation.
16

17 Bencomo: All right. Thanks.
18

19 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED THE PRESENTATION.
20

21 Bencomo: I've got a comment. Are we going to pause? So again, the total fatalities
22 obviously as the population increases probably the fatalities will increase
23 just by total numbers of people. We would hope that even with an
24 increase we could decrease that? So this isn't going to be like per
25 100,000. I mean because if you look at total fatalities, oh per 100 million,
26 sorry. My bad.
27

28 Wray: The metric is specifically per 100 million.
29

30 Bencomo: Read Andrew. Sorry.
31

32 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED THE PRESENTATION.
33

34 Pearson: So is there an increase in vehicle safety why fatalities are ...
35

36 Wray: There are a number of different causes, that is one of them. Another one
37 is improved geometry on roadways, reducing the opportunities for
38 crashes, mitigating dangerous areas, vehicle safety features. There's a
39 wide range of contributing factors as to the overall decrease which we are
40 obviously very grateful for.
41

42 Pearson: So if we had an overall crash rate, that's probably going up and or
43 fatalities and injuries are kind of going down?
44

45 Wray: Well part of the reason why there's the disparity between fatalities and
46 serious injuries as Ms. Herrera laid out, we were giving her credit for the

comment that she made to the TAC earlier this month. Part of the reason here in New Mexico why we are seeing the increase in fatalities that we are is because of increased freight that's going through the state and so if something goes wrong with the truck just given the mass, the vehicle involved, the likelihood that there's going to be a very bad outcome to that is higher and that is a large part of the reason why we're seeing the higher fatality rates in the State of New Mexico is because of that reason.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. There's also a very big increase in distracted driving crashes and when you couple that with speeding there's a pretty good likelihood for fatalities. But yes vehicles are getting safer, road geometry is getting better, so the rate is going down but it seems like when we do have a crash, people are unfortunately dying.

ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED THE PRESENTATION.

Pearson: Back it up a little bit, I had a question.

Wray: I'm sorry. I apologize Mr. Chair.

Pearson: It's combined with the fatalities and serious injuries, is that just because the value for fatalities is so low that you can't really make a good predictability of that and so they're combined together or what's the justification for that?

Wray: The justification is that the metric that was handed down in the rule.

Pearson: Okay.

Mathews: Mr. Chair may I ask a question? Earlier this year I saw a report from a private organization regarding bicycle and pedestrian fatalities throughout the country and the report looked at race and income of fatalities and injuries and indicated that New Mexico is very high with fatalities and injuries of pedestrians and bicyclists of minority groups. Does that have any bearing in the targets that we set with regard to minority groups or does that help in determining how these targets are set? As a new person I apologize, but I find it very disheartening that we're setting goals of increasing fatalities. But with that I just wanted to pose the question regarding any data available regarding minority populations were disproportionately affected by these kinds of fatalities and injuries.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Ms. Mathews. That's a very good question. The specific numbers for crashes is actually a little bit difficult to extract because that's not something that's reported in the crash data that we have. Now you can obviously take a look at the location of crashes and extrapolate if you have a particular disadvantaged area, then that would become probably

1 beneficiary of environmental justice that would get more likely to have that
2 area addressed in that way. But it is a little difficult to extract that specific
3 information because of the nature of, people are in motion, they're in
4 transit. These unfortunate incidences don't necessarily happen in the area
5 where people live. Now it's also statistically true that a lot of times it is
6 within some degree of relative proximity, but you have a smaller
7 community like ours and you can still be within two miles of your house but
8 be in a very different economic area than the one that you live in. So yes
9 that is something that is very much taken into consideration as part of the
10 project selection process, but that specific metric is a little difficult for us to
11 extract via the means of what we're looking at here tonight. I don't want to
12 say that it's impossible but I would say that it's always going to be a little
13 bit fuzzy looking for that specific metric within the context of this particular
14 conversation.

15
16 Billings: In our last work session we discussed a lot, the importance of highlighting
17 areas that have a specific need like around the City of Hope and the
18 connecting roads and I think this is kind of related to that where if we could
19 focus some of these projects on roads that are heavily trafficked by maybe
20 not recreational cyclists and pedestrians but people who are doing it
21 because of necessity, that would be really useful to the whole thing.

22
23 Wray: Yes.

24
25 Pearson: And a question maybe Lance can answer. In the uniform crash report, is
26 there any indication of ethnicity?

27
28 Shepan: No sir. In fact I pulled it up right here. I was looking at it because I didn't
29 want to speak wrong, but there's a check box for fatality and then there's
30 injury code block, and then it goes on; was the seatbelt used properly,
31 were they ejected, the EMS run number, and the med trans which would
32 be the medic unit number. So the information's out there. Because in my
33 report when I do a crash report of somebody's injury, they're injured, in my
34 narrative I do not put in what the injuries are because this becomes public
35 record, so I can't put it in there. I just put down the facts A, B, C, and D of
36 what happened. I don't know without court orders and all of that to get
37 EMS reports which is a big project for somebody to do to quantify all this
38 data. I don't know how to do it. I think the Uniform Crash Report could be
39 modified. I think it should be modified. And off the top of my head I can't
40 remember what I kept thinking should be in it. Something other than
41 distracted driver maybe, because over 90% of the crashes I've done in my
42 career have been cell phone related or just plain old being distracted,
43 reaching for my purse, something like that. But under distracted driver I
44 think there should be another set of codes in there. And along with
45 injuries, I'm trying to remember what the codes are and it won't let me

1 open up the code section so I can breakdown; is it a serious injury or
2 what. But I can try and get that for the next meeting if you would like.
3

4 Curry: Mr. Chair. Is anybody familiar with the training the bicycle/pedestrian
5 crash investigation training that Maurice Williams did back in September?
6 Did anybody here attend that? Because I think that this would've all been
7 addressed in that training that he did.
8

9 Shepan: The crash investigation, if it's a vehicle versus a bicycle or pedestrian,
10 we're still filling out a UCR. I didn't attend that training. I wanted to but
11 things were just conflicted. I couldn't. We still look for the cause of the
12 crash and who's at fault. And you're going to do that in any type of crash
13 investigation, be it a bicycle investigation, or a vehicle. But yes I do want
14 to go to that class.
15

16 Curry: Yeah I think it would just be interesting to have Mr. Williams weigh in and
17 let us know, he'd have some answers to this, to these questions I think.
18

19 Pearson: So it's the Uniform Crash Report so any changes that have to be made at
20 the state level presumably.
21

22 Shepan: If we came up with something then I assume it could be presented
23

24 Pearson: Do you know the mechanism?
25

26 Herrera: Yes. We did have that suggestion come up a lot in the stakeholder
27 meetings that we had when we were doing the State Highway Safety Plan
28 and so that is something that we are trying to work through now, about
29 how to do that, what kinds of additional information would be needed.
30 Obviously we're not the implementing agency so we would have to work
31 with the law enforcement agencies and I think we're doing that, it's just
32 going to take a while, but that's definitely something that's been identified
33 is that there are problems with how crashes are reported.
34

35 Pearson: So who actually owns that report? State Police or don't know? It's just
36 this thing that's out there that everybody uses. It's also based on National
37 Report.
38

39 Herrera: I'm sure somebody knows, but I don't.
40

41 Pearson: Right?
42

43 Herrera: Right. There's some data that because it's reported nationally or FHWA
44 looks at national trends, there are certain things that have to be on there
45 like the check box for fatality, some of those things. But there is some
46 leeway there. For instance, adding more boxes to the distracted driver

1 section. That's something that we talked about a lot because you know
2 cell phone is a little different than reaching for a cup or talking to your kid
3 or whatever the situation may be that distracts you. And there might be
4 somethings that we can specifically target and other that we just can't. So
5 knowing more information, there's been a lot of issues raised about how
6 the reports are filled out when there is a bicycle or pedestrian because it's
7 a Uniform Report, so unless the officer is aware of some of these things,
8 they don't know to write some stuff down and so there's a lot of
9 information missing. So when we pull a crash report it doesn't really tell us
10 anything about why the crash occurred. We just know it happened and
11 the severity maybe. But it doesn't say exactly why or give us any
12 indication of if there's any modifications that we could make that would
13 have prevented that crash.
14

15 Pearson: Right. It seems like every time we have a safety discussion we get down
16 to this exact topic, so maybe as a recommending committee is there
17 something that we can recommend to some place that might end up in
18 some change.
19

20 Herrera: We're working on it. We really are. It's not through the planning
21 department, it's actually through the Traffic Safety Bureau who deals with
22 the NHTSA funds. And so they're the ones who are working on updating
23 the report. I don't have a whole lot of specifics on that. All I'm told is
24 they're working on it and it's like this big black whole. So I'm sure
25 somebody has an update and I can try to get more information on that.
26

27 Pearson: Maybe just passing on that we're concerned about these issues and that
28 they do need to be working on it and don't let it slide off.
29

30 Herrera: Yeah. We definitely won't. We realize that there's a lot of issues. There's
31 a lot of data that we want also.
32

33 Pearson: Okay. I guess I'll let you go on Andrew.
34

35 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED THE PRESENTATION.
36

37 Curry: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wray. So my question to you is who's carrying this big
38 stick?
39

40 Wray: The Federal Government.
41

42 Curry: So why are the communities all around the country embracing Vision
43 Zero, but we're doing the opposite?
44

45 Wray: Because of the stick.
46

1 Curry: But how are they able to get around and go to Vision Zero and really put
2 forth those efforts but we're not?

3
4 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I answer that? We do have Vision Zero also, but we
5 realize that we have to set targets that are achievable in the meantime.
6 Until we can take cell phones away from people while they're driving.
7 There's only so much roadway work that we can do to prevent crashes,
8 but we also have the Vision Zero and we are working towards that.

