MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held October 16, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla Citizen Rep)
Dona Devine (Bicycle Community Citizen Rep)
Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Jack Kirby (NMSU Staff Rep)
James Nunez (City of Las Cruces Staff Rep)
Samuel Paz (Dona Ana County Rep)
Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla Staff Rep)

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Andrew Bencomo (Pedestrian Community Rep)
Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
Jess Waller (Bicycle Com. Rep.)

STAFF PRESENT:  Andrew Wray (MPO)
Michael McAdams (MPO)
Debra Fuller (MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT:  Cathy Mathews, CLC
Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

1. CALL TO ORDER (5:00)

Pearson:  Okay it's 5:00 so I'll call this meeting of the Mesilla Valley MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to order. First order after the Call Order is the approval of the agenda. Call order, let's do, start with Jolene down here.

Herrera:  Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Shepan:  Lance Shepan, Mesilla Marshals.

Devine:  Donna Devine, Bicycle Advocate.

Curry:  Ashleigh Curry, Community Representative of the Town of Mesilla.

Paz:  Samuel Paz, Doña Ana County.

Kirby:  Jack Kirby, New Mexico State University.
Nunez:     James Nunez, City of Las Cruces Rep.
Pearson:   And George Pearson, City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Pearson: Approval of the agenda. Were there any changes for the agenda? And I'll hear a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Herrera: So moved.
Paz: Second.
Pearson: Second. All in favor "aye".

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
Pearson: Any opposed?

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.1 August 21, 2018

Pearson: Third item is approval of the minutes. Is there any discussion on the minutes? Hearing none. I'll hear a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Nunez: Make a motion to approve minutes.
Pearson: And a second.
Shepan: Second.
Pearson: We have a motion and second to approve the minutes as presented. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
Pearson: Any opposed?

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pearson: Next item is public comment. Do we have any member of the public that wishes to make a comment at this time?
5. **ACTION ITEMS**

5.1 **FFY 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments**

Pearson: Moving on to action items. We have TIP amendment.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: On the grant, the $16 million, what grant was that the City was awarded?

Wray: I believe it was the BUILD grant was the one that was awarded.

Pearson: Okay because I know they applied, made the same application for two grants. I know the build was one of them.

Wray: It was one or the other.

Pearson: I knew that already.

Wray: I believe it was the BUILD grant.

Pearson: Okay.

Wray: But I might be mistaken.

Pearson: Any members have questions? Hear a motion to accept the TIP amendments as presented?

Curry: I'll put forth a motion.

Paz: Second.

Pearson: We have a motion and second to accept the TIP amendments as proposed. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed? So that passes.

5.2 **Transportation Alternatives Program and Recreational Trails Program Application Recommendations**

Pearson: Next item is our TAP program.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
Pearson: I have a question before you go, talking about the TAP and the RTP?

Wray: Yes, we are doing both TAP and RTP as part of this same presentation. Yes, that's correct.

ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.

Curry: Thank you Mr. Wray. So this is as Mr. Wray just said, this is a continuation of the Safe Routes to School Program. Currently the request is to continue funding at 25 hours per week for nine months of the school year and we provide services to all 25 elementary schools. We offer education. We offer weekly walking school buses at 18 of our schools. We offer them monthly at four of our schools and education is offered at all of the schools to the third grade students currently. We would like to continue that and per our action plan which hopefully you'll be seeing later this year, we would like to kind of expand our education program and continue to outreach to as many schools as we can. I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody might have.

Pearson: So is this the same dollar level in previous applications?

Curry: It is a little bit more and it is nothing has changing in the amount requested. The hours and the hourly rate is remaining the same for the coordinator. We are asking for a little bit more funding for the education encouragement materials just because we've reached into so many more schools than we originally did and just the cost of providing the little chimes and incentive items exceeds what we have originally requested in that, but otherwise everything else stays the same.

Pearson: Any other Board Members have questions? So I guess now we can either move on or we could vote on this.

Wray: Whichever the Committee prefers.

Pearson: We do have some conflicts by a couple of members for each of the items. I know one of the Board Members of course is receiving funds and the other wrote the application, so maybe we should vote them separately, maybe do a role call to give members opportunity to abstain where necessary.

Wray: Very good Mr. Chair.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I make a comment on that? I think that is okay if that's what this Committee wants to do, but just keep in mind that the decisions made by this Committee are not the final decisions on the applications.
They still have to go through the statewide scoring process, so just wanted to add that information in.

Pearson: Right, we're recommending to the Policy Committee as we usually do and the Policy Committee will then recommend.

Wray: Yes. Ultimately the applications have to be approved by the Policy Committee in order for them to be submitted to NMDOT and this is an advisory body to the Policy Committee. So that the process theoretically would be if an application was declined by this Committee it would still proceed through the TAC to the Policy Committee just with the note that BPAC had not spoken in favor of it, but it still would go to the Policy Committee for it's review for approval.

Pearson: Okay.

Wray: We have never had that happen but just.

Pearson: So I'll hear a motion to recommend approval of this item to the Policy Committee.

Nunez: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry can I stall that out with one question first?

Pearson: Sure.

Nunez: Can you describe to me, I'm not familiar with this, on the second page or page three, to as it says, it says topics to discuss during PFF meetings looks like a number of questions throughout this. Are there some answers to each of those or is it, why does that have a bunch of questions without answers?

Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. The PFF is the Project Feasibility Form that is a required document that must go in the TAP application, and you will see it in all the rest of these applications this evening. But it's kind of a non-binding document once the PFF meeting happens. The purpose of the PFF as it says, Project Feasibility is to establish in the eyes of NMDOT whether the project that's being applied for is even feasible either fiscally, physically what have you. All of the applications except for the SRTS because it's non-infrastructure did go through the required PFF. Partially because it's non-infrastructure and also because it's a program of such long standing, DOT determined that Las Cruces Public Schools did not need to have a Project Feasibility meeting specifically for this application but it's still Harold as you will note on page 32 his signature is present as recommended. As far as the Project Feasibility Form goes for this project and for the three remaining that we're going to discuss this evening that's
all that needs to be there. That's the critical thing is whether Harold signed it or not.

Nunez: Okay. Then I have one more question to you Mr. Chair. If there is what do you want to call it, like whether we vote yea or nay, if there is opposition or whatever it is to each of these, do you want to discuss them at all or would you rather just vote. It doesn't matter to me either way, but not really just vote.

Pearson: I was thinking take each one separately.

Nunez: Okay. In terms of discussion or people's, I guess they speak up if they had an issue with one of these or not to make it stronger or whatever. I'm not communicating very well I'm sorry. But, yes, I'm sorry you can go back to your motion if you'd like. I think you were looking for a motion for somebody to vote on this.

Pearson: Well we can certainly have more discussion if members want that or we can move ahead with the vote. So make a motion to accept approval.

Nunez: I'll make the motion to vote for approval.

Pearson: We need a second.

Shepan: Second.

Pearson: Okay, so we have a motion and a second to approve the Safe Routes to School Program to the Policy Committee. And we'll go ahead and do a roll call vote, "yes" or "no."

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. Mr. Nunez

Nunez: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Kirby.

Kirby: I'm for it.

Wray: Mr. Paz.

Paz: Abstain.

Wray: Ms. Curry.

Curry: Abstain.
Wray:  Ms. Devine.
Devine:  I'm for it.
Wray:  Mr. Shepan.
Shepan:  Yes.
Wray:  Ms. Herrera.
Herrera:  Yes.
Wray:  Mr. Chair.
Pearson:  Yes.
Wray:  That passes.

ANDREW WRAY CONTINUES HIS PRESENTATION

Pearson:  So this was discussed last time with the TAP application that the City hasn't closed out the previous TAP application, so later in the process there'll be points levied against it, is that what happened?
Herrera:  Yes. So into the guide we wrote that it is a five-point deduction for every inactive project and so the scoring will be done and then the list of inactive projects will be brought in and points will just be deducted off of each one of those.
Pearson:  But for our purposes today we can just move forward.
Herrera:  Right.
Pearson:  Any further discussion?
Nunez:  Just a point of information. I remember that discussion and I took it back to my superiors and they did handle it. They talked about it and they did convey to me that they'd been giving and conveying all information. And I know that there's a little bit of communication issues with whoever it was at the State DOT, but anyway, my superiors know about it. So I mean a couple of people on this Committee just expressed concerns so I conveyed those to my superiors.
Pearson:  So if no further discussion I'll hear a motion to approve this item to the Policy Committee.
Curry: I'll put forth a motion.

Shepan: Second.

Pearson: We have a motion and a second to approve this item to the Policy Committee. Let's do a roll call vote.

Wray: Mr. Nunez.

Nunez: Abstain.

Wray: Mr. Kirby.

Kirby: Approve.

Wray: Mr. Paz.

Paz: Approve.

Wray: Ms. Curry.

Curry: Approve.

Wray: Ms. Devine.

Devine: Approve.

Wray: Mr. Shepan.

Shepan: Approve.

Wray: Ms. Herrera.

Herrera: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Wray: That one passes. The next application is the second one from the City of Las Cruces. This one is for a multi-use trail proposed to be constructed along the Las Cruces Lateral between University and Main Street. We have Ms. Cathy Mathews here from the City of Las Cruces to speak further about this application.
Mathews: Good evening Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect with the City of Las Cruces. I don't have any prepared remarks necessarily except that we're interested in applying for this grant to further develop the trail system throughout the City of Las Cruces and hopefully to make progress towards closing the loop per say on the trail system in Las Cruces. And I will be happy to answer questions or provide further details if you're interested.

Pearson: Could you just outline the route that's proposed for this trail?

Mathews: Mr. Chair. The route we're proposing is from University Avenue across the street from the Convention Center, along Las Cruces Lateral parallel with El Paseo Road, and then continuing along the lateral adjacent to Las Cruces High School and connecting then to the intersection of Idaho and Main Street. And the idea was that this route could provide some connectivity between the campus and the City per say and future bicycle lanes that are I believe still in design on Main Street.

Pearson: So the roadway crossings has there been any, I mean this is all preliminary I presume so there haven't been any designs, but are there thoughts on like the University crossing in particular, put in a crosswalk at that point or something, some sort of roadway marking and any of the other roadway crossings can you speak to any of that?

Mathews: Definitely, Mr. Chair. The crossings will be critical and essential and we have addressed that in our application making statements that we will do, we will make signals, signs, and markings, other kinds of features that are required to make those crossings as safe as possible for trail users, but we have not started any kind of design at this point in time.

Pearson: So there's I know HAWK lights are rather expensive, the flashing, yellow flashing pedestrian crossing demand activated flashing lights those kind of ideas maybe at University is that in the thought process?

Mathews: Yes.

Pearson: Any other questions?

Curry: Mr. Chair. Ms. Mathews, may I ask a question? What's the proposed length of the project?

Mathews: It is, I believe 1.65 miles.

Curry: Thank you.

Devine: What is the projected start date of this project?
Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. As soon as we receive the grant award letter and Council has approved it and we have the final signed documents, we will start.

Pearson: So these are reimbursement grants aren't they?

Mathews: Yes.

Pearson: And the grant, this is a two-year grant period that we're talking about so the last, as an example the Mesilla multi-use trail the first year was designated as a design fund phase and the second year was construction. Do you have this phased out or are you just going go with it?

