

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

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
5 Advisory Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
6 which was held October 16, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana
7 County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

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

18 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Andrew Bencomo (Pedestrian Community Rep)
19 Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
20 Jess Waller (Bicycle Com. Rep.)
21

22 **STAFF PRESENT:** Andrew Wray (MPO)
23 Michael McAdams (MPO)
24 Debra Fuller (MPO)
25

26 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Cathy Mathews, CLC
27 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
28

29 **1. CALL TO ORDER (5:00)**
30

31 Pearson: Okay it's 5:00 so I'll call this meeting of the Mesilla Valley MPO Bicycle
32 and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to order. First order after
33 the Call Order is the approval of the agenda. Call order, let's do, start with
34 Jolene down here.
35

36 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.
37

38 Shepan: Lance Shepan, Mesilla Marshals.
39

40 Devine: Donna Devine, Bicycle Advocate.
41

42 Curry: Ashleigh Curry, Community Representative of the Town of Mesilla.
43

44 Paz: Samuel Paz, Doña Ana County.
45

46 Kirby: Jack Kirby, New Mexico State University.

1
2 Nunez: James Nunez, City of Las Cruces Rep.

3
4 Pearson: And George Pearson, City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep.
5

6 **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
7

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

10
11 Herrera: So moved.

12
13 Paz: Second.

14
15 Pearson: Second. All in favor "aye".
16

17 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
18

19 Pearson: Any opposed?
20

21 **3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
22

23 **3.1 August 21, 2018**
24

25 Pearson: Third item is approval of the minutes. Is there any discussion on the
26 minutes? Hearing none. I'll hear a motion to approve the minutes as
27 presented.
28

29 Nunez: Make a motion to approve minutes.

30
31 Pearson: And a second.

32
33 Shepan: Second.

34
35 Pearson: We have a motion and second to approve the minutes as presented. All
36 in favor "aye."
37

38 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 Pearson: Any opposed?
41

42 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**
43

44 Pearson: Next item is public comment. Do we have any member of the public that
45 wishes to make a comment at this time?
46

1 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

2
3 **5.1 FFY 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments**

4
5 Pearson: Moving on to action items. We have TIP amendment.

6
7 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

8
9 Pearson: On the grant, the \$16 million, what grant was that the City was awarded?

10
11 Wray: I believe it was the BUILD grant was the one that was awarded.

12
13 Pearson: Okay because I know they applied, made the same application for two
14 grants. I know the build was one of them.

15
16 Wray: It was one or the other.

17
18 Pearson: I knew that already.

19
20 Wray: I believe it was the BUILD grant.

21
22 Pearson: Okay.

23
24 Wray: But I might be mistaken.

25
26 Pearson: Any members have questions? Hear a motion to accept the TIP
27 amendments as presented?

28
29 Curry: I'll put forth a motion.

30
31 Paz: Second.

32
33 Pearson: We have a motion and second to accept the TIP amendments as
34 proposed. All in favor "aye."

35
36 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

37
38 Pearson: Any opposed? So that passes.

39
40 **5.2 Transportation Alternatives Program and Recreational Trails**
41 **Program Application Recommendations**

42
43 Pearson: Next item is our TAP program.

44
45 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

1 Pearson: I have a question before you go, talking about the TAP and the RTP?

2
3 Wray: Yes, we are doing both TAP and RTP as part of this same presentation.
4 Yes, that's correct.
5

6 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUED HIS PRESENTATION.
7

8 Curry: Thank you Mr. Wray. So this is as Mr. Wray just said, this is a
9 continuation of the Safe Routes to School Program. Currently the request
10 is to continue funding at 25 hours per week for nine months of the school
11 year and we provide services to all 25 elementary schools. We offer
12 education. We offer weekly walking school buses at 18 of our schools.
13 We offer them monthly at four of our schools and education is offered at
14 all of the schools to the third grade students currently. We would like to
15 continue that and per our action plan which hopefully you'll be seeing later
16 this year, we would like to kind of expand our education program and
17 continue to outreach to as many schools as we can. I'm happy to answer
18 any questions that anybody might have.
19

20 Pearson: So is this the same dollar level in previous applications?
21

22 Curry: It is a little bit more and it is nothing has changing in the amount
23 requested. The hours and the hourly rate is remaining the same for the
24 coordinator. We are asking for a little bit more funding for the education
25 encouragement materials just because we've reached into so many more
26 schools than we originally did and just the cost of providing the little
27 chimes and incentive items exceeds what we have originally requested in
28 that, but otherwise everything else stays the same.
29

