MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held June 13, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
Trustee Stephanie Johnson-Burick (Town of Mesilla)
Councillor Gabriel Vasquez (CLC)
Commissioner Benjamin Rawson (DAC)
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Kim Hakes (DAC)
Commissioner Isabella Solis (DAC)

STAFF PRESENT: Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)

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

1. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (1:02 PM)
Eakman: Members of the Metropolitan Planning Organization of Mesilla Valley welcome today. I'm calling this meeting to order.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY
Eakman: Do we each of us have an agenda in front of us at this time? If you would please review that agenda and declare whether or not you have a conflict of interest regarding today's agenda?

MEMBERS DECLARED NONE.

Eakman: It's unanimous, there are no conflicts. Well open it up to public comment at this time. Oh, I am told that I have overlooked something. We're going to at this time have our Pledge of Allegiance.

ALL STAND FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

Eakman: I apologize to everyone present on that oversight.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT
Eakman: Is there public comment? Mr. Wray would you poll the MPO to see if we have a quorum.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Councillor Vasquez.

Vasquez: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.

J-Burick: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Arzabal.

Arzabal: Here.

Wray: Commissioner Rawson.

Rawson: Here.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Here.

Wray: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: Madam Mayor.

Barraza: Here.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Eakman: Thank you so much. And I appreciate everyone’s attendance today and their promptness.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Eakman: The consent agent is in front of us. It only includes the approval of minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes?

Rawson: Mr. Chairman.

Eakman: Yes.
Rawson: Move to approve.

Vasquez: Second.

Eakman: Motion and a second to approve the minutes. Mr. Wray will you poll the Board.

Wray: Councillor Vasquez.

Vasquez: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.

J-Burick: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Arzabal.

Arzabal: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Rawson.

Rawson: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: Madam Mayor.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Eakman: Yes.

5.  * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

6.1  * May 9, 2018

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6.  ACTION ITEMS
6.1 Resolution 18-04: A Resolution Adopting the FY2019 and FY2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Eakman: At this time we have one action item. Andrew would you like to discuss that.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. I’d like to turn the attention of the Committee to page 32 of the packet. This is the final draft that staff is presenting to this Policy Committee of our impending, for federal Fiscal Years 2019 through 2020, Unified Planning Work Program. We did give a presentation about this at the last meeting going into some detail as the projects that are included in this UPWP. I’m not going to go into that level of detail today unless somebody wishes for me to. I will just say that the UPWP is the list of staff tasks that are to be undertaken during a specified timeframe. Things that fall outside of the scope of the UPWP MPO staff is not allowed to work on. There really are no substantive changes to the document from the last time this Committee reviewed it. There were a couple of small typos and things of that nature that staff found that were pointed out to us that we have corrected since the May meeting, other than that the document is the same as when this Policy Committee last reviewed it. And I will stand now for any questions.

Eakman: Hearing no questions. What are the wishes of the Board on this action item?

Vasquez: Mr. Chair.

Eakman: Yes.

Vasquez: I'd like to make a motion to adopt Resolution 18-04.

Eakman: Is there a second?

Barraza: Second.

Sorg: Second.

Eakman: There is a second. Discussion. Hearing no discussion. Would you poll the Board?

Wray: Councillor Vasquez.

Vasquez: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Johnson-Burick.
J-Burick: Yes.
Wray: Trustee Arzabal.
Arzabal: Yes.
Wray: Commissioner Rawson.
Rawson: Yes.
Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
Doolittle: Yes.
Wray: Councillor Sorg.
Sorg: Yes.
Wray: Madam Mayor.
Barraza: Yes.
Wray: Mr. Chair.
Eakman: Yes. Thank you.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Committee Training: Roundabouts: How they work for pedestrians

Eakman: We have two discussion items here and we'll start now with MPO staff on a discussion about roundabouts.
Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. I'd like to introduce Michael McAdams to speak on this topic.
McAdams: Thank you Andrew. Pleased to do the presentation Mr. Chairman and Committee Members. This actually was a portion of an FHWA training that I attended in March 2018 by the FHWA with sponsorship of NMDOT. And I think it was one of the best I've seen coming out of DOT.