Mathews: Mr. Chair. It's not necessarily designated as phase, but that's our intention is the first year will be planning and design and the second year will be construction.

Pearson: Okay.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I just have one question, is a follow-up to the PFF meeting we had. We talked about the EBID property and that they're at that time was not easement or permit. And I notice that documentation is not in this packet, so has that process been started?

Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. No we have not started that process. We're essentially waiting to see if we get the grant or not before we start on that effort.

Herrera: What kind of time frame do you think that it will take to work out the easement issues with EBID? I'm just worried about if you receive the grant will you have time to work out the issues in a year and also complete design.

Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I have experience of seeking one landscape permit from EBID and it took a matter of maybe a month. And I anticipate this would be very similar, the entire length is along EBID right-of-way along their ditch. It's our understanding that they're interested in this kind of thing. The State has granted the City the ability to do public City projects along EBID right-of-way. I don't anticipate any kind of problems or delay and I also don't anticipate waiting to start design until the permit is completed. I anticipate simultaneous kinds of process through both of those procedures.

Herrera: Andrew, question for you. So if they were to get a letter, if the City was to get a letter from EBID just saying that they're willing to work with them on
the easement process would they still be allowed to put that in the packet or is it kind of like it's cut off now?

Wray: We could probably try to incorporate it into subsequent packets. They would have to move very quickly. Just for the information of this Committee, due to the Veteran's Day holiday in November and the Board of County Commissioners shifting that week's meeting from Monday to Wednesday that puts it directly in conflict with our regular second Wednesday protocol for Policy Committee meetings, so the November meeting of Policy Committee is going to be the first week, the first Wednesday rather than the second Wednesday, so it's a very compressed time frame that we would be looking at. But all that being said, we have not put together the TAC packet yet, we have not put together the Policy Committee packet yet. Staff doesn't see any reason why we couldn't amend in that documentation into this application going forward because obviously we want to give all of our member agencies the best chance possible of getting a project awarded. So we would certainly try to incorporate that into the final documentation.

Herrera: Thanks. And I would recommend that you include that documentation. It doesn't, it just has to be a letter that says they're willing to work with you just because I have a feeling that that's going to come up at the committee meeting and you know unless that's kind of written somewhere they're not really going to have an idea of what's happening.

Mathews: We'll make that happen.

Herrera: Thank you.

Pearson: Are there any current EBID and City of Las Cruces MOUs in effect right now? Because I remember the discussion about it having happened or the ability for it to happen, but I think the Outfall Channel actually fell outside of the EBID if I remember correctly.

Mathews: That's correct Mr. Chair. There's one instance with which I'm familiar and that's, I can't remember the name of the ditch, but it's along Motel Boulevard NM-292.

Pearson: That multi-use trail there.

Mathews: Yes, that multi, there's a small lip length of trail that's right along the EBID right-of-way and we got what's called a Landscape Permit from them to install the landscape and the multi-use trail there.

Pearson: Right.
Mathews: That's the one that took maybe a month.

Pearson: Right. Well the EBID was at one of the City's Transportation Policy Review Committee meetings expressing interest in cooperating with us so hopefully the letter will be enough to let the State know that the process will be smooth.

Mathews: I anticipate I could get that letter and then also submit an application too. I mean it's a one-page application.

Pearson: Because part of the discussion with EBID is which side of the ditch should the trail be on.

Mathews: True.

Pearson: And that's part of the process I think.

Mathews: Sure. Okay. Very good. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Pearson: This is the RTP application.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. And there's one other thing that I would like to add also for Ms. Mathews' benefit, but there is a standing MOU or MOA I can't remember which it is between EBID and the City of Las Cruces stating that the City of Las Cruces is allowed to apply. Now the way that the permits work, it is on a case-by-case basis, but there is that standing agreement that the City can apply. So I would suggest to Ms. Mathews that in addition to a letter you might include the current MOU to staff as well because I don't believe MPO staff has that most recent one. I believe the one that we have on file was from 2009. So just additional documentation I think would be helpful.

Pearson: Okay so this is the RTP so the the outstanding tab doesn't count on this one is that right?

Herrera: It does.

Pearson: It does?

Herrera: Yes. It's the same guide for both and it's the same scoring criteria along with the same deductions.

Pearson: Okay, so even more encouragement needed for the City to close out that project. Any other discussion?
Nunez: Mr. Chair. Ms. Mathews did you mention a value? I can't remember, did you mention a cost estimate for that section?

Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. We do have a project total of $504,000.

Nunez: Okay, interesting. We're about to put a HAWK system up. We're about to go out to bid here in a few weeks. The one on University close to Lorenzo's/Garcia Hall, and already the estimate is something around $200,000 I think. At any rate you had mentioned that the crossings and stuff so I'm not sure my focus would be on the trail. And it's kind of unfortunate that you maybe didn't put the HAWK system on the new hotel right there on University that they're building. It comes out right there, correct? So anyway I'm not sure how that would be eventually but I know you mentioned the HAWK so I just thought I'd chime in with that. And then also I mean at the other extreme and where it comes out on, where did you mention by Las Cruces High School or something?

Mathews: Idaho and Main Street.

Nunez: Idaho and Main. I'm not sure what structure is there.

Pearson: But there's going to be a crossing at Missouri then.

Nunez: Or Boutz or whatever they call it, what is it?

Pearson: Boutz.

Mathews: Boutz, thank you.

Nunez: Very good. Anyway, that's my suggestion. Is to focus on the trail.

Mathews: Okay. Thank you.

Pearson: Any further discussion? Hear a motion to move this forward to the Policy Committee for approval?

Curry: I put forth a motion.

Paz: Second.