9
10 Curry: Okay. Thank you.

11
12 Pearson: Any others?

13
14 Paz: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wray. It's a probably a question for Jolene as well. Do we
15 know what El Paso MPO's doing or TXDOT's doing with their kind of
16 regional targets?

17
18 Wray: Since Ms. Herrera interacts with El Paso MPO directly more often than I
19 do I would like to defer that question to her.

20
21 Herrera: That's complicated because they do have two state DOTs, we are setting
22 different targets clearly because we're different states, but Texas is also
23 seeing an upward trend of fatalities, so their targets will probably mirror
24 what ours are, of course their rates might be higher just because they
25 have more people there than we do. They also have a lot more vehicles.
26 The MPO has made the decision to support the state targets for both
27 states and we're trying to figure how exactly we're going to implement that
28 right now.

29
30 Paz: Thank you.

31
32 Pearson: Any others? I'll hear a motion to recommend the State targets as the
33 MPO targets for the safety targets.

34
35 Herrera: So moved.

36
37 Billings: Second.

38
39 Pearson: I have a motion and a second to accept the state targets as the MPO
40 safety targets. All in favor "aye."

41
42 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

43
44 Pearson: Any opposed? Hearing none. That passes. Thank you.

45
46 **6.3 RoadRUNNER Transit Asset Management Goals**

1
2 Pearson: So onto the next item please.

3
4 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I will now have Mr. McAdams come and present
5 about the RoadRUNNER transit asset management goals.
6

7 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE THE PRESENTATION.
8

9 Pearson: Any questions from any members?

10
11 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So their goals of replacing vehicles replacement is 14 years, 10
12 years, seven years, five years. There's no milage attached, it's just simply
13 based on years not by miles, road miles or anything like that.
14

15 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. To my knowledge it'd be 12 years, or 14 years
16 and I'm not able to answer specific questions about that. Probably Mike
17 Bartholomew can tell you much more. But in general it's 14 years based
18 on the wear of the bus. I would have to look at other, more specific FTA
19 and I can't really address that but I'm sure I can get the questions
20 (*inaudible*). In the average if you have a bus in normal, I guess, I'm sort of
21 supposing, in normal VMT 14 years we want to replace them. But I don't
22 have the specifics. There probably is a formula based on VMT and urban
23 versus rural setting as far as when you should retire buses.
24

25 Bencomo: Great. Then that's what I'm asking because I mean a bus is one of those
26 constantly in motion type of things.
27

28 McAdams: Exactly.
29

30 Bencomo: Milage rather than just years type of thing, I was just curious if there was
31 any metrics in there for milage over years. I mean because you could
32 have a unit, I don't know what a heavy-duty unit is, there's no explanation.
33 I'm not sure what that is. So it may be used less, may not have the milage
34 that other ones do but they're still going to try to replace it. The goal is
35 zero percent at that same amount of time instead of some milage or years
36 or a combination of the two type of thing to manage that fleet, just curious.
37

38 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. I don't really have the knowledge for that. I'm
39 sure like you say it is a form of VMT and whether it's urban or rural. And
40 probably the FTA has a formula to really look at when you should replace
41 a vehicle or not. But usually, regardless if, if it's a normal use like 10 years
42 or 12 years and you look at replacing. If you look at really a lot of buses
43 they can last for 30 years, if they're well maintained. But we say normally
44 this is a normal condition for urbanized area for small urban prep, this is
45 when you should replace it. But I'm sure if you're like to get further, I'm
46 sure we can gather how FTA really does that. I think some of these

1 issues are developing. Asset management and for the vehicle
2 replacement has been around for many many years, but I think the FTA
3 and FHWA are getting more serious about how exactly are people
4 managing their vehicles. So it's a developing issue, it's not a new one but
5 it's a developing one.
6

7 Bencomo: Okay. Yeah I'm just curious. I am no transit unit expert in when they
8 should replace them. I've dealt with a fleet of my own when I worked for
9 the City but they're not used the same way. I'm just curious because it's a
10 very finite, very set for this number of years when there could be some flux
11 in there or something like that. We're just going to trade it out or get rid of
12 it at that point no matter what. So just curious. I mean it's not going to
13 change anything right now. I just had those questions is all. Thank you
14 very much.
15

16 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I guess just to follow-up on that. Did Mr. Bartholomew submit
17 like a report along with this to explain why these are the way that they
18 are? There had to be some backup documentation. I'm sure he didn't just
19 say, here, did he?
20

21 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. No this is the only thing we received from them.
22 The situation is vague about, we weren't really sure at first whether the
23 DOT wanted to adopt as a resolution to the MTP and we sort of
24 persuaded them, sort of this is too specific and so they agreed to the
25 resolution, I guess to endorse their plan. It's very much in flux. And yes I
26 agree. I think that someone should develop, some of this is, comes from
27 the annual or the biannual report they have to file and there were issues
28 about asset management there. Right now I think it's very vague and
29 those are good questions, but Mr. Bartholomew did not give any other
30 documentation. I know that they do keep vehicle records and for each
31 vehicle which one is what the year of the age and also probably the
32 vehicle mileage of sure. So I think it is probably there's a basis for that but
33 this is also part of their normal asset management plan too. And these
34 are goals which may or may not be achieved but I think they're realistic
35 goals and one they would like to see. But I think that, my understanding is
36 something under development and there is right now, has to be, I think we
37 have to look at further (*inaudible*) done. Is that a good answer I hope?
38

39 Herrera: Yeah. I guess. I'll follow up with the transit division at NMDOT just
40 because I definitely see your point and it makes more sense to me to be
41 based off miles but just for curiosity's sake it would be good to know, so let
42 me see if I can get some more information on that and then I can send it to
43 the MPO staff, just so we're all more knowledgeable about that.
44

45 Bencomo: Okay. Mr. Chair. Part of the reason I ask is because I'm being asked to
46 give a yeah or a nay on something that I have no detail on, it's just these

1 numbers and what's it based on. I mean like I said I'm no transit bus
2 expert but to at least be able to see that, oh we see the average at 14
3 years they're all like this many miles or we've had to put this much
4 average maintenance into every unit, by the time they're 14 years old,
5 then we could look at that and go "Oh that makes perfect sense," but right
6 now I'm being asked to vote yeah or nay on something that I have no
7 information on other than those two lines right there. So that's my only
8 concern. Thank you.
9

10 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. They are vague. They presented for the MPO
11 state quarterly. They interpreted as you say sort of conflicting ways. I
12 don't think they're really sure about how these goals are going to be. I
13 think the edict came down from the FTA that you're going to start to do
14 asset management and I think they're in the flux of being developed. And
15 that's a very good question because you're exactly right. Some buses
16 don't receive as many milage as other do, I think this is a process being
17 developed. If you look at overall it's a good goal and we endorse at the
18 MPO, say yes we should have a certain goal for when we want to have
19 buses replaced. Now the other thing is that like with the FHWA targets
20 there is only a stick and no carrot. They're not guaranteeing that there'll
21 be additional funds to replace those buses. So the reality is, one there is
22 a goal to replace, and all transit agencies have a goal to replace most of
23 their fleet by 10 years. Every 10 years you retire the vehicles. That's
24 normal. All transit agencies have them. But goals don't reflect reality
25 sometimes too because you can't extend the life. They're saying we can
26 extent from 12 to 14. You extend many more. So without additional funds
27 allocated they are strictly goals and they are vague and I think they're in
28 the process of being developed and these issues are very real but now
29 we're complying, we'd like to comply with FTA regulations and the State
30 particularly in looking at asset management. It does have to be developed
31 further and I think those are good points.
32

33 Pearson: So do you know what the current practice is and how many years they
34 hold a bus? Because it sounds like, I mean if I was the manager and the
35 Feds say I have to do something, it's like well I'll just take the longest that I
36 have ever held a bus and that's going to be my target because I know I'll
37 fulfill that.
38

39 McAdams: Mr. Chair. Buses age at different levels, but generally these are the
40 average of what normal milage etc. and you should schedule for
41 replacement. And they're either by state or federal edict or by your own
42 knowledge. I've worked with transit before and usually there is a set limit
43 where you should retire vans, and buses the same way. Buses, I think
44 heavy-duty buses can last longer. You can replace things and you can
45 repair them, they can go 30 years. That's not the ideal. The ideal is say
46 would be like Mr. Bartholomew said 10 to 15 years should be the normal

1 replacement for heavy-duty vehicle used regular service. Now if they're
2 backup vehicle you don't have to use them as much, then you could say
3 there's a difference between back vehicles and regular vehicles. But most
4 times in our fleet we're rotating so it's not really you don't have a set of
5 backup vehicles and they also in maintenance as well, you push them. So
6 this is a general goal and you obviously you look at general goals and
7 specific ones based on VMT so I think that maybe the DOT and working
8 with FTAs regional office there is, but I think that's a real technical
9 question. It really boils down is how much money is available and what
10 you're (*inaudible*) fleet. If you have enough money to replace those
11 vehicles at 14 years, most transit agencies would. The reality is that goals
12 and what actually is in process are totally different. So these are goals
13 that we hope that the FTA will belly up to the bar and say "Yes we want to
14 help you realize that goal, replace them at 14 years" and the transit said
15 "Well we agree with that."