So roundabouts are just not fun, but they are so are, they can and do prevent pedestrian and bicycle crashes. There is reluctance sometimes with, from the public and sometimes others, public officials about roundabouts. Usually from a survey people really concerned after they get used to the roundabout, they find that it works better, they're
pleased with it. Here's I'll walk you through some aspects of roundabouts. If you know approaching from the south and you're going toward the roundabout the roads get narrower and so will the speeds. And the pedestrian crosswalks you see are right before the yield area on purpose so that the drivers will not be distracted. At that point the drivers will then proceed into the intersection. If they're a truck there's an apron so the trucks can go on the radius and then again since there's a slower speed probably 25 miles an hour I hope, you will see the crosswalk and where there's one right as they get out of the intersection. Going through the other side you'll see that they separate sidewalks for pedestrians and then going around, exiting the roundabout there is crosswalks and again slower speeds and also a *(inaudible)* too. You see so the process you can see on your screens how that process goes through the roundabout and exists the roundabout.

Roundabouts are really a subset and distinct subsets of circular intersections which includes rotaries, neighborhood traffic circles, and others. Here's example of how a rotary is not a roundabout and just go through it real quickly. If you look at this example that here is before, example of a regular intersection with turn lanes, travel lanes, etc, and you see that this is a very almost unapproachable area for pedestrians. Once you have four lanes it becomes treacherous for pedestrians and also particularly those who have disabilities. And you look at this, this is how it would look if you reconstruct it, actually a site that was reconstructed. You can see that pedestrians since there are refuges have a short distance to travel, but the same we look before, before the intersection the crosswalks and also the other side you can see the same thing happening where the pedestrian refuge and the short distance to walk. The other thing is with the roundabout is that usually it's recommended landscaping to distinguish this area as a different area as opposed to travel or areas without the roundabout. So it creates a different space and says we're in a place we want to slow down. And that's been shown in studies as well.

You look at pedestrians *(inaudible)* reduced travel speed. We know reduces pedestrian collisions and also decrease the injury rates. Anything below 25 the possibility of fatality is lowered and major injury is also lowered as well. And you look at, we'll look at a further slide, the conflict points are almost divided in half and I think they are. Splinter islands or refuge islands make a short distance from the curb to the first refuge island and a shorter distance for people to cross. And also it prevents this attitude of having to look at all four lanes before you cross. You only look at one lane at a time. And the traffic, the crosswalk is always placed before the yield sign and one car length back. Here is just what I was talking about, in the normal intersection you have 16 conflict points. If you have a roundabout you have eight conflict points which means you reduce the amount of crashes both vehicles and for pedestrians, so it's much safer on all accounts. Here's another example of looking at how your pedestrians and how they would maneuver the roundabout. If you notice
they would look toward one travel lane, not two, bidirectional, they would
cross the street and then look at the other lane as the vehicles going out
of the roundabout and then you notice also addition there is back, the stop
for the vehicles or where the crosswalk, before they yield, the stop
pedestrian signs and then they have the apron as well for large trucks or
buses so they can safely, you don’t have to run over the curb etc.

Look at this, looking in another direction and this is a good example
when you approach a roundabout there’ll be a narrow entry for slow driver
that slows the drivers. We know that reducing the size of the width of
travel lanes normally reduces speed. So you reduce and the travel in this
situation are very defined crosswalk and hopefully that will alert drivers
that there are pedestrians or possible pedestrians in there and then of
course you get beyond that, look at the next slide and the (inaudible) lane,
you see the pedestrians walk safely, the car is stopped and then as you
exit you can see that again it’s slowing, they have enough time to look at
pedestrians (inaudible) then trip speed because every time you slow down
speed you widen your angle of vision. If you go further and further and
further I think we saw that before, you vision becomes narrow. So slower
speed makes you aware of things around you, particularly of things like
pedestrians. Here is also an example of schools, there are about 100
schools in the nation that have roundabouts, again safer conditions for
schoolchildren crossing the road.