30 Pearson: Any other Board Members have questions? So I guess now we can either
31 move on or we could vote on this.
32

33 Wray: Whichever the Committee prefers.
34

35 Pearson: We do have some conflicts by a couple of members for each of the items.
36 I know one of the Board Members of course is receiving funds and the
37 other wrote the application, so maybe we should vote them separately,
38 maybe do a role call to give members opportunity to abstain where
39 necessary.
40

41 Wray: Very good Mr. Chair.
42

43 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I make a comment on that? I think that is okay if that's
44 what this Committee wants to do, but just keep in mind that the decisions
45 made by this Committee are not the final decisions on the applications.

1 They still have to go through the statewide scoring process, so just wanted
2 to add that information in.
3
4 Pearson: Right, we're recommending to the Policy Committee as we usually do and
5 the Policy Committee will then recommend.
6
7 Wray: Yes. Ultimately the applications have to be approved by the Policy
8 Committee in order for them to be submitted to NMDOT and this is an
9 advisory body to the Policy Committee. So that the process theoretically
10 would be if an application was declined by this Committee it would still
11 proceed through the TAC to the Policy Committee just with the note that
12 BPAC had not spoken in favor of it, but it still would go to the Policy
13 Committee for it's review for approval.
14
15 Pearson: Okay.
16
17 Wray: We have never had that happen but just.
18
19 Pearson: So I'll hear a motion to recommend approval of this item to the Policy
20 Committee.
21
22 Nunez: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry can I stall that out with one question first?
23
24 Pearson: Sure.
25
26 Nunez: Can you describe to me, I'm not familiar with this, on the second page or
27 page three, to as it says, it says topics to discuss during PFF meetings
28 looks like a number of questions throughout this. Are there some answers
29 to each of those or is it, why does that have a bunch of questions without
30 answers?
31
32 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. The PFF is the Project Feasibility Form that is a
33 required document that must go in the TAP application, and you will see it
34 in all the rest of these applications this evening. But it's kind of a non-
35 binding document once the PFF meeting happens. The purpose of the
36 PFF as it says, Project Feasibility is to establish in the eyes of NMDOT
37 whether the project that's being applied for is even feasible either fiscally,
38 physically what have you. All of the applications except for the SRTS
39 because it's non-infrastructure did go through the required PFF. Partially
40 because it's non-infrastructure and also because it's a program of such
41 long standing, DOT determined that Las Cruces Public Schools did not
42 need to have a Project Feasibility meeting specifically for this application
43 but it's still Harold as you will note on page 32 his signature is present as
44 recommended. As far as the Project Feasibility Form goes for this project
45 and for the three remaining that we're going to discuss this evening that's

1 all that needs to be there. That's the critical thing is whether Harold
2 signed it or not.
3
4 Nunez: Okay. Then I have one more question to you Mr. Chair. If there is what
5 do you want to call it, like whether we vote yea or nay, if there is
6 opposition or whatever it is to each of these, do you want to discuss them
7 at all or would you rather just vote. It doesn't matter to me either way, but
8 not really just vote.
9
10 Pearson: I was thinking take each one separately.
11
12 Nunez: Okay. In terms of discussion or people's, I guess they speak up if they
13 had an issue with one of these or not to make it stronger or whatever. I'm
14 not communicating very well I'm sorry. But, yes, I'm sorry you can go
15 back to your motion if you'd like. I think you were looking for a motion for
16 somebody to vote on this.
17
18 Pearson: Well we can certainly have more discussion if members want that or we
19 can move ahead with the vote. So make a motion to accept approval.
20
21 Nunez: I'll make the motion to vote for approval.
22
23 Pearson: We need a second.
24
25 Shepan: Second.
26
27 Pearson: Okay, so we have a motion and a second to approve the Safe Routes to
28 School Program to the Policy Committee. And we'll go ahead and do a
29 roll call vote, "yes" or "no."
30
31 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. Mr. Nunez
32
33 Nunez: Yes.
34
35 Wray: Mr. Kirby.
36
37 Kirby: I'm for it.
38
39 Wray: Mr. Paz.
40
41 Paz: Abstain.
42
43 Wray: Ms. Curry.
44
45 Curry: Abstain.
46