16
17 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So that brings me to another question was in my head and you
18 just kind of touched on that. So there's the FTA, there's the Federal
19 portion of it that pays out, there's also a local match. So has this gone to,
20 through the City budgeting process has it gone to City Council, have they
21 endorsed this plan or even the City Manager level to say "Yeah we've
22 looked at that and we have the matching funds in place to do that on that
23 cycle." We went through that cycle, again going off my previous
24 experience, we created a 20 year plan for our fleet replacement and in
25 that cycle we had specific dollar amounts that were estimated and we're
26 able to get that to, Mr. Garza was the City Manager at the time, and we
27 looked at those dollar numbers, specifically dollars, not just years, and
28 they were saying we can support that with stipulations that in lean years
29 you're not going to get what you want and other priorities come up. So
30 has this gone to the budget process at the City level and they're on board
31 with this?

32
33 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. Not in recollection. These are just come through
34 us the last month and so we can't really make those decisions. But with
35 transit funding you know it's pretty stagnant right now. And those will be a
36 question probably would be answered by the City Council in a better way.
37 And if you like to, they'll probably address in the Policy Committee
38 particularly. So I can't really give those answers as yet because really the
39 fluctuation in transit fund and it's very hard to plan for more than two or
40 three years with transit too. And I hate to give so vague answers but this
41 is the nature of transit. It's very, you're lucky for two years, you try to plan
42 in advance but a lot of these are dependent on Federal funds and Federal
43 regulations. And no City can afford to buy all their buses with their own
44 funds, local matches.

45
46 Bencomo: Correct.

1
2 McAdams: And things with the operating. They can't fund the whole bit. So depends
3 on the Federal government and how much money they're going to give the
4 City, pretty good capital and how much the City's willing to do. So is that
5 an answer? I hope.

6
7 Bencomo: It is.

8
9 McAdams: It's not a good answer but it's not the answer I'd like to give but it's a reality
10 because of the fluctuation of funds and the reality of the Federal
11 Government as well. How much money they're going to give us, it really
12 depends on Congress.

13
14 Bencomo: Correct. So Mr. Chair just to be clear, I'm not opposed to this, just to be
15 clear. I just have these questions on it. Thank you.

16
17 Pearson: I think I was trying to ask the same kind of question. They're going to
18 replace a bus after 14 years no matter what, then they're going to have
19 money to replace that bus in 14 years.

20
21 McAdams: Exactly. Mr. Chair. If you don't have the money available you don't
22 replace it. And many transit agencies they don't have the, they'd like to
23 replace them every four years but they don't have enough funding. So
24 they get part, etc. They have good maintenance practices can also add to
25 intended life. If you're a good transit agent you'll have the buses and
26 when they need oil, transmission oil, etc and you can really maintain those
27 buses up to 14 years without any problem. But we know that if you have
28 the money, yes you're going to replace them every 12 years. But if you
29 don't have the money you have to scramble and try to make the buses last
30 as long as possible.

31
32 Pearson: Okay.

33
34 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Sorry I know we're kind of taking a long time on this. So I think
35 what happened with this is FTA said well FHWA is doing asset
36 management, we need to asset management too and then they said,
37 everybody needs to set goals, but they haven't provided the guidance to
38 do that yet. So I think this is the attempt to start setting goals and my
39 guess is that we will definitely be voting on an amendment to this once
40 more guidance comes out. Like with Federal Highway they're constantly
41 rewriting the CFRs and FTA is undergoing some of that right now. So my
42 guess now is that some of that guidance will be hopefully in the sections
43 that are forthcoming.

44
45 Pearson: Okay. Any further comments? I'll hear a motion to approve this as
46 presented.

1
2 Curry: I'll put forth a motion to approve as presented.

3
4 Bencomo: Second.

5
6 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to bring this forward as presented. All in
7 favor "aye."

8
9 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

10
11 Pearson: Any opposed? And that completes that item.

12 13 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

14 15 **6.1 Trail Plan Evaluation Matrix**

16
17 Pearson: We're on to discussion items.

18
19 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE THE PRESENTATION.

20
21 Paz: Mr. Chair. Thank you Dr. McAdams. You can tell that a lot of work has
22 been done to this and we appreciate that effort. I had some concerns or
23 questions about the public health section. I believe when we initially
24 discussed it we were looking at connecting to areas with chronic disease
25 or areas with high rates of childhood obesity.

26
27 McAdams: Okay.

28
29 Paz: I was trying to incorporate how those questions or those measurements
30 align with that kind of vein of thinking rather than providing, you know does
31 the trail encourage bicycling or recreation or shopping. I was thinking of
32 like does this connect to an area that has the highest rate of childhood
33 obesity or something like that. That was kind of the disconnection that I
34 saw between I think the original ideas that we had last meeting to the
35 questions that I see before me today. So you can kind of elaborate. I just
36 have some questions about that area in particular.

37
38 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Paz. Those are really good questions, I agree. I think that
39 we didn't incorporate that. I think that I can see where we can do it, but I
40 think one of the real problems is trying to measure what are the areas of
41 high obesity or perhaps diabetes which is also, obesity and diabetes are
42 very problematic in Dona Ana County, but how do you measure that. And
43 I agree with you. Because we know many areas that have obesity and
44 problem with diabetes are in areas of colonias is the other MPO area. But
45 I don't know, I think we should but I'm not sure how we measure that and
46 how we incorporate that into our factors unless we say we have a feeling

1 that these areas are, some kind of documentation that these areas have
2 high diabetes or high obesity rates. I agree with you completely but I'm
3 not sure how we get the metrics to do that. If you can give me any
4 suggestions from the Health Department we can probably do that. I would
5 open the discussion for anybody else too as well on this issue.
6
7 Herrera: Mr. Chair can we suggest that staff reach out to somebody in the Health
8 Department and see what kind of data they're collecting? Maybe they are
9 collecting data like that and we just don't know about it.
10
11 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I will. Because we have contacts in DOH, we just
12 didn't address those issues. But I'm sure they do have factors, I'm not
13 sure how specific they are to small areas, but I know they do exist.
14
15 Herrera: Well then maybe you can just when you reach out to them make the
16 question vague and just say "What kind of data are you collecting?"
17
18 McAdams: Okay.
19
20 Herrera: Because that might tie into more than just obesity. Maybe there are some
21 other things that we can put in here somehow.
22
23 McAdams: Okay.
24
25 Paz: Another component that I thought of as well was aging populations and
26 their access to recreation. I know that some rural areas have large
27 populations that are older citizens, retired citizens, so that's just another
28 component to kind of think about. Thank you.
29
30 Curry: Mr. Chair. I just want to add in, I don't know if our new members know
31 what we're talking about here. Are you guys familiar with what we're
32 talking about? Both of you, I don't know. I mean we just kind of jumped
33 into this and I'm thinking I would be lost if I hadn't been to previous
34 meetings. So basically we're looking at bicycle/pedestrian trail facilities
35 around the community and whether they're in street or off street, the
36 multiuse trails, those types of things, and this criteria here is weighing how
37 we're going to prioritize which areas get mapped. So we have, I actually
38 met with Mr. McAdams this past week and I really appreciated his time
39 because I had really fussed a lot about a good map. There's a tiny version
40 but I've brought his nice big printed out version and so it's looking at EBID
41 trails, it's looking at current in-road facilities. But it's looking at this and it's
42 taking all these trails and figuring out which ones we want to prioritize and
43 which ones we want to use. So I thought I would just explain that to you
44 because I think if I were coming to this meeting and just hearing us rattling
45 off about weights and points I'd have no idea what it is. So I wanted to say

1 that. So also just again thank you for this map it's very nice to have it. It
2 meets a lot of what I see.