Lighting as in any situation, lighting can improve safety for
pedestrians. It’s also true for roundabouts, this is the situation we have
the center mounted lighting and pedestrian will be only in silhouette, so
very difficult to see them and the signs are not visible. You put approach
mounted lighting toward the pedestrian, they become clearer as actual not
silhouettes but clearer images and also the signs are also clearer as well.
Simple things like lighting can make a difference between a severe injury
or no injury.

One thing that is a detriment to roundabouts is where people are
visually impaired and what you can do is have beacons, flashing beacons
etc. to make people aware, also sound items as well for blind people can
safely maneuver roundabouts. So if you look we’ll go through really
quickly. The hybrid stuff, we have hybrids in the City and those are very
effective and they’re also effective in looking at (inaudible) access too. Go
through very quickly. One thing that’s really apparent in roundabouts too
is that sidewalk, raised crossing can also make people more aware of the
pedestrian crossing around roundabouts in combination with hybrid
signals.

We have actually two roundabouts in the MPO area; one is at Vado
and dual roundabouts at the Vado interchange. The Vado interchange
has limited pedestrian facilities. The one we’re also familiar with is the Las
Cruces City Hall roundabout. If you notice there’s good principles in this
situation. The crosswalks are before the yield on all four sides. There are
pedestrian refuges which actually is much better if you look at surrounding
intersections, pretty good on at Spruce, you can see that it's much more
inviting for pedestrians. And I think Spruce and Picacho and North Main
and I think this, although there's controversy, I think this roundabout does
operate in fairly well condition. We also have a proposed in the Triviz/I-25
interchange project's coming up in the near future. Two roundabouts, one
above University, one below. I think that's still on the planning stage so
it's interesting what's being proposed. This has been an issue in this
project, a very interesting issue to look at but I think that it may be a
possibility. And I stand for questions or open up for discussion.

Rawson:    Mr. Chairman.
Eakman:    Vice-Chair.
Rawson:    Thank you. Could you go back to the before and after pictures that you
had? I think they were slides nine and ten maybe.
McAdams:   The one with the big. Okay. That.
Rawson:    That one. So that's an intersection in Las Cruces that could be similar to
maybe Lohman and Telshor type of area with three lanes going. Then we
go to the after example. How do they go from three lanes down to one?
Where did all the traffic go? An alternate route?
McAdams:   In roundabouts the traffic's still accommodated. It doesn't decrease the
capacity at all. It's just a way that the traffic is moved around the
roundabout. So it doesn't avert traffic in the least in normal situations.
Have to quality that. So we can accommodate the same traffic volume
within the roundabout. It's safer too.
Rawson:    I guess what I'm curious at is we've got three lanes on the right hand.
McAdams:   Right.
Rawson:    That are going, actually four lanes, two straight and then two turning, and
you're saying you can take all four lanes of that traffic and make it one
lane and it doesn't decrease the volume of traffic it carries?
McAdams:   Normally it does not. I mean I have to qualify it, but normally roundabouts
do not decrease, it doesn't divert traffic to another facility.
Rawson:    And I apologize, maybe I should be more clear. We're going from four,
disregarding the roundabout we're going from four lanes to one lane ...
McAdams: That's correct.

Rawson: And you're saying that one lane can carry as much traffic as the four lanes?

McAdams: In, I can't, I would have to, I can't speak to this particular situation, but normally roundabouts can carry the same amount of traffic that the other intersection can do and that's possibly because the way the traffic can move smoothly throughout, it's not stop and go and so the right lane's accommodated by going off the roundabout. There may be exceptions of course. I don't know, it's not particular, this is an example, but we have to study, but in the rules, the literature says, and experience says that roundabouts can actually accommodate more traffic (inaudible). Roundabouts are not cookie cutter, basically they should be designed on the amount of traffic that's flowing through the intersection.

Rawson: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Eakman: Yes Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Sorry I didn't mean to cut in front of Councillor Sorg, but I just wanted to add just one small thing that I noticed. Michael could you go to the after photo. If you also notice they did a road diet, so past the roundabout you no longer have the four lanes of traffic, so they did the road diet so that's why it's not just about taking the four lanes and putting it into one, they also did traffic calming through that entire corridor, so that's just something else that I noticed.