Pearson: We have a motion and a second. Would you do a roll call please?

Wray: Mr. Nunez.

Nunez: Abstain.
Wray: Mr. Kirby.
Kirby: I'm for.
Wray: Mr. Paz.
Paz: Approve.
Wray: Ms. Curry.
Curry: Approve.
Wray: Ms Devine.
Devine: Approve.
Wray: Mr. Shepan.
Shepan: Approve.
Wray: Ms. Herrera.
Herrera: Yes.
Wray: Mr. Chair.
Pearson: Yes.
Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Lastly we have application from Doña Ana County. This proposed trail is proposed to be along Elk's Drive from Doña Ana School Road to the Columbia north driveway. We have Mr. Paz here present so I'll turn the presentation over to him.
Paz: I'll stand for any question. The main intent is to connect obviously county residents to community amenities, parks and schools. We're looking at a situation where we want to mimic or copy the Triviz Trail using that right-of-way that abuts the State Highway and really that's it.
Pearson: So this is almost a Safe Routes to School Project.
Paz: In reality it does support the connection between Columbia and the park and really the County's issues with infrastructure and lack of infrastructure. So Columbia is a Safe Routes to School location, but it has limited activities. You don't have a walking school bus program there. There is no sidewalks, no connectivity in those areas, so in theory it supports both Safe Routes to School and just connectivity in the community.
Pearson: Right. Any other questions?

Devine: I have a question. What would be the length of the trail, like maybe a mile?

Paz: So the proposed length we have is a little bit over a mile, it's 1.15 miles.

Devine: So it'll go from Columbia to that park?

Paz: Yes, Doña Ana Park. Those are the two dots we're trying to connect.

Devine: Okay.

Paz: So we have a very similar project that we're doing in Chaparral which is in the El Paso MPO, really built off of the same concept, connecting community amenities, parks, schools, clinics so that's really where we're picking up off that momentum.

Herrera: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: I have a comment maybe on that active transportation and recreational programs application, it's on page 121. The funding is a little bit confusing the way that it's listed there. It makes sense on the project prospectus form, how it's broken out into the preliminary engineering, construction management, and construction, but the way it looks on the actual program application is that you're trying to split this out between three years. So I guess to MPO staff can they update that? So it should just be two years and the construction management can be included with the construction cost in project here number two.

Wray: Yes, we will take that amendment if the county chooses to submit it.

Herrera: Thank you.

Paz: Yes, we agree with that. And I can provide that amendment if needed to the documents or we can work with that so.

Pearson: Sounds rather necessary since it's a two-year funding cycle that we're in. Any other comments? Hear a motion to send this to the Policy Committee for approval?

Nunez: I'll make the motion.
Kirby: Second.

Pearson: We have a motion and a second to send this to the Policy Committee for approval. Take a roll call please.

Wray: Mr. Nunez.

Nunez: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Kirby.

Kirby: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Paz.

Paz: Abstain.

Wray: Ms. Curry.

Curry: Yes.

Wray: Ms. Devine.

Devine: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Shepan.

Shepan: Yes.

Wray: Ms. Herrera.

Herrera: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Pearson: Yes.

5.3 Performance Measure 1: Safety Target Recommendation

Pearson: Okay, so next is performance measure. We have three performance measure items and the first one is the Safety Target Recommendation.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair, I'll be turning the meeting over to Dr. Michael McAdams.

MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION
Pearson: So you're showing mostly the State numbers, but you don't really have a chart of the MPO because what we are talking about is the MPO areas right?

McAdams: These are State numbers, these are not MPO numbers. Total state and vehicle miles traveled. We are developing a report right now, or I am, and we'll do that in probably a couple of months.

Pearson: So are there separate, are we, we're using, we're following the State what the State is recommending.

McAdams: Right.

Pearson: We're measuring it separately aren't we, I mean the whole state gets measured at once and it gets chopped up into areas.

McAdams: We are looking at our portion of decrease which we're a small portion but say we like the intent, we're going downward and our report will subset either be against that or it will be lower or higher than the State standard. So we are required to report, but right now we say we could develop our own standards, but that's not, it would be too complicated and we're off the State standards.

Pearson: So what else besides the numbers in the State standards?

McAdams: That's it, just say the targets. We'll adopt the targets.

Pearson: So then it's the other policies that the local MPO like the ATP was just adopted by the City, so that could be a policy document that helps support lowering.

McAdams: Yes, I think that definitely if you look at the state that'd be something to support that and then actual numbers when our, if our numbers go down or go up and we hope that they go down.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I add some clarity maybe? So we're asking the MPO the MPOs all five of them in this State to support the State targets which is what was just presented to you, the numbers that were just presented. Basically what goes along with this is a lot of reporting requirements and at this point in time because this is still new this is only the second year that we've adopted targets, we don't feel like the MPOs have enough information or the capability to set their own targets and be able to report on those at this time. That's not to say that that won't change in the future, but at this time with the massive amount of reporting requirements that go
into this one in particular we would not advise that any of the MPOs set their own targets.

Pearson: But then the preventive measures are still a separate issue that each entity, each jurisdiction should still be addressing.

Herrera: Right. And to go along with that if you notice, if you go back through the packet into the TAP and Rec trails applications we just looked at we added a section for performance measures. And so every single project that's funded with Federal funding or State funding from the DOT has to show how it is going to help the State and the MPO meet the performance targets and unless that information is included, no Federal funding can be expended. So that's how all of our projects are.

Pearson: So for the trails, the roadway crossings would need to have a plan for the crossing at the trails too.