3 I do have sort of one small fussy piece and I have to say this as the
4 Safe Routes to School Coordinator, I just feel that two points for being
5 close to a school is not enough. When we're giving 10 points to being
6 close to transit stops, the number of children who are at public schools in
7 Las Cruces is 12,000 or something and that I think is just elementary
8 schools, so you know versus the number of people that use transit, I think
9 that those should be weighted a little bit differently. So I would like to put
10 some more points towards schools if we could please.

11
12 McAdams: Okay.

13
14 Billings: Mr. Chair. On my end I think this is a huge improvement from what we did
15 on the last work session and thank you for it. I also think you addressed
16 the equity element really well and I really appreciate that being in there.
17 Thanks.

18
19 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I agree with Ashleigh on the schools and the transit stops. If
20 you look at probably, I don't know that there's going to be just in the little
21 research I've done with the maps and creating different things and looking
22 at the off road facilities which I'm focusing on more because the in-road
23 facilities are the easier ones and we have a lot more of those. It's virtually
24 impossible not to connect to a transit route when all of these cross the City
25 the way they do. So I think that's almost going to be a given that it
26 connects to a transit route. I actually took the transit map and then drew
27 in the laterals and all that and there's like literally 100 points probably or
28 more where they touch the transit routes very closely to transit stops,
29 actually not just the route but the stop itself. So I think that's going to be a
30 given, so if those are given less points I think it's going to be a wash either
31 way because they're all going to touch them. But I think the schools do
32 need have a little higher point value. We're trying to not only get kids to
33 school more safely but we're trying to build ridership and those are the
34 people you start with. And so trying to incorporate the schools in there a
35 little bit more, plus a lot of families use school playgrounds as their parks
36 because there's not a park perhaps that close.

37 Addressing the public health piece. Public Health Department does
38 have statistics on things like diabetes. I don't know that they have
39 breakdowns on obesity. I don't recall that, but working with Communities
40 United, Place Matters previously, they do have statistics and areas where
41 it shows higher rates of diabetes and things like that because that is
42 tracked at the health clinics and reported on. I don't know about the
43 obesity part though. So they may have that also. So I would suggest
44 either the health department or actually Carrie at Communities United, she
45 has a ton of that information already. When we did the health impact
46 assessment on the counties parks and trails, that was part of our process

1 was doing that. So she may have a lot of that already. And I know you
2 have a connection with her.

3
4 McAdams: Of course.

5
6 Bencomo: It may be easy enough just to pick up the phone and talk to her and she
7 can give you everything you need, I'm not sure. So other than that I like
8 the changes on this. The layout, I'm curious, are we going to, because it's
9 laid out in a Word document type form. Are we going to put it back into a
10 scoring matrix form before we use it?

11
12 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. Yes. We're really look at the basis without, one
13 thing we had was like we put the projects and that sort of focused things
14 away. What we're creating is the instrument to evaluate the project. So
15 we bring through the sieve and as these things point up then it'll come out.
16 I think that what we'd like to do is have this approved as a method. We'll
17 put the more evaluation or more points on the schools with the same point
18 system and then also the *(inaudible)*. But next time we'd like t come back
19 and say we approve it and then we take that, then we put the matrix with
20 the suggested projects you want. I mean two projects per person or
21 whatever number we want to do to come out with using this evaluation
22 matrix sort of filter out to what could be the best project and also it's good
23 for *(inaudible)*. Once we take this stuff we can then explain to policy
24 makers, this is why we made this decision because of this narrative. So
25 again I think focusing on this as a tool, we can use this over and over
26 again. Right? And hopefully we can explore it maybe. But to look at it as
27 a tool for evaluating projects. So I think a lot of time we get so stuck on
28 project itself that we really set up blinds as to the overall evaluation
29 process. And the evaluation process is not perfect. We will probably look
30 and say we should do this and this and this and this, but is a tool, a sieve
31 to look at how we can evaluate by points. And the points are variable to a
32 certain degree but they're reflecting our priorities of what we should do.
33 So that way, and we will look at, I know we shouldn't done it this way or
34 didn't look good, we should do this way, but I think that we probably be on
35 forever. So I think we would like to as staff sort of next time we'll come
36 out, we'll take your recommendations and next time we'll vote on it so we
37 can start looking at priority. Actually looking in the matrix, that'll be
38 another exercise and give us a project, we'll put it through the sieve, and
39 then after a couple months we'll come back with rankings and then you
40 can alter that too.

41
42 Herrera: Mr. Chair. If that's the way we're going to go which is okay with me, I have
43 some comments on the readiness aspect. I like that we gave it less
44 weight overall. I think that that's good but I have some concerns about the
45 points given to the measures, A, B, and C. Just because the types of
46 funding that these projects are probably going to go after, at least

1 Federally, are TAP and rec trails and we haven't set a limit on how much
2 money an entity can get. It's really about how much you can match. So I
3 don't feel like construction costs should have the most points. I feel like
4 intergovernmental agreements and right-of-way acquisition make projects
5 much more complicated.

6
7 McAdams: Okay.

8
9 Herrera: More so than project costs I would say.

10
11 Curry: Okay. Mr. Chair and Mr. McAdams. Could I just add a couple more
12 things? Again I think it's again like who said it, maybe Maggie, that it's
13 really a great improvement and it's looking really good, but just a couple
14 thoughts. Under public health, specifically B, mirrors very much what one
15 E says; does it provide connections to parks or complexes, you know,
16 blah, blah, blah, five points. It's very similar to one, Connectivity to parks,
17 blah, blah, blah, so I think that you know maybe fine tuning that and not
18 having that mirror something because somebody's going to end up getting
19 double points because it matches both areas.

20 And I think the other big question that's not addressed on here and
21 this is something that Mr. Bencomo's talked about a lot, is does it stay
22 completely off road or are there parts of this that would be partly in-road,
23 partly off-road. So when we're talking about the EBID irrigation usage are
24 we all on EBID where there would be no point in time other than just to
25 cross an intersection that travel would be needed as an in-road facility.
26 But if it's a little bit in-road, a little bit off-road, I would like some where in
27 the matrix to catch that. Because I think again when you're looking at
28 children on the road, you're looking at a facility that's completely off-road,
29 that's going to get a way more of a thumbs up from me than one where
30 you're going to be, you know just for these three blocks you're going to be
31 sharing lanes with traffic or have a bicycle lane in traffic. So I would like
32 something in there, more heavily weighted than not that's going to address
33 that. Safety section. Is it already in there? Oh put it in the safety section,
34 okay.

35
36 McAdams: That would be appropriate to put that. And I agree that Mr. Chair, Ms.
37 Curry. I think I agree because if the trail's exclusive, restricted right-of-way,
38 no conflict, like some of the multiuse, no intersections, yes that will receive
39 higher than those that have to cross intersections or those you have to
40 take, you have to dismount your bike and then go the next section of trails.
41 So yeah I think that would be a very good thing. Does it require going
42 through intersections? Because that would be additional cost if we have
43 to do intersection improvement for bicycles, or is the facility like many
44 portions of EBID, you don't have to do anything. You improve it and then
45 it doesn't go, and you don't have to cross streets etc. So I think that's a
46 very good aspect.

1
2 Curry: Thank you. I think in particular I'm thinking of the north/south that
3 everybody was in favor of getting from you know University area to north
4 of town and that was why I was so naggy about this map because I think
5 parts of it we were saying just saying let's use EBID but EBID didn't run
6 along Main Street and particular the section of Main Street that's between
7 Alameda and Avenida de Mesilla and that's a really sketchy place on a
8 bicycle and so if you had to share the road at that point I wouldn't be
9 hugely in favor of sharing the road in that stretch of road. Whereas if there
10 another section that could be exclusively on EBID, and yes you're going to
11 have to cross some major roads at some point, that's fine, but I think those
12 are the kinds of things I'd like to be able to weed out with that matrix.
13 Thanks.

14
15 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. And I agree with Ashleigh. Now that you're saying all that it's
16 kind of, the wheels of my head are turning, so looking at the safety
17 section, I'm thinking maybe, because there's no breakout in there, it's just
18 kind of a paragraph that talks about what we want to do. But if we can
19 break it out into like some points like weighting those points out perhaps
20 there's points for an off-road facility compared to an in-road facility. And
21 then there may be even sections of off-road facilities like for example the
22 Armijo Lateral where from Three Crosses all the way to Picacho there's
23 only minor road crossings; it's McClure and Hoagland's pretty busy, and
24 then there's some residential streets it crosses but nothing major. When
25 you get to Picacho that section there may score lower because now
26 you've got to cross Picacho and you've got to cross Amador, and then
27 farther down you've got to cross Avenida de Mesilla, so there may be
28 sections that get a higher ranking, so maybe if we have the first of all off-
29 road versus in-road, then maybe major road crossings versus minor road
30 crossings, those type of things that we could maybe break it out that way
31 and that gives us a little more to drill into and break that 25 points, that's a
32 lot of points which is great because it's safety, but there's not really any
33 levels of criteria within that 25 points and maybe those of the kind of things
34 we need to look at there. Thank you.