Rawson: And that's what would indicate that the traffic must have gone somewhere else.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. Not necessarily Commissioner. They may have had the same volume but what they're doing is they're slowing them down, they're doing more access control, they're putting on-street parking, so again I understand where Michael's coming from without knowing the specifics, but a road diet similar to Solano, it used to be four lanes and now it's down to two through the southern section, that doesn't necessarily mean the traffic went somewhere else, it just means you're slowing it down and controlling it a little bit better than a faster four lane facility.

Rawson: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Eakman: Thank you so much. I think we'll get back to that point in a little bit. Councillor Sorg.
Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you for that presentation. I likened it to the roundabouts to a situation where you go on any street that has several traffic lights and you're stopping at most of them for the green light as opposed to another street where you're maybe going half as fast but you're not being stopped Commissioner. You understand? If you can keep moving even though it's a much slower speed, you'll get there at the same time than if you were at the stop and go all the way.

MR. RAWSON SPEAKING, MICROPHONE NOT TURNED ON.

Sorg: Okay. I will also add the fact that I hope we continue to encourage all of our planning in the area here, where appropriate roundabouts or traffic circles to be used, as opposed to one of my constituents that just didn't see the light and I couldn't convince him otherwise. I don't know, have any of you seen the, I think it's a video, yes, in fact it is a video of an intersection somewhere else in the world in which they had pedestrians, bicyclists, car traffic, and it was as I recall kind of a multiple intersection with more than just four roads into it. And they took everything away; there are no signs, there are no lanes, no nothing and people actually navigated it just as well or better, because people just slowed down. There were less accidents, less crashes, less pedestrians being hit and everything just by doing that. It was kind of an experimental thing but actually it worked. Took away all lanes, took away all signs, you just figure out how you're going to get through there, and you can make it better. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Eakman: Thank you Councillor. Are there other, yes Stephanie.

J-Burick: Yes, thank you Chair. What are the key criteria that are used in determining where the roundabouts are placed? Traffic? Location? What other?

McAdams: Let me think a little bit on this too. Generally roundabouts are like I said are good for road diets. There is a certain amount of volume, there are certain limits. I can't say exactly what the limit, but roundabout would not work well but even then (inaudible) turbo roundabout which is how you develop a roundabout. A roundabout can actually be teardrop or oval which will accommodate traffic, very large volume of traffic. It really depends on studying the situation and where it accommodate. The biggest factor is do you have enough land available, right-of-way to do it without, as people don't really want to take right-of-way but I think a lot of times (inaudible) space available. That would be the criteria and also appropriate for the road you're looking at, but Councillor Sorg is correct, that was in the Netherlands I think, they actually did, no traffic signs, no stop light. People slowed down. So actually regulations at stop signals can also cause more crashes than they actually prevent sometimes. So I
hope that answers your questions. It's again, I don't mean to waffle, but
it's a case-by-case basis based on space and criteria, the amount of
volume and also what directions the traffic is going to. We did this on El
Paseo, looked at roundabouts and they stay the same way; where the
traffic's going, the direction etc. is quite complex but it can be done too.
Thank you.

J-Burick:     Thank you.

Eakman:     Any other questions? I have a request of staff, with Vice-Chair Rawson's
            question, is there data available on how many vehicles can get through a
            roundabout in an hour compared with streets with four lanes?

McAdams:    Chairman. We can look into that. How many, it's supposed to say how
            many volume for regular intersection, what would be the volume for a
            roundabout.

Eakman:     Yes, I think the data would be very great.

McAdams:    I would be glad to look into that for you.

Eakman:     Okay. And secondly, does staff have any ideas, recommendations, or a
            project they're working on where they see roundabouts fitting better in this
            region for the MPO?

McAdams:    We're presently not looking at that but I think we're going to have the MTP
            coming up very soon and I think there'll be a good item to include. Where
            roundabouts will be appropriate.

Eakman:     The one thing that strikes me is the higher number of pedestrians might be
            a cue here, so that we can have really good pedestrian safety within the
            MPO. Is that a possibility?