Herrera: Right. And most of the descriptions in the TAP and Rec trails applications we just looked at, I think it's number 31 on the project prospectus form, if you take a look at it, it's trying to get at the target number five, the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries, and so a lot of the descriptions say things like separation between the bicycles and vehicles, separation between pedestrians and vehicles, we hope is going to make it safer just less conflict points. So those are some ways that those types of projects can help the State and the MPO meet these targets.

Curry: Mr. Chair. May I ask a question? So Ms. Herrera what I'm understanding is what we're voting on now is not so much these increases and decreases and individual charts, but do we agree with the set State standards?

Herrera: No, it's actually the targets. So in the slides and if you have the handouts there is an NMDOT target statement under each of the graphs.

McAdams: Want me to go back.

Herrera: Yes, please. So any of them. This one, that's fine. So NMDOT target statement, decrease the fatality rate from 1.343 in 2016 to 1.318 by December 31, 2019. So that is the goal that the State has set and we are asking for the MPO areas to help us meet that goal.

Curry: Got you. Thank you. And I did bring this up last year I have a really hard time voting to approve an increase in fatalities.

Herrera: I agree and we have, I can just tell you at DOT, we have a really hard time looking at the numbers and seeing an increase in fatalities, unfortunately
there's more distracted driving, there are more vehicles on the road because gas is getting cheaper. We've had kind of a boom/bust situation going on in some of our oil field areas that's adding to the fatalities. So we definitely don't like to see an increase in fatalities either, unfortunately with the way that the Federal government has framed these is we have to pick a number and we have to pick a reasonable number. We would like it to be zero, but we know that that's not reasonable.

Curry: Right. And I remember Mr. Wray commenting last year that if you put a decrease and you didn't meet that need, then you have failed and don't qualify for funding. Is that correct or something along those lines?

Herrera: Yes, you qualify for funding, but basically FHWA has more say over where that funding should go, which kind of leaves us less flexibility for actually taking care of issues. One thing I can tell you that we're doing at the State level is we used to do an open call for projects for the Highway Safety Improvement Program funding and I think what we found is that we've looked at hotspot maps for a number of years and we keep seeing the same hotspots over and over because we're doing this kind of open call for projects and not addressing the high fatality areas in the State. And so, we're no longer doing open calls for projects. We are taking the hotspot maps and we are addressing the issues regardless of whether it's a DOT road or a local road or whatever it is, we're not discriminating that way we're just looking to actually solve, try to solve issues as best we can through engineering in hotspot areas so hopefully, eventually we'll get to a place where we will see the numbers decreasing.

Pearson: Any further discussion? Hear a motion to approve this to the Policy Committee.

Paz: Make a motion.

Nunez: I'll second.

Pearson: So we have a motion and a second to approve this to the Policy Committee.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.


5.4 Performance Measure 2: State of Good Repair Target Recommendation

Pearson: We're on to.
McAdams: Let me go to the next. State of Good Repair.

MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

ANDREW WRAY AUGMENTED THE PRESENTATION.

Pearson: What was in the packet is the State targets.

Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. There's been a lot of work that has gone into this performance measure in particular. We actually have only I guess finally come to this particular agreement with NMDOT last Friday. As a matter of fact, it was last Friday when we finally came to consensus as to what the targets that staff would recommend this MPO adopt. So we did not have this information available at the time that your packet was put together. If we had, we would have, but it was just a question we were still working with the DOT at that point to figure out exactly what staff was going to be recommending to this Committee and to the TAC and to the Policy Committee.

Pearson: So the State level for Good Repair non-NHS is 34.2% and the MPO is 10%. Is that an indication that our roads down here are in much worse condition than the State overall?

Wray: That's actually a more difficult question than it may seem on the surface Mr. Chair. I guess the short and dirty answer to that is yes, but we do have a couple of things to keep in mind with regards to that. We do have a major international border just immediately to our south which is the hub of trade. We do have I-10 which is a major east/west connection that is on the interstate NHS obviously, but it is also supported by non-interstate NHS facilities around it US-70 some of the connections down in the south etc. As far as specific reasons as to why the roads are proportionally worse, that was actually a question that was raised by the Policy Committee last week when we gave this presentation to them as well. Unfortunately, and Mr. Doolittle spoke at some length, but DOT at this point in time doesn't really have information to explain why the roads in this particular area are worse, and same thing with Farmington and Santa Fe, that was just not something, all due respect to Ms. Herrera whose here and her department, I don't think that DOT was necessarily anticipating finding this when they did this analysis and so I don't think that they expected to have to do that analysis. I don't know if Ms. Herrera wishes to speak any further on this particular topic.

Herrera: I think one of the things that's affecting the numbers in this area and possibly in Farmington, I haven't looked into them as much just because they're outside of my area. But I have looked at the data for Mesilla Valley and we're a year behind so there are some roads on the non-interstate
NHS that are City owned that have had some work recently. Valley Drive is another one that is on the NHS that’s a non-interstate one, obviously we’re doing full reconstruction and so I think some of the data is behind. So I think once we get through this year and data is collected next year, that number will be lower and it will be below the State target. At least that’s what we anticipate. The thing about this target is, well all of these targets is that we haven’t had a whole lot of guidance at the DOT from FHWA on exactly how this works. There have been multiple peer exchange programs between State DOTs and we’re all kind of in the same boat. We don’t really know exactly what FHWA is trying to get at with this. We think we have a pretty good idea they want us to use the pavement management system but the fundamentals that go into that can be very different depending on what methodology you use. So even us trying to compare our pavement management system and our targets to TXDOT to ADOT, to our neighbors around us, Colorado DOT, we’re getting something totally different. So the good news is that we can’t find anywhere in the law where there’s consequences written in so if we don’t meet our target in two years we don’t really know what’s going to happen. I guess to take that a step further, the law doesn’t have any consequences written in for MPOs not meeting targets. So all of the consequences if an MPO area or the State don’t meet the targets is on the State. I don’t really know what that looks like at this time though.