1 Wray: Ms. Devine.
2
3 Devine: I'm for it.
4
5 Wray: Mr. Shepan.
6
7 Shepan: Yes.
8
9 Wray: Ms. Herrera.
10
11 Herrera: Yes.
12
13 Wray: Mr. Chair.
14
15 Pearson: Yes.
16
17 Wray: That passes.
18
19 ANDREW WRAY CONTINUES HIS PRESENTATION
20
21 Pearson: So this was discussed last time with the TAP application that the City
22 hasn't closed out the previous TAP application, so later in the process
23 there'll be points levied against it, is that what happened?
24
25 Herrera: Yes. So into the guide we wrote that it is a five-point deduction for every
26 inactive project and so the scoring will be done and then the list of inactive
27 projects will be brought in and points will just be deducted off of each one
28 of those.
29
30 Pearson: But for our purposes today we can just move forward.
31
32 Herrera: Right.
33
34 Pearson: Any further discussion?
35
36 Nunez: Just a point of information. I remember that discussion and I took it back
37 to my superiors and they did handle it. They talked about it and they did
38 convey to me that they'd been giving and conveying all information. And I
39 know that there's a little bit of communication issues with whoever it was
40 at the State DOT, but anyway, my superiors know about it. So I mean a
41 couple of people on this Committee just expressed concerns so I
42 conveyed those to my superiors.
43
44 Pearson: So if no further discussion I'll hear a motion to approve this item to the
45 Policy Committee.
46

1 Curry: I'll put forth a motion.
2
3 Shepan: Second.
4
5 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to approve this item to the Policy
6 Committee. Let's do a roll call vote.
7
8 Wray: Mr. Nunez.
9
10 Nunez: Abstain.
11
12 Wray: Mr. Kirby.
13
14 Kirby: Approve.
15
16 Wray: Mr. Paz.
17
18 Paz: Approve.
19
20 Wray: Ms. Curry.
21
22 Curry: Approve.
23
24 Wray: Ms. Devine.
25
26 Devine: Approve.
27
28 Wray: Mr. Shepan.
29
30 Shepan: Approve.
31
32 Wray: Ms. Herrera.
33
34 Herrera: Yes.
35
36 Wray: Mr. Chair.
37
38 Pearson: Yes.
39
40 Wray: That one passes. The next application is the second one from the City of
41 Las Cruces. This one is for a multi-use trail proposed to be constructed
42 along the Las Cruces Lateral between University and Main Street. We
43 have Ms. Cathy Mathews here from the City of Las Cruces to speak
44 further about this application.
45

1 Mathews: Good evening Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. Cathy Mathews,
2 Landscape Architect with the City of Las Cruces. I don't have any
3 prepared remarks necessarily except that we're interested in applying for
4 this grant to further develop the trail system throughout the City of Las
5 Cruces and hopefully to make progress towards closing the loop per say
6 on the trail system in Las Cruces. And I will be happy to answer questions
7 or provide further details if you're interested.
8

9 Pearson: Could you just outline the route that's proposed for this trail?
10

11 Mathews: Mr. Chair. The route we're proposing is from University Avenue across
12 the street from the Convention Center, along Las Cruces Lateral parallel
13 with El Paseo Road, and then continuing along the lateral adjacent to Las
14 Cruces High School and connecting then to the intersection of Idaho and
15 Main Street. And the idea was that this route could provide some
16 connectivity between the campus and the City per say and future bicycle
17 lanes that are I believe still in design on Main Street.
18

19 Pearson: So the roadway crossings has there been any, I mean this is all
20 preliminary I presume so there haven't been any designs, but are there
21 thoughts on like the University crossing in particular, put in a crosswalk at
22 that point or something, some sort of roadway marking and any of the
23 other roadway crossings can you speak to any of that?
24

25 Mathews: Definitely, Mr. Chair. The crossings will be critical and essential and we
26 have addressed that in our application making statements that we will do,
27 we will make signals, signs, and markings, other kinds of features that are
28 required to make those crossings as safe as possible for trail users, but
29 we have not started any kind of design at this point in time.
30

31 Pearson: So there's I know HAWK lights are rather expensive, the flashing, yellow
32 flashing pedestrian crossing demand activated flashing lights those kind of
33 ideas maybe at University is that in the thought process?
34