35
36 Curry: One more thought from me. I think that something else that we should
37 consider is the length of path or facility that we're going to be providing.
38 So I mean you could be looking at something that's going to be 10 miles
39 and it crosses the whole of town and that may end up weighing more or
40 less because it passes more schools or because it's got more intersection
41 crossings blah, blah, blah. So I'm wondering if we need some kind of
42 metric that says this is the VMT since that's the term of the night. So
43 maybe we have per one-mile VMT so that it can then be divided out. So
44 you'd look at the matrix, I know you're rolling eyes at me.

1 McAdams: No, excuse me, I'm not rolling eyes. I'm just saying because we have
2 such, we don't know bicycle counts on some of them, we're not really
3 aware of even the most used path, we have better hand on. But it's
4 looking at how many bicycles on some of these roads. We have a very
5 vague. We have Strava data but that is really ...

7 Curry: I'm sorry, you're misunderstanding me.

9 McAdams: Okay.

11 Curry: I'm not speaking clearly. What I mean is that we would take a 10-mile
12 stretch. Let's just say from University up to Dona Ana Road. We've got a
13 10-mile stretch where we're going to say "Hey this would be a really
14 awesome opportunity to put a multiuse trail that goes north to south." In
15 that 10-mile stretch we're going to pass five schools, we're going to pass
16 six parks, we're going to pass grocery center, so it's going to weigh high
17 on the matrix. And then we're going to have all these dangerous
18 crossings, it's going to come lower. But it's a 10 mile stretch, versus a
19 piece on Roadrunner where you're going to say "Hey let's do this." But the
20 piece on Roadrunner's only one mile and so it may end up scoring much
21 higher in that one mile because it's only a mile, so it doesn't have any
22 dangerous crossings. So how are we going to then compare one-mile
23 segment or a half-mile segment; Hadley Boulevard for example, how are
24 we going to compared one to another? Sort of comparing apples to
25 oranges. So can we divide out by one mile sections or, I don't know,
26 somebody with more mathematical.

28 Wray: Mr. Chair. Could I interject? I would caution consideration on that
29 particular metric of length just on the basis if you look at something from
30 the overall system perspective I think that's something that should be part
31 of the analysis and I don't know necessarily that there's a good way to
32 capture this as a metric per se, but you want to kind of look at, I'll use the
33 word strategic connections from a system perspective and I would caution
34 against biasing the process against small but strategically significant
35 connections that need to be made in the context of the overall network.
36 Now this is something, we'll take all of this as staff back, we'll look at this,
37 but I just wanted to kind of pipe in here on that specific point. As we're
38 building this we need to be conscious of any unintended biases or
39 anything like that that we may be building into this, because the intention
40 of this matrix is this is going to become as objective a process as possible
41 so that it's less an opinion based, "We think this is a good trail we'd really
42 like to do this," and more of "Okay, how does this fit into the matrix?" But
43 we have to caution ourselves when we're building this matrix to make sure
44 that we're not building biases into the matrix because then we could end
45 up saying I have a specific point in mind that I'm actually thinking of the
46 crossing of the southern loop of the multiuse trail, getting it across Main

1 Street, that's going to be a high dollar project when we get it to that point
2 and I'm just thinking if we're going to be looking at it in the basis of length,
3 that's going to be a very short segment but a very very important and
4 critical and probably costly to be honest about what it's going to look like in
5 the final analysis. So we need to make sure that we don't bias things too
6 heavily one way or the other and that goes across the board but in this
7 specific instance as well.
8

9 Curry: Right. So I take your point completely and I fully agree with what you're
10 saying. So I think that maybe all of this matrix comes with ... the final
11 decision making shouldn't be done just based on the matrix number
12 because some of it is going to be something super short and important, as
13 you said a connectivity piece, and something is going to be maybe
14 weighted higher or lower, but it has a really long stretch and covers a lot of
15 ground. So I think my point is just that we need to take length into
16 consideration one way or the other and whether it fits into a matrix formula
17 or whether it fits into a "Hey we've got this number but then let's still look
18 at the project as a whole." Because I think that that is going to be a really
19 important piece. We don't want to just look at numbers and come out and
20 go "Okay, well you know the numbers look good for this project, let's move
21 forward" when we may have something else that's more important, either
22 because it's longer or because it's a critical piece.
23

24 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Curry. I think we could maybe bias a little weighting on the
25 connectivity address exactly what Andrew was saying, but some of these
26 things will be, even though you're right, I mean we're trying to be objective
27 possible some like strategically, we may have to fudge the numbers a little
28 bit to a certain way. And these are not stuck in, doesn't mean we violate
29 the point system, but we look at other factors that may be important and
30 again as I emphasized, this is not a perfect matrix, it's a way to evaluate
31 projects and some of (*inaudible*) strategic. And I agree because that
32 would connect several different trails together, complete the multiuse path
33 which is a goal of ours. So sometimes goals kind of override, maybe
34 looking at some of the matrix too. And so we have to look, as any kind of
35 matrix you have to take in common sense. If they violate common sense
36 and then expect they're really above metrics, then we have to go to where
37 our overall goals are. So it's a little bit of fuzzy stuff, a little bit qualitative
38 versus quantitative which we're straying now to the quantitative side, but
39 it's obviously qualitative, you can't really define it sometimes.
40

41 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I make a suggestion? So maybe what we say is because
42 I think the point of doing all of this is to provide more transparency for how
43 decisions are made at all levels; this level, at the Policy Committee level,
44 and then at the individual jurisdiction levels which is good. That's always
45 good when the public understands why decisions were made. But maybe
46 we can just put a caveat at the top of the matrix itself that says "This is the

1 criteria but there's always going to be judgement." Or some kind of ...
2 because we can recommend whatever and the Policy Committee can
3 come and say "Well I want number four, not number one," for whatever
4 reason and then you know they have to be transparent in how they
5 choose that. But I think we should really outline this as a guide for
6 transparency on how things score and put some sort of caveat. Maybe we
7 can work on the wording for that. But just let it be known that the number
8 is the number but that doesn't mean that's the final decision just because
9 it's the number.

10
11 Mathews: Mr. Chair. May I make a comment? I think this discussion is terrific. I feel
12 like the weighting, the total number of points given to each component, to
13 the five components are weighting and obviously connectivity is very high,
14 so maybe that takes care of the issue of a longer trail will by necessity
15 have more connectivity and obtain more points overall anyways just
16 because of the weighting here, that the connectivity's been weighed very
17 high. Also I thought under readiness maybe one of the measurements
18 can be approval or acceptance or suggestion by an elected governing
19 body; the City Council or the County Commission if they as public
20 representatives with a public process that is responsible to their
21 constituents, if this process gives weights some points to that then the
22 openness and the transparency for a particular project is built in under this
23 readiness task or readiness evaluation criteria, perhaps that's a way to
24 address both of those issues.

25
26 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So I agree with most of what you said Cathy but I disagree with
27 the readiness and being that City Council has approved this or whatever,
28 the approval process really starts with us, we're the advisory committee
29 and so our advice to them through of course the TAC and the Policy
30 Committee is this is what we want. It's not the other way around. So I
31 would tend to disagree with that. Now there are governing bodies that we
32 do need to work with, for example Elephant Butte Irrigation District, they
33 are a governing body and so if they're not supportive of this which is the
34 agreements there also. So those are some governing bodies that I think
35 would need to be done on the upfront, but this is a plan that we're going to
36 put together to take to those governing bodies at the final stage, not now
37 and they're giving their input now, we're giving input to them. So I would
38 tend to disagree with that. I like your thoughts.

39
40 Mathews: Mr. Bencomo I understand. So maybe that's not the way to go since this
41 is advising, you know perhaps advising or making suggestions to these
42 other governing bodies. But maybe there would be a way to evaluate their
43 planning documents to see if those documents, if any particular project fits
44 in with those kinds of documents that are available out there and that's
45 another way to determine readiness that essentially the public through
46 their representatives has made these suggestions so far.