Pearson: Because the underlying driver for this presumably is funding.

Herrera: Right.

Pearson: And looking at the State charts going from the two year to the four year the bridges in poor condition is going down so, but the bridges in good condition is also going down, which implies that you’re putting the money in bridges that need to be fixed and the bridges that are okay will wait for a while on those.

Herrera: Right. So in order to get a bridge out of poor condition you have to replace it. So that’s where the number is going down. But if a bridge is in good condition it can get to fair condition and still be okay. So we’re letting more bridges go to fair condition and rebuilding the ones exactly like you said Mr. Chair that are in poor condition.

Pearson: Because if a bridge fails, it's a bad thing.

Herrera: Exactly. If pavement fails there's some cracking, it's bumpy. If a bridge fails we don't want that to happen. We're not going to let that happen.

Pearson: You see the news reports from Minneapolis, other places.
Herrera: Exactly. Yes and so that absolutely will not happen. The other thing I can
tell you is that the NMDOT spends a lot of money on all this data collection
and we have been doing that for quite some time. I mean the bridges we
have a really robust bridge inspection program. It's run out of NMSU and
UNM. We contract with the two universities and the bridges are inspected
on an every other year basis unless they have been noted that there's
potentially issues and then they're inspected every year. The pavement
data for interstates and NHS is collected yearly. So we will have data.
We just don't exactly know how to report it correctly to FHWA yet.

Pearson: Any other comments? James.

Nunez: I did have a couple of questions. Ms. Herrera and Dr. McAdams. On the
NHS List does that include like the whole MPO area and does every, like
Ms. Herrera you mentioned that every, all of the roads on there are
inspected every year and they're on the list? Is that correct? Because I
know, what I was getting at is that I know that the City we have our own
plan to improve our roads and how we're going to tackle that. So I'm not
sure which of the City's roads would be included on that list and I know
that, well anyway, I know that we are increasing, we're doing, our plan is,
in our funding we plan to make our roads better.

Herrera: Right. There is a list. We're only talking about the NHS, the National
Highway System Roads that are in the MPO area. And some of them are,
actually the majority of them are owned by NMDOT, but there are a few
that are owned by the City. And I have the list in front of me; so there's
Telshor Boulevard, University, Motel, and Lohman are the ones that are
on the NHS system, owned by the City of Las Cruces.

Nunez: And so to that end, I know that we've been, we just did some more work
mill overlay right there, you guys went down Lohman and Solano and then
we last year did some work on Lohman and Amador, but so okay then not
just the City of Las Cruces correct is probably I would assume Anthony
and other places?

Herrera: Right. Yes, the City of Las Cruces is not the only agency that has roads
on the NHS. There's a bunch in Albuquerque, there's oddly enough some
in Roswell and Clovis, Alamogordo has one and then well it says El Paso,
Texas/New Mexico, but it's actually in the City of Sunland Park. So there
are other entities that have NHS roads.

Pearson: So does NMDOT do the pavement or do the measurements on these the
State/City owned roads or do you rely on the City pavement preservation?

Herrera: No, for all of these roads that are on the National Highway System the
NMDOT does data collection. And like I said, it's a little bit behind so all of
the work that was just done by the City, basically anything done in 2018
has not been accounted for in the targets, because we’re a year behind.
So I imagine a lot of the, like I said the target for NHS non-interstate in
poor condition is likely a lot lower than what it’s showing at 13% currently
just because of all the work that’s going on or has happened this year. But
we won’t know that until the data is collected. I believe the time frame on
that is March for when all the data will be collected and we’ll actually have
a new target to look at. We won’t be able to reset the target until 2020, is
the first opportunity that the State has to look at our targets. But that’s
kind of what we think is going to happen.

Kirby: Mr. Chair. I have one question. Ms. Herrera your discussion somewhat
preempted my question, but I still want to be clear on it. I’m sorry, can you
go back to the slide that was the table showing the targets? Right there.
No I’m sorry, one more I think. Okay for instance that last one the bottom
one, just for debate’s sake, if we recommended a target of 0% on poor
condition is, what’s the negative implication? Is it unknown or is it none?

Herrera: Both. So it’s unknown what the impact to the NMDOT will be. There is no
consequence to the MPO as far as we know right now. So it’s a little bit of
both. There also, I have to say because we have had this discussion
where some MPOs think well if we set a lower target then the State will
have to fix our roads. That’s not the case either, because our pavement
management system prioritizes routes that are already in good condition.
So if it’s dropped to poor condition basically our pavement management
system is kind of saying well you need to keep your good roads good
because you only have $68 million dollars statewide to spend on
pavement.

Kirby: Well I understand it's complex and that 13% may actually be lower, but
again kind of like voting for increased injuries, it seems like we're voting for
worse conditions. But I understand there’s a lot of moving parts. All right,
thank you.

Wray: Mr. Chair. Just one general note that I’d like to add. Ms. Herrera is
correct that as of right now it doesn't seem like there will be negative
implications for the MPOs and unclear what the implications would be for
DOTs. But I would caution just in a general sort of way, not necessarily
speaking specifically to this audience, but it would be very foolish to
presume that a state of no negative consequences is going to last in the
future. Failure to meet performance targets in pretty much every other
area of life results in negative consequences. I think we should probably
anticipate that at the next Federal Transportation enabling legislation that
this may very well be clarified and the negative consequences spelled out.
So we should not anticipate operating for long in a system where negative
consequences are not present.
Nunez: If I could chime in here Mr. Chair. I've gotten a little bit more familiar with our rating system and on the percentage of our roads for the City and for us even to go down 1% on our percentage of low/poor condition means we did a lot of work and we put a lot of money in. So talking about going from 17 to 0, even going from 17 to 16 you are doing a magnificent job. So in my opinion, I mean, so and I don't know enough about what you're dealing with Dr. McAdams, Mr. Wray, but if it becomes the point where they're going to be criticizing or we're going to be losing funding or whatever I don't know that extra information and explanation of what had been done would help with that. Do you see what I'm saying or mitigate the damages of whatever decision makers are towards this report compared to what it looked like the year before or whatever. So I'm not sure I conveyed my message very well here but, talking about these percentages going up and down drastic amounts is it's a lot of effort and a lot of money so if you're going even slightly in the right direction I think you're doing a great job.