McAdams:    Looking at pedestrian volumes are quite difficult sometimes, you actually
            have to manually count them, but we have done that in the past. I don't
            think, sometimes it's the chicken and egg situation as far as pedestrian
            movement. When you have high areas of pedestrians that warrant
            perhaps a roundabout or other improvements like we did hybrid beacons,
            so I think that would be a good thing to study but in high pedestrian area
            particularly on University could we use roundabouts or other type of road
            calming or road diet on University perhaps. So it's kind of, we can do that
            but it's the way to do it through traffic planning is very difficulty but it can
            be done, but we don't have any pedestrian counts at this point and to do
            that would be, we could do that, it'd be a very time intensive thing to do.
Eakman: And maybe the cueing system is where we want more pedestrian traffic such as in our retail areas, our downtown, our campus, there might be other areas where we want more retail traffic because of the businesses that are there.

McAdams: Absolutely. I think that we have, and we look at land use and try to put stores affronting the sidewalks, making the parking in the back like we discussed in last session, will definitely include increased pedestrian traffic. And we'd like to have more people and pedestrians than vehicles I think because it's more user friendly and also it does encourage more retail activity because people go to one store and then decide to go to another one because it's right next door. So I think that that's really beyond our aspect as transportation planning, but I think in the Comprehensive Plan those will be addressed and think they're at the forefront to make our City more walkable, more transit oriented, and in turn there is a correlation between walkability and business development. And we'd like to go through that way and I think that's the way that most communities are going to because of the big boxes are failing; Sears, Penny's, etc. We're going to have to go to more localized walkable situations so, and that's also if you look at cities that are making success economically, they are going that way. People want walkable, transit-oriented places and companies locate because of that.

Sorg: Mr. Chairman.

Eakman: Yes, Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: I would like to relate a personal experience. I spent three years in a country that had nothing but traffic circles. Not only that, they drove on the left side of the road, the wrong side, you know. And it didn't take me long to get used to it, sure the first two or three times I got to a traffic circle, especially the busier ones in the bigger City I was quite nervous, but boy you pick it up just like that, at least young people do like I was young. And so the O&M on traffic circles are much less than signal intersection too. So there's two things to consider. That's why I'm so in favor of traffic circles to use. Thank you.

Eakman: Yes, Councilor Vasquez.

Vasquez: Thank you Mr. Chair. Some good conversations and relevance to obviously some of the traffic circles we have here now and some of the resistance to using them or adopting them as viable traffic devices is interesting. The evolution of the roundabout on Main Street obviously is one that comes to mind as far as how the community has accepted it a little bit more, especially with some of those landscaping features that in addition to calming the traffic make the entrance, one of the entrances to
downtown a lot more aesthetically pleasing, I appreciate that. And then
the opportunities for cultural stuff in the middle of those roundabouts is
really cool. I've noticed more people have started to understand how to
use them. I use them frequently. Of course I'm not sure, this probably
happens everywhere but there's always people who will just never know
when to yield and the potential for accidents more so I've seen more road
rage type of scenarios where people get mad because they get stuck
yielding to each other and nobody wants to go, but I haven't seen very
many accidents and so that's definitely a positive over maybe some of the
higher speed accidents at intersections.

The only thing I'll say regarding the pedestrian angle on this is that I
think, you know I share the thoughts that there are some really important
retail and kind of lodging areas in the City right now that don't have very
good connectivity, very good walkability. I'm thinking about for example
where Hotel Encanto is on Telshor, I see tourists who stay at that hotel
frequently crossing the street to try to go to one of the restaurants or the
shopping mall or further down to some of the other entertainment
establishments and you know they're kind of playing Frogger because the
traffic's going pretty fast and people aren't accustomed to seeing
pedestrians in some of those areas because there is so much traffic and
such high speed area. The same thing with perhaps Lohman and Walnut
area, people walking from Walmart to do grocery shopping and then
subsequently crossing those, I think it's got to be about eight lanes worth
of traffic there. I think by the time they start and finish and especially if
they have some type of disability or mobility impairment, often the timer
almost runs out on them before they can actually safely cross. So I think
there's some good opportunities to look at those places where we have
high retail or high pedestrian activity that's already happening but it's not
very safe, so I hope that we're looking some of those areas.