1
2 Pearson: So far I think our planning documents are the only ones that address this.
3 The Active Transportation Plan throw a City flavor on this pretty soon. But
4 that's a valid point about is if there are other plans that identify, maybe the
5 Arroyo plan identifies some trails that would add points to this.
6

7 Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I can add something to that thought. We also have to keep in
8 mind that we are an MPO body and so there are Federal laws about
9 consistency with the MTP, so everything that we do has to be consistent
10 with the MTP. Anybody who receives Federal funds in an MPO area has
11 to make sure that whatever projects they're putting forth are consistent
12 with the MTP, so it doesn't, this is going to sound bad, but it doesn't really
13 matter what they're planning documents say if they are not consistent with
14 this MPO MTP they will not receive funding, at least not through the
15 Federal government. So we get to set the rules I think a little bit.
16

17 Pearson: Okay. On the length of the projects, maybe project selection an also help
18 determine that if we're looking at the Armijo Lateral from the Outfall
19 Channel to University it might be appropriate so that's two or three
20 projects to get evaluated rather than one project. Looking at the public
21 health and socioeconomic, I see those could be closely related and as you
22 discuss that with the Department of Health you'll probably find out
23 information about that. I don't know if they'll be combined, but they
24 probably play off of each other and inform each other. On public health,
25 there's the prescription trail system out there, I wonder how that would
26 interact with this might be reflected and that might be something that
27 you're discussion with Department of Health would also reflect.
28

29 Bencomo: I'm sorry Mr. Chair, another comment. So just for future reference, so
30 we're putting this matrix together, we're hopefully doing to have this
31 completed, ready to go maybe everything by the end of the year, I'm
32 hoping. So overtime things change and socioeconomic areas change and
33 health factors change and all those things, so are there certain guidelines
34 that maybe through the Federal Highway Administration or the State,
35 whoever, that we need to revisit this at a certain timeframe; every 3 years,
36 every 5 years, do we know what that is?
37

38 Herrera: Yes, if we're going to make this part of the Metropolitan Transportation
39 Plan, the long-range plan for the MPO, for the new members, the
40 minimum requirement is that that plan must be updated every four years
41 or as needed. So that means if we get a major industrial section in the
42 MPO area and it's only been two years, then that would drive an update.
43

44 Bencomo: So I'm asking because we would then have to update like any health
45 information that we have gotten, we'd have to get the most current
46 information on that and those type of things, so we'll have to keep that in

1 mind when we're putting required criteria in here that we're doing to have
2 to, somebody's going to have to get that updated information and provide
3 it here. So just because that's probably going to fall on MPO staff, so we
4 need to be careful what we throw on you guys even more. By the way I
5 just wanted to say I really appreciate the work you guys have done and
6 we've given you a lot of information and you've taken it and put it all
7 together in a very comprehensive manner and I appreciate that. Thank
8 you very much for doing that, all of you, all the MPO staff. Thank you.
9

10 Pearson: So I thought I heard you say that you wanted to bring this as an action
11 item next time.
12

13 McAdams: Mr. Chair. That's correct.
14

15 Pearson: And would we also then have a discussion item for the projects to look at?
16

17 McAdams: Yes. I would think it'd be a good thing because I think getting the matrix
18 kind of formalized is what you want and I think that probably the
19 discussion will be what projects you want to consider. So I would ask all
20 the members to come with their projects they think was important, you
21 know two or three, whatever, and then we could push using the matrix, we
22 then could evaluate those projects through the matrix and bring them back
23 and you, well that did what I want, or the matrix is not working. That's
24 really sort of the litmus test, when we do bring them through, are they
25 reflective of what we know is common sense or did they actually do a
26 good job in evaluating these projects. And we hope that through that will
27 come two or three projects that we said these are our priorities and we
28 can then put it though the member implementing agencies and say, these
29 are our choices. Here's our number one, here's number two, for Dona
30 Ana County, for the City of Las Cruces, for DOT maybe, for the Town of
31 Mesilla. These are what we like to see. And of course that becomes
32 another realm. That will be a success. We can look at projects and then
33 of course we say this gives like Ms. Herrera was saying, this gives us
34 justification, also to the public. We're totally transparent. Here are the
35 reasons we're choosing this projections. It's not somebody's pet projects,
36 here's the justification. So I think getting the matrix approved next time
37 and then discussion, and then probably another three months or four
38 months having our projects in line so we can get them in line with CIPs I
39 think will be a *(inaudible)*.
40

41 Pearson: Okay.
42

43 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Sorry one last thing. When we look at that we need to make
44 sure that we're looking at the current list of projects in the MTP.
45

1 McAdams: Absolutely. And Ms. Herrera I agree with you completely. We are now on
2 the verge, within, next year we'll be looking at the update for the MTP so
3 we're again I think this is good (*inaudible*) we've always emphasized,
4 these are approved trails in the first year, primarily we're going to alter that
5 first year that's an amendment, but mainly we're looking at first year trails.
6 So nothing outside of the adopted MTP. I think that I would recommend if
7 it's like something's really major we should postpone it to the update which
8 is like coming very soon. So we do have some issues in line and let's deal
9 with what we have now with adopted. It's like Ms. Herrera said, we can
10 look for that as any kind of project, it has to be according to the MTP for
11 Federal funding and then I think we can also look forward to the next MTP
12 which is coming up really soon.

13
14 Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

15 16 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

17 18 **7.1 MPO Staff Update**

19
20 Pearson: So we'll move on to 7.1, MPO update.

21
22 McAdams: We have no report at this moment.

23
24 Pearson: Okay, I guess I'll ask the state plan is going to have a meeting down here.
25 Do you know about that or ...

26
27 Herrera: The state bicycle plan.

28
29 Pearson: The state bicycle plan.

30
31 Herrera: Yes, there are several meetings planned in Las Cruces for that.

32
33 Pearson: We'll wait for your section then for that or you want to talk about that.

34
35 Herrera: Sure. Whatever you would like Mr. Chair.

36
37 Pearson: Well let's go through local updates and then we'll get to you in about three
38 minutes.

39 40 **7.2 Local Projects update**

41
42 Pearson: City of Las Cruces, do you have updates for us?

43
44 Mathews: Mr. Chair. Yes I do. James Nunez provided me with a list and I'm not
45 terribly familiar personally with each of these projects, but if you have
46 questions I'll be happy to try to answer them or take those questions back

1 to James. Under construction are six projects; pedestrian and ADA
2 improvements on Hadley Avenue at Melendres Street; traffic signal at
3 Amador and Melendres; the downtown conversion project is ahead of
4 schedule; Dona Ana Road north of Alameda Avenue includes water and
5 sewer lines in that construction project, it's set to begin within a few
6 months; ADA improvements are under construction at Solano Drive at
7 Poplar and Mulberry; and ADA improvement at Cambridge.

8 In design a couple projects; the design of complete reconstruction
9 of Richard, Karen, Jody, and Terry Streets in Alameda State Subdivision
10 should be bid for construction in December; Telshor Boulevard and Court,
11 West Water Street is in design. And finally maintenance overlay projects
12 include East Missouri Avenue, east of Telshor Boulevard. This one is to
13 be restriped with a wider bike lane and a center turn lane. Telshor
14 Boulevard at University Avenue is on the maintenance list. Hermosillo
15 Place, Nemesh Drive, a small section of that street. Jasmine Street is
16 under repair for washboard at the west end. Idaho Avenue at El Paseo
17 and a rutted area is repaired. And in additional various projects of slurry
18 seals have been started this week. And that's it.

19
20 Pearson: Okay. Thank you. The County.

21
22 Paz: I have no updates at this time.

23
24 Pearson: Okay. Thank you. Does NMSU have something for us?

25
26 Kirby: No, there are currently not bicycle or pedestrian projects that would affect
27 the group.

28
29 Pearson: Town of Mesilla.

30
31 Shepan: Nothing sir.

32
33 Pearson: Okay.

34 35 **7.3 NMDOT Projects update**

36
37 Pearson: NMDOT.

38
39 Herrera: Thanks Mr. Chair. I'll go through the projects and then we can talk about
40 the State Bicycle Plan. I guess I want to start with Dona Ana County
41 actually does have an update, probably their Engineering Department. So
42 the safety project at the intersection of, oh man what are those two roads,
43 I just drew a blank. El Camino Real.

44
45 Wray: Dona Ana School Road.

1 Herrera: There you go. So that project has been in the works for five years and
2 they got their funding obligated finally last month. So that project design is
3 complete, construction funding is obligated, they should hopefully open for
4 bid here in the next few weeks, so congratulations. That's going to be a
5 really good project.

6 Onto DOT projects, the project on US-70 though San Augustine
7 Pass is moving along quite nicely. We hope to finish that one by the end
8 of October. It's been a pretty short project and we haven't had any
9 complaints from cyclists during the construction which kind of surprised
10 me but it's a really good thing. We only have a couple more weeks
11 though, so if you know somebody who's disgruntled let them know that
12 we'll be out of there soon and they'll have a nice wide shoulder to ride on.
13 The project at Main/Solano/Spitz and Three Crosse, if you've driven
14 through there it's pretty torn up. We're still on schedule for completion
15 May or June of next year. We are working extensively with the City to
16 upgrade water and sewer lines at the same time, so that adds time to the
17 project. But we're on schedule so, so far so good. We have two small
18 projects that did not come through the MPO for approval because they
19 were 100% State funded through capital outlay through some of the State
20 reps, but one of them is on Tortugas and it's some drainage, sidewalk, and
21 basic ADA upgrades there. So it's a very short stretch of road, I think less
22 than a mile, but that project is almost complete. We have just about three
23 more weeks left on that one. Then there's also a similar project on Thorpe
24 road to upgrade the ADA facilities and ramps and add some sidewalks
25 along there. And that one again should be complete here in the next few
26 weeks.