Pearson: Any other comments? I'll hear a motion to approve these targets to the Policy Committee.

Curry: I'll put forth a motion.

Herrera: I'll second.

Pearson: I have a motion and a second to forward these targets to the Policy Committee. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed?

5.5 Performance Measure 3: System Performance Target Recommendation

Pearson: And now we're on to.

MICHAEL MCDADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Pearson: So I guess my take away from this is adding capacity doesn't really add to the performance levels.

McAdams: Well, I think Mr. Chair, in theory it should add to performance, but I think in this situation it really doesn't make a difference in that according to this calculation. This calculation came from the State.
Pearson: Because in general you it seems you add capacity you're adding congestion.

McAdams: That's a little, when you're at capacity at first it's called a vicious cycle of transportation. You have like C, but eventually development current land use and you have a level service D, so actually capacity at first does decrease travel time because it's easier travel development per hours and then it goes back to another situation. So you really don't ever have roads that are you know well enough for the capacity.

Pearson: So if we didn't have that third lane added on I-10 between here and El Paso as a performance it would still be about the same probably overall.

McAdams: I can't really talk on that point per se, but in theoretically and what I know in my experience that capacity is short-lived and probably this situation is too. It depends also like Andrew was saying, as a border increase you know more activity I-10 will also get a lot of that too.

Pearson: Right. Well of course it's a lot nicer driving with three lanes than with two, but was it a good investment of money is the other question. I think it was like $36 million could we instead hit some of those other performance standards we talked about on the road condition and the non-interstate highway system?

Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I can maybe just add a little bit of clarity or not, I'm not sure. This is the most confusing one actually I think for all of us at the DOT as well and the one that we had the least amount of guidance for. So we tried our best, but if you look at the justifications for what we did, basically we looked at the STP and the projects that are currently programmed in the four-year STP and said if we kept funding levels as is, and we project the traffic volumes out, what would our reliability look like? So that's what these numbers are saying. That if we kind of kept business as usual with the same amount of funding programmed out and it increased forecasted traffic models, traffic volumes, then the reliability will go down slightly, but not enough to make a difference.

Pearson: Not significantly.

Herrera: Right. So actually I think it kind of shows that we're doing okay for the most part and I don't know if that's because we just don't have a lot of population and so we don't have a lot of congestion issues at least outside of really Albuquerque area. I'm just not sure why that is, but it seems like we're doing okay.

Pearson: But this kind of indicates any new money should go to maintenance rather than new construction.
Herrera: Right. And that's sort of what all of our Phase A/ Bs which is like kind of the preliminary planning stages when we're looking at new roads even like the West Mesa Road or High Mesa Corridor whichever name you know it by, the no build option was the best option for that one because of the enormous amount of money that it would take and really the small amount of traffic that it would divert. So it is kind of showing us that capacity projects aren't necessarily the way to go.

Pearson: Any other comments? James.

Nunez: I'm a little bit new to some of this too so I just heard a presentation maybe I think some people in this room were at it also at the Planning Conference and it was a presentation I believe was in Santa Fe on was it Guadalupe Road and how they mentioned that the some of the ratings were actually going to go down as far as like from I think from a B to a D I think it was or a C? And they said that's okay or because of the fact that they made the road safer and the congestion and it was safer for pedestrians and all kinds of other things, but I think that's what I heard them say. So that kind of is what I just heard from Ms. Herrera I think.

And then the other comment or question I have for you Dr. McAdams and somebody can elaborate on what I just commented on, is on your second bullet right here, MPO Staff is asking for a recommendation on system performance targets at this meeting from us? So I guess can you, what have we had in the past and what is, can you maybe elaborate on that second bullet.

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. I think again we're dealing with amorphous phase; we're saying we're adopting what the State is going through and basically it's not really much change as a rule, as far as (inaudible) performance. Does that answer your question or no?

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I answer that question maybe? We haven't had anything previously. We've never had targets before. We've never had performance measures so we don't have anything to base this off of. This is the first year that we're doing this and basically what the State is asking the MOP staff the recommend to this Committee, the TAC, and then ultimately the Policy Committee, is to support the State targets, which are the ones that were just presented to you.

Pearson: Any further discussion? Hear a motion to approve this recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Nunez: I make the motion.

Shepan: Second.
Pearson: So we have a motion and a second to recommend this to the Policy Committee. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Pearson: Any opposed?

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

6.1 MPO Staff Update

Pearson: And we're on to discussion items.

Wray: One thing from MPO for this month's meeting, we do have an open call for projects for non-mandatory CMAQ money. We are however kind of drawing near the end of the phase for that because similar to the TAP and RTP that the Committee considered earlier this evening is a Project Feasibility Meeting that's required and any jurisdiction that has not made arrangements for that Feasibility Meeting basically at this point is out of time. I have until November 1st to get the applications into MPO staff. We have had one Project Feasibility Meeting set up between DOT and the City of Las Cruces. We have not had that one yet. But if there are any other jurisdictions that have any interest in that CMAQ money you need to speak to me tomorrow in order for there to be any hope of us getting a PFF Meeting set up. And that's the only MPO update for this month.