In addition to just making the City more pedestrian friendly in
general, growing up here and in El Paso, I mean coming home after a
one-mile walk with jeans and boots or shoes full of you know all kinds of
vegetation right, what do they call them, the burrs and everything. It's not
a pleasant experience and part of that is because we have a lack of
sidewalks, lack of infrastructure, but sometimes lack of transportation so
we have to walk. So for folks to be able to walk with dignity to wherever
they need to go and not come with their pants shredded up or their
shoelaces in shambles, I think is something that we owe to people as
we're thinking about pedestrian connectivity, whether roundabouts are the
best option or not. I know at least at the City we're really thinking about
how we pay for more sidewalks, how we build more sidewalks without the
need for developers or impact fees to cover some of those costs because
it's tough to get around the City if you don't have a car or if you don't know
or you don't have public transportation available to you. So if this is part of
the solution to do that and especially in some key areas where this makes
sense, I think hopefully staff continues to look at those opportunities. Also
I'm thinking around the area of the Convention Center, people that come
to conventions want to leave a convention and be able to walk to their
hotel or to a restaurant. And I think we've gotten better on University but
there's still some work to be done I think in other parts of the City as well.
I appreciate this presentation and the analysis. Thank you. Thank you
Chair.

Eakman: Great discussion. Thank you so much Dr. McAdams.

7.2 NMDOT update

Eakman: We'll now have an update from NMDOT.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. North Main we continue to finish a few of the last
punch list items, but again for the most part we've been completed with
that one for a little over a month now.

Valley Drive, last month I reported that they expected to start
sometime in July, contractor's actually worked diligently to get his things
on site and the plan is for them to start work on June 26th as opposed to
July. For those of you that are interested, we are going to have our first
construction public meeting on June 20th at 6:00 at our Solano Project
Office. We'll continue to hold those every month for the duration of the
project as long as we have public participation. And in general what they
do at that one is the contractor comes in, talks about their schedules,
gives updates on how their doing, any kind of major traffic changes it will
have. Valley Drive won't be near as complicated as for instance the North
Main project at Spitz and Three Crosses, only because this one our plan is
to move traffic to one side, reconstruct the one that's torn up and then
basically do the exact same thing the other way, so it won't be a lot of lane
changes like you saw at North Main. So it's a fairly complex project but for
impacts to the public it's pretty simple and will stay the same through a
majority of it.

The other two that I wanted to touch on very quickly are some
studies that we've been conducting. On June 11th we had our first public
meeting, actually the second public meeting for the US-70 Corridor Study
which is basically from the Spitz/Three Crosses intersection, across I-25
just prior to getting to the Del Rey intersection. What we're looking at
there is potential for six lanning all of US-70 to that Spitz/Three Crosses
intersection. What do we do with the traffic at the Elks/Triviz/US-70
intersection? So we presented that to the public on June 11th. Just a
quick and dirty on that one, ultimately there's two alternatives for the main
line US-70 that pretty much the same, looking at six lanes of traffic all the
way through town. The biggest change between the two alternatives is
the intersection at Elks; one is an at-grade intersection which is what you
experience now but will be substantially larger on the Triviz/Elks legs.
Actually we're going to put the presentation on our website but if you get a
chance to look at that it's a little daunting. Very large intersection, extensive right-of-way purchase from CVS and Walgreens, but is one of the alternatives. Right now the preferred alternative pending public comment is an interchange very similar to what you see along the entire US-70 corridor headed east out of town. Basically US-70 would go over Elks/Triviz. You'd have Texas turnarounds for those quick U-turn movements, but all of the City traffic would basically be underneath the US-70. So that's the preferred alternative right now. Again, pending public comment. The biggest difference is cost of course. So the full build out for that entire corridor on alternative two is about $55 million, alternative one I believe was about $36 million I believe. Substantial difference between the two, but I will tell you that alternative one doesn't really do a whole lot for the local traffic on Elks and Triviz because they're still having to wait for the US-70 cross traffic. The one thing I will tell you is we as a department, unless the DOT hits the lottery, we won't have the money to build that entire corridor all at once. So our plan is to basically try to do it in segments. Our very first priority is to address the bridge right there at the Jiffy Lube that goes over the arroyo, only because right now it's a safety concern. There is no pedestrian or bicycle access across that bridge because there's no shoulder. So we're continuing to move forward with design, making that our number one priority just because it needs to be done regardless of what we do in that corridor and it's a safety issue now. Outside of that, once we get the Phase A/B completed, we'll start looking at how do we prioritize that project and then second how do we fund it. But right now it's a very preliminary. We did have a lot of public participation. I was actually kind of surprised. We probably had between 30 and 40 people there. A lot of good questions, most of them were focused on the design and the construction time, but again we're way ahead of that. One of the more participative meetings that I've been to. I was pleasantly surprised at the turn out that we had. Again, the Phase A/B and the presentation will be posed on our website I expect in the next couple of days, so if you're interested take a look at it and then I'd be happy to answer any questions that you all may have once you have a chance to look at that.