27 Two other projects that are coming up, Valley Drive, we did already
28 put that project out for bid, unfortunately the bids came in \$11 million over
29 the engineer's estimate which we cannot accept, so we rejected the bid
30 and we're looking at the plans right now to make sure that there are no
31 issues and then we hope to re-let that project in December and hopefully
32 we will get a more reasonable price on that. University and I-25 is
33 underway, we're about 30% design. They have started public meetings,
34 so be aware of those. They had one I believe September 28th, but there
35 will be more coming, so if you're interested in that project or you want to
36 provide input, the public meetings are the place to do that. You can
37 always e-mail me also if you want to provide comments. We're looking at
38 an October 2018 let on that project, so we have just about a year left on
39 design. And that's all I have for projects. Are there any questions on any
40 of that?

41
42 Curry: Ms. Herrera. I have a question. And I know this was brought before us a
43 while ago but it just keeps coming to my attention every time I drive
44 through. On the Valley Drive project, where the lateral crosses at
45 Caliche's on Valley Drive, is there some kind of pedestrian crossing there?

1 Because I don't think I've driving past there where there isn't a pedestrian
2 in the middle of the road.
3
4 Herrera: I'm not sure. I'll have to check.
5
6 Curry: Because I think, I mean it may be too late to put it in, but it just seems
7 safety-wise, I mean I literally don't think I've been there where there hasn't
8 been a pedestrian or a bicycle crossing in the middle of that. And there
9 really isn't a midblock crossing there. So I mean since you're in the middle
10 of it, can just add a little bit more and make a pedestrian crossing there?
11
12 Herrera: I will check in the plans and see if there's anything there and then speak to
13 the engineers and we'll see what we can do.
14
15 Curry: I'd be interested to hear what that is. Thank you.
16
17 Pearson: On the University/I-25 project, I went to the public meeting and spoke to
18 some of the consultants there and they expressed that they would come to
19 this Committee and present, I don't know what an appropriate time might
20 be, I guess anytime now since they're in that part of the design.
21
22 Herrera: I would suggest waiting until about 60% so maybe another couple of
23 months just because 30% is still pretty preliminary, we're still trying to
24 define the footprint of the project and workout just some basic things so I
25 feel like the changes between 30 and 60 are very significant and I wouldn't
26 want them to present something to us here and then totally change it.
27
28 Pearson: Right. So maybe ask for a February meeting with them?
29
30 Herrera: I'll check their timeline and just make sure that it's around the 60%, that
31 way we can still provide input and it can be incorporated so it's not too
32 late.
33
34 Pearson: Okay so maybe plan for January or February. Okay.
35
36 Herrera: Any other questions on projects? No, okay. So Mr. Chair alluded to the
37 New Mexico State Bike Plan. I don't know if you've all had a chance to
38 see the flier. There are upcoming meetings in Las Cruces for that. All of
39 the BPAC members have been invited to a working lunch on November
40 2nd. It's at the Mesilla Community Center I believe and it's from 12:00 to
41 1:00.
42
43 Pearson: Yeah, I saw the invitation to lunch but no further details on that.
44
45 Herrera: Okay. And for that meeting we want to keep just to the BPAC members.
46 The TAC will also be receiving a presentation, that is the public meeting,

1 and then after TAC, at 6:00 p.m. at the library there will be a public
2 meeting. So there are three chances for this body to comment.
3

4 Pearson: So the time has been sent to 6:00. Okay.
5

6 Herrera: Yes.
7

8 Pearson: That detail hadn't reached me yet.
9

10 Herrera: Yes, and I believe that they're working on the press releases now so we
11 should have something that we can circulate with those times. But again I
12 just stress that for the working lunch we want to keep it to this Committee
13 only.
14

15 Bencomo: I'm sorry, George you said you got notification of that, was it an e-mail, but
16 I don't know anything about this.
17

18 Pearson: I got an e-mail from the consultant. I'm on the distribution list so they sent
19 flier.
20

21 Bencomo: Okay.
22

23 Pearson: Said that they were planning for the luncheon. So I would expect we
24 should get another e-mail solidifying the lunch.
25

26 Herrera: Yeah, you'll get a formal invite. The e-mail that went to George was really
27 just to ask him if that was okay since he's the BPAC Chair, so the formal
28 invites will be going out to the entire Committee. And we'll make sure,
29 Andrew's really good about putting all the information on the webpage, so
30 all that will be available there. But I'll make sure that everybody on this
31 committee gets the fliers for the times and the places.
32

33 Pearson: And there is currently an active website for the projects, they've got a
34 questionnaire and they've got an interactive map.
35

36 Herrera: Yes. And if I e-mail you the flier MPO staff, can you make sure that that
37 gets to this Committee?
38

39 McAdams: Yes, we can do that.
40

41 Herrera: Okay. I'll make sure to get that to you. It's a really cool map. You can go
42 on there and you can pick locations that you would like to ride but don't
43 because you feel it's dangerous in some way. There's a place where you
44 can mark that you really like to ride this and obviously we're focusing on
45 the state routes but you can make comments on local routes also, so
46 we're planning on passing along any information that we get to

1 jurisdictions. And please take time to take the questionnaire. It only takes
2 about 10 minutes to take it, but it really is going to help I think drive what it
3 is that we're trying to do with the State Bike Plan.

4 And I guess I didn't even give any background on it. So what we're
5 trying to do is set priorities basically for biking through the State. So we're
6 not focusing on the urban areas, that's what the MPOs do, so we're
7 focusing more on through state travel or within state long distance travel.
8 One other part of it is that we are trying to set some kind of standards for
9 what a road should look like if its been deemed let's say Tier 1 for travel
10 versus like maybe Tier 3 and the NMDOT will be implementing those
11 standards and all districts will be following them after we get the plan
12 implemented. So we would really really like your input.

13
14 Pearson: And it'll also reflect how the U.S. bike route system standards are needed
15 through New Mexico.

16
17 Herrera: Yes. And we have a pretty wide stakeholder list we're working with that
18 organization also.

19
20 Pearson: Okay. Thank you.

21 22 **7.4 Committee Members Update**

23
24 Pearson: Any Committee Member updates?

25
26 Curry: Yes, I have some. I don't have the final number because on Thursday this
27 week we have our final walk to school day celebration. We had one that
28 was put up for, I think it actually ended up being a City project, Public
29 Works replaced a sewer line on one of our Safe Routes to School routes
30 at Tombaugh Elementary, so Thursday they're going to do their
31 International Walk to School Day, but that will be 100% participation again
32 for International Walk to School Day for the school district, so 25
33 elementary schools. I will publicize the number once Tombaugh's walked.
34 But we I think had probably the most successful year that we've had yet
35 for number of kids walking to school for International Walk to School Day
36 which is great.

37 And I just wanted to let everybody know we are going to be working
38 towards having a League Cycling League of American Bicyclist, League
39 cycling instruction training in February. I don't think we've had one here
40 for probably eight years, 10 years, quite a long time. And we're going to
41 be bringing somebody in from Tucson who's going be doing that training.
42 It's a 26-hour training. It's going to be happening all in one weekend,
43 February 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, and the prerequisite for that one is a Classical
44 Traffic Skills 101 and we're going to have another one of those
45 prerequisite classes on November 11th. I'm working right now just to kind
46 of find a location. I'm hoping we're going to kind of finalize details but I'm

1 hoping that the training will happen here in this building. But again that's
2 just very tentative right now. There is a cost for the LCI seminar, but my
3 goal is that maybe we can find some funding within the City or the County
4 or whomever to help alleviate some of those costs. But the ultimate goal
5 would just be to get more people trained to be cycling instructors so that
6 we can kind of increase the safety numbers for people who are
7 pedestrians. We can offer services, whether it be the Community of Hope
8 or to schools or to you know general community members on teaching
9 them how to bike safely with traffic. So the Traffic Skills 101 on November
10 11th will be free and open to anybody in the public. That's it. Thank you.

11
12 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So the Traffic Skills 101 class I went through that. That's the
13 one I went through, right? Okay. I remember some of it. It's a great
14 class. It's a really good, Michael was there, it was a wonderful class. I
15 would suggest anybody that rides a bicycle go through that class. I think
16 the best part for me was just learning how to handle yourself in traffic, I
17 never knew how to do that properly. I kind of still don't, but it's a lot better.
18 So it's a great class. You should go to that.

19 I had a question, it was brought up last meeting, two meetings ago,
20 and it was a question about bicycle parking code requirements for
21 buildings, because I was just noticing, I'm noticing now just looking at
22 buildings all around the City, there's no place to lock your bicycle up or
23 park,. What are the requirements for that?

24
25 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. As a result of that comment made a couple
26 months ago, staff, the specific criticism was leveled on Telshor north of
27 Lohman. Staff has done a preliminary assessment of the facilities at the
28 various businesses along that stretch. It is complicated and it is going to
29 be a time consuming process just for that one stretch because there's the
30 issue of grandfathering things in because you can't retroactively require
31 businesses to provide stuff after the fact, after an ordinance has changed.
32 So there's a process of having to go through and evaluate when a
33 business went in, whether it was a requirement that they have cycle
34 parking at the time that it went in or not, and if it was not a requirement at
35 the time, that business is still existing in that same building, there's no way
36 to require that until some sort of change triggers them having to come into
37 compliance. And analysis of trying to go through there and wade through
38 that, we haven't actually gotten started on that, we've just done our
39 preliminary analysis of kind of "Is something there? Is something there?"
40 type of thing, but we are working on it. We are working on it specifically
41 on Telshor between Lohman and I guess effectively the intersection of Del
42 Rey is where we stopped.