Pearson: Okay

6.2 Local Projects update

Pearson: Local projects. City.

Nunez: I have no report.

Pearson: Okay, I guess on the City side, the City Council approved the Active Transportation Plan which also is MPO funded in part?

Wray: Yes.

Pearson: So that has been accomplished so that's City policy now. NMSU?

Kirby: I do have one project update. It's an informational item. We'll be repaving Espina Street between University Avenue and South Horseshoe, so south of Espina starting this December finishing in July. It won't have an ultimate effect on bike traffic or even vehicle traffic. It's ADA
improvements, storm water drainage improvements, restriping, repaving, curb and gutter that type of job so that's coming up.

Pearson: So maintaining the current striping.

Kirby: Yes.

Pearson: Okay. Thank you. County.

Paz: No updates today.

Pearson: Mesilla.

Shepan: No updates.

6.3 NMDOT Projects update

Pearson: So we're on to the NMDOT.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We just have the one project going on right now, it's Valley Drive. You might have noticed that traffic control has shifted a little bit on Picacho going through, we're still moving right along on that. The City utilities we finally I think caught back up so we're back on schedule, but we're still looking at quite a few months. So just be careful as you go through there.

The University project we finally got all of the right-of-way settled and we I think are going out to bid on that one in November if I remember correctly. We're talking internally about having that potentially start in May after school is over. At least we're trying to go that route.

Pearson: Okay. Any information on when Hadley will be open again? Looked like they were filling in the hole when I drove by today.

Herrera: I don't have any information on that. From my understanding, reading the update last week it shouldn't be more than a couple more weeks at the most.

Pearson: Because that also has an impact on the Safe Routes to School Program.

Herrera: Right. It is. The other thing I think to keep in mind is that there's a lot of work on city streets happening in that area also that's not related to that NMDOT project. So it's causing kind of double headache for traffic.

Pearson: The Hadley work and Second Avenue.

Herrera: Right.
Pearson: Yes.

Herrera: So that's not.

Pearson: The previous time I tried to come this direction I had two detours.

Herrera: Right. That's not part of the NMDOT project. That's city work that's happening at the same time.

Curry: Mr. Chair. May I just ask Mr. Nunez if he has any updates on that project that's happening around MacArthur Elementary? Do you know anything about the timeline on that?

Nunez: I do not. I did drive through there the other day and I noticed that the roads around the school were in better shape right? I think some of them are completed. But I can look into that. I'll find out if they're on schedule.

Curry: Thank you.

Pearson: Okay and I'd asked you about the State Bike Plan last time. Do you want to comment on that?

Herrera: Sure, I actually just got an update on it today. It is out for 45-day public comment. The comment period ends November 9th. And if you don't have a link to that, let me know now just nod at me or something I can forward that to MPO staff to send out to you all.

Wray: Yes, please we'll post that on the website.

Herrera: Okay, I'll send that to Andrew right now.

6.4 Committee Members Update

Pearson: Okay, do we have any other Committee Members who wish to comment?

Curry: Yes, I'd like to just give a quick update on our International Walk to School Day. This was the fourth year that we had a walk and event at every single elementary school. I don't actually have numbers off the top of my head right now. Again two years ago we were rained out on Friday and we were rained out this year for our Friday schools and I think we had about twelve schools walking on Friday. So our numbers won't be as good as they normally are although a lot of the schools. I was at White Sands that day and we had about 78 kids. So we still had decent turnout, but it wasn't nearly as good as it would have been if we didn't have rain. But we did have a really big kind of success.
We had for the first time ever the school buses dropped off at Mesilla Park Elementary so we had about a hundred kids who were dropped off at Mesilla Park for the International Walk to School Day, which was a really great collaboration with the school buses. So kids who normally wouldn't be able to participate were, we did field trip permission slips for those and so my hope is in the future we'll be able to do that either at more schools or on a more continual basis there.

So I just wanted to say thank you to everybody and it was a really big collaborative effort. We had the Sheriff's Department and all the law enforcements from the City and from the Town of Mesilla helped at the one for Mesilla. And you know really collaboration from our City Council and from our County Commissioners and all the various entities that DOT so we really just wanted to, I wanted to just say thanks to everybody who was able to come out and help out. And always to George for being there not just once a year but every single week and multiple times in the week, so thank you.

Pearson: Any other members? Okay, we'll move on to public comment.

Wray: Mr. Chair we do have kind of one final sort of community interest announcement. We have a date of November 8th for the Doña Ana County Trail Summit. It's sponsored by the Southern New Mexico Trail Alliance. It's going to be at the Farm and Ranch Heritage Museum 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., so basically a daylong event for the Doña Ana County Trail Summit.

Pearson: Okay and there was an email from Mr. Leisher. Did you have any further communication with him?

Wray: I didn't see any email from Mr. Leisher. It may have, if it came after 4:00 we did see it because we all left.

Pearson: No previous. I saw your reply actually. He expressed interest in resigning, but he didn't give an actual date or anything you asked for a date.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. He has informally expressed an interest in resigning, but has not actually done so as of yet.

Pearson: Okay, so until that happens we won't.

Wray: We can't open a call for candidates.

Pearson: Okay, so we'll move on to public comment

7. PUBLIC COMMENT
Pearson: Okay, so we'll move on to public comment. Looks like it's pretty empty for public comment.

8. ADJOURNMENT (6:33)

Pearson: So we'll move on to adjournment. Hear a motion to adjourn.

Curry: I put forth a motion to adjourn.

Pearson: Do we have a second?

Shepan: Second.

Pearson: We have a motion and second. All in favor "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Chairperson