The other one I wanted to mention is a little bit outside of your MPO boundary area, but it's certainly something that has been of interest to this Board. We've been studying the New Mexico 404 corridor which is the Anthony Gap basically from I-10 over to Chaparral. We have our first public meeting on June 13th in Chaparral at 6:00. We'll have a second meeting on June 14th in Anthony, basically to talk about what we're doing with that study. Again very preliminary but I will tell you that we're moving forward with the design of the I-10/404 interchange; one to increase capacity, but we've had several accidents and fatalities between I-10 and just past the community college, so that project will address all of that. But if you're interested I guess what I can do just to make things simple is I'll forward the flyers to Andrew for that project and then maybe we can get
that sent out today if possible to the Board, just so if you're interested, especially the county, we'll have some impacts with the county. But if you're interested I'll make sure that you get the flyer before I leave today. With that Mr. Chair I believe that's all I've got unless anyone has any questions for me.

Eakman: Questions?

Sorg: Yes.

Eakman: Yes, Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Did you mention something about the Interstate 25/University project? I probably missed it.

Doolittle: I did not, but I can give a quick update on that. We are continuing to move forward with the design on that project. It's currently scheduled for a December let, so that hasn't changed, so we can expect to see construction on that project some time in the spring.

Sorg: A December let?

Doolittle: Correct.

Sorg: Proposal.

Doolittle: Let out for bid. December bid.

Sorg: Yes.

Doolittle: So we'll have a contract February, my expectation probably late spring/early summer for construction. So we are moving ...


Doolittle: That's correct. It's just right around the corner.

Sorg: Okay.

Eakman: Any other questions? That's a busy report Mr. Doolittle. Mr. Wray could you please get me the information on the June 20th meeting that they're going to have on Valley Drive?

Wray: I will certainly do that.

Eakman: Very important to my District.
8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Eakman: Moving on. Are there any Committee comments for the good of the cause today?

Rawson: Mr. Chairman.

Eakman: Yes Vice-Chair.

Rawson: Mr. Chairman. Do we have any update on the plans for Weisner? I've heard that Weisner was going to loop through the City on that side of the community, but I haven't heard anything from that on a few years. Is that still the written plan and just waiting on funding, or do we have a different plant on that?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Rawson. That is still in the MPO future thoroughfare plan as existing. There's been no, that I am aware of, there's been no impetus or any sort of initiative to bring that to fruition as far as I'm aware.

Eakman: It's not on the CIP?

Wray: No, I don't believe it is.

Rawson: Mr. Chair. It'd be nice to move that forward. We're starting to see some traffic taking Baylor Canyon now that that road is paved as people seek for an alternate way around the City and that road and Dripping Springs is certainly not designed to be a bypass there so it might be something worth looking at again.

Eakman: Thank you so much.

Rawson: Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Rawson. I will say that we are on the cusp of starting our next MTP process so that can very well be part of the conversation for that next MTP.

Rawson: Appreciate that. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Eakman: Thank you. Appreciate that. Thank you for the comments and question. Any other comments from Committee Members? Hearing none. Does staff have comments today?

Wray: Mr. Chair, we do not.
9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Eakman: Then is there any public comment? Hearing nothing.

10. ADJOURNMENT (1:43 PM)

Eakman: This meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[Signature]

Chairperson