43
44 Bencomo: Okay. I guess my question is what is the code requirement?
45

1 Wray: The code requirement is that cycle parking be provided but that only went
2 into effect I believe in 2006. So things that went in before 2006 would not
3 have had that requirement. I might be wrong about the year though so
4 don't quite me on the year.
5

6 Bencomo: Okay. That makes sense, but I would almost guarantee that there's a lot
7 of businesses that've opened since 2006 that don't meet that requirement
8 and for some reason I guess working on the previous stuff and getting
9 them up to code, the ones that required, the ones that were grandfathered
10 in right now until they make major changes, then you can't require it. I
11 understand that. But maybe some kind of focus or notice to Community
12 Development when they review these or the, I can't remember the
13 committee that needs to review it, fire departments, parks. Anyway,
14 there's a committee that reviews all of those as the processes go forward,
15 the subdivisions and the buildings, and it appears that they're not noticing
16 that that's not on there. It appears that that just an afterthought and
17 they're not even thinking about bicycle parking. And so if nothing else
18 from this point forward we can get them to start thinking about it, put them
19 on notice that that's something we, I think all of us, would probably agree
20 with that we want done and so we could just bring that up maybe.
21

22 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bencomo. Yes, I agree that there have been a couple of
23 specific, probably kind of high visible instances where things did slip
24 through the crack, but in our analysis of the area most, and I want to
25 emphasize most, of the most recent businesses do have the cycle
26 parking.
27

28 Bencomo: Okay.
29

30 Wray: Things have not slipped through the cracks perhaps as much as it might
31 seem. There are a couple of instances where it definitely has. I don't
32 want to dismiss that. There have been some instances where things have
33 slipped through the cracks, but in our analysis, and we have not, I want to
34 emphasize, we have not gone through rigorously to analyze year of
35 construction etc., but kind of hold up a thumb and well we think, our
36 memory is that most of the most recent businesses do have the cycle
37 parking, at least on that stretch of Telshor that we have analyzed.
38

39 Bencomo: Okay. Thank you.
40

41 Wray: And I want to emphasize recent businesses, because most of the
42 businesses I would say do not, but quite a lot of them existed before 2006.
43

44 Bencomo: Okay.
45

1 Pearson: If you go to the Velo Cruces website, velocruces.org, you can find the
2 resources. There's a direct link to the zoning code that talks about the
3 bicycle requirements and there are examples where things slip through
4 the cracks as the new Public Safety building on the East Mesa, if you look
5 at the zoning code and you look at the bike racks that they put in, they put
6 in the prohibited style bike racks.
7

8 Bencomo: That's got to be PD's fault, it's not fire, it's got to be PD. Just kidding. All
9 right. Thank you for that. Appreciate that research. Also I wanted to
10 second Ashleigh's suggestion about a crossing at Amador, by Caliche's
11 there, not that I like Caliche's or anything, but right there a pedestrian
12 crossing. That lateral does go, zigzags right past there and that brings a
13 lot of traffic. I was for some reason at Caliche's the other day and I was
14 noticing a lot of people using the lateral and crossing there. There's just a
15 ton of people that go back and forth there, most of them on foot, on bikes,
16 very heavy traffic for that area. And they run to the middle and they stand
17 there for a little bit and then they run there to the other side. So it's
18 something to look at.

19 Part of the reason I bring that up is I was asked by Dan Carter, he's
20 the president of the Southern New Mexico Trail Alliance to attend a
21 meeting this afternoon. We met with Elephant Butte Irrigation District
22 staff, Zach Libbin, and Gary Esslinger is their engineer and we met with
23 them this afternoon, we talked about the laterals, they were very
24 supportive of us using the laterals. They were even more supportive of us
25 using, they call them drains instead of laterals. There's a drain over here by
26 17th Street that crosses, it's more of a drain instead of carrying water for
27 irrigation. They even talked about that they were in negotiations of
28 discussion with the City, that the City might take over all drains within the
29 City limits, not that they're going to take over the laterals, but the drains
30 and the drains are more wide open, easier to use, just trying to put this in
31 a nutshell very quickly because I don't want to keep everybody here too
32 long. They talked about details as far as they were very supportive of it.
33 They wanted to go out and perhaps even walk and ride the ditches with us
34 because they're going to have to decide, one side's going to be for
35 pedestrian and bicycle traffic permanently, the other sides going to have to
36 be for their ditch riders to use permanently, can't cross the two, can't mix
37 the two. They wanted to make sure that no vehicles could get onto those
38 laterals. They even talked about them providing funding for gates that
39 were accessible as far as bicycles and pedestrians getting through but not
40 vehicles, very supportive of the whole process. So the reason that Dan
41 wanted to meet with them is because he wanted to get their feeling on he
42 would like to approach the parks and rec advisory board, he's already kind
43 of discussed this with them and they are on board with it. He would like to
44 try to get them to take the laterals that we kind of are talking about and
45 designating and call them official trails, but unimproved. They would be
46 official but unimproved. So they would be officially brought in as trail

1 system but there would be no improvement right now, and then that's
2 where this matrix would come in to where the designation of what level
3 they would be at which would drive the funding would be in that. It doesn't
4 mean the trail, but unimproved doesn't mean it goes to the top of the list or
5 anything, we're still going to have to be vetted through this criteria that we
6 have here. It doesn't change anything. So he's pursuing that kind of
7 separately and I support that as a community member. I think anything
8 we can do to give these more visibility, to keep the process moving, to get
9 people like the parks and rec advisory board as part of this, he says
10 they're very supportive of using the laterals. The trails become parks,
11 they're technically considered parks. We still have to work out the details
12 as we've talked about before. The City can't own them because they're
13 EBID laterals, but they would have use of them and they would maintain
14 them and those types of things. So there are some details to be worked
15 out. But in general the meeting today was super productive. I was very
16 pleased, they were almost pushing us to like do these things and they're
17 very interested in us, and people using the laterals. They even had
18 suggestions of routes and all kinds of stuff. They weren't the same
19 suggestions we necessarily had but it's great to hear them saying the
20 same things that we're saying as far as use of them. So just wanted to put
21 that out there so everybody knew what was happening with those. So
22 thank you.

23
24 Pearson: Any one else?

25
26 Bencomo: I'm sorry Mr. Chair. Do we have to get autographs now because I see a
27 picture that you need to hold that picture up there? Go on hold I up. That
28 looks pretty good. George and Ashleigh and other people out biking.

29
30 Pearson: That was the ...

31
32 Bencomo: Visibility day.

33
34 Pearson: Visibility ride that we have the second Monday of every month. Just
35 leaving the transportation museum train museum at 7:15 a.m. Any other
36 comments?

37 38 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

39
40 Pearson: Okay, we'll go onto our public comment.

41
42 McAdams: One remark. These issues can also be addressed in the Active
43 Transportation Plan and all of you are an external review. We can double-
44 team this again so the issue about the bike racks, the laterals can then be
45 addressed in that form too. So remember there's going to be a public
46 hearing coming in November or external, I think you already got notice of

1 that. Again we can double-team all these things and that. I think a lot of
2 these are in the purview of the Active Transportation Plan, the MPO and
3 (*inaudible*) are involved with.
4

5 Pearson: Okay. Public comment? Seeing none.
6

7 **9. ADJOURNMENT (7:08 p.m.)**
8

9 Pearson: We'll move on to adjournment. I'll hear a motion to adjourn.
10

11 Curry: I put forth a motion to adjourn.
12

13 Pearson: Can I hear a second?
14

15 Shepan: Second.
16

17 Pearson: All in favor "aye."
18

19 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
20

21 Pearson: We're adjourned.
22
23
24
25

26
27 _____
Chairperson
28
29



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF November 21, 2017

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 Trail Plan Evaluation Matrix

ACTION REQUESTED

Review and approval of the Trail Plan Evaluation Matrix

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

The revised matrix will be provided at the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

On October 17, 2017, the MPO staff presented the basis for a more detailed Trail Evaluation Matrix. The BPAC members discussed the matrix and gave feedback to MPO staff. The staff reviewed the comments and will present a revised Matrix to the Committee.



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 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 17, 2017

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Recommended Trails for Evaluation Matrix

DISCUSSION:

The Staff is requesting that the Committee members give the MPO staff a prioritized list of projects from the MTP Trail Plan that would be considered for evaluation by the Matrix. The staff would use the recommended Matrix to evaluate the prioritized projects and return with the preliminary findings to the Committee at the next regularly scheduled BPAC meeting for comments.