35 Mathews: Yes.
36

37 Pearson: Any other questions?
38

39 Curry: Mr. Chair. Ms. Mathews, may I ask a question? What's the proposed
40 length of the project?
41

42 Mathews: It is, I believe 1.65 miles.
43

44 Curry: Thank you.
45

46 Devine: What is the projected start date of this project?

1
2 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. As soon as we receive the grant award
3 letter and Council has approved it and we have the final signed
4 documents, we will start.
5
6 Pearson: So these are reimbursement grants aren't they?
7
8 Mathews: Yes.
9
10 Pearson: And the grant, this is a two-year grant period that we're talking about so
11 the last, as an example the Mesilla multi-use trail the first year was
12 designated as a design fund phase and the second year was construction.
13 Do you have this phased out or are you just going go with it?
14
15 Mathews: Mr. Chair. It's not necessarily designated as phase, but that's our
16 intention is the first year will be planning and design and the second year
17 will be construction.
18
19 Pearson: Okay.
20
21 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I just have one question, is a follow-up to the PFF meeting we
22 had. We talked about the EBID property and that they're at that time was
23 not easement or permit. And I notice that documentation is not in this
24 packet, so has that process been started?
25
26 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. No we have not started that process.
27 We're essentially waiting to see if we get the grant or not before we start
28 on that effort.
29
30 Herrera: What kind of time frame do you think that it will take to work out the
31 easement issues with EBID? I'm just worried about if you receive the
32 grant will you have time to work out the issues in a year and also complete
33 design.
34
35 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I have experience of seeking one
36 landscape permit from EBID and it took a matter of maybe a month. And I
37 anticipate this would be very similar, the entire length is along EBID right-
38 of-way along their ditch. It's our understanding that they're interested in
39 this kind of thing. The State has granted the City the ability to do public
40 City projects along EBID right-of-way. I don't anticipate any kind of
41 problems or delay and I also don't anticipate waiting to start design until
42 the permit is completed. I anticipate simultaneous kinds of process
43 through both of those procedures.
44
45 Herrera: Andrew, question for you. So if they were to get a letter, if the City was to
46 get a letter from EBID just saying that they're willing to work with them on

1 the easement process would they still be allowed to put that in the packet
2 or is it kind of like it's cut off now?

3
4 Wray: We could probably try to incorporate it into subsequent packets. They
5 would have to move very quickly. Just for the information of this
6 Committee, due to the Veteran's Day holiday in November and the Board
7 of County Commissioners shifting that week's meeting from Monday to
8 Wednesday that puts it directly in conflict with our regular second
9 Wednesday protocol for Policy Committee meetings, so the November
10 meeting of Policy Committee is going to be the first week, the first
11 Wednesday rather than the second Wednesday, so it's a very compressed
12 time frame that we would be looking at. But all that being said, we have
13 not put together the TAC packet yet, we have not put together the Policy
14 Committee packet yet. Staff doesn't see any reason why we couldn't
15 amend in that documentation into this application going forward because
16 obviously we want to give all of our member agencies the best chance
17 possible of getting a project awarded. So we would certainly try to
18 incorporate that into the final documentation.
19

20 Herrera: Thanks. And I would recommend that you include that documentation. It
21 doesn't, it just has to be a letter that says they're willing to work with you
22 just because I have a feeling that that's going to come up at the committee
23 meeting and you know unless that's kind of written somewhere they're not
24 really going to have an idea of what's happening.
25

26 Mathews: We'll make that happen.
27

28 Herrera: Thank you.
29

30 Pearson: Are there any current EBID and City of Las Cruces MOUs in effect right
31 now? Because I remember the discussion about it having happened or
32 the ability for it to happen, but I think the Outfall Channel actually fell
33 outside of the EBID if I remember correctly.
34

35 Mathews: That's correct Mr. Chair. There's one instance with which I'm familiar and
36 that's, I can't remember the name of the ditch, but it's along Motel
37 Boulevard NM-292.
38

39 Pearson: That multi-use trail there.
40

41 Mathews: Yes, that multi, there's a small lip length of trail that's right along the EBID
42 right-of-way and we got what's called a Landscape Permit from them to
43 install the landscape and the multi-use trail there.
44

45 Pearson: Right.
46

1 Mathews: That's the one that took maybe a month.
2
3 Pearson: Right. Well the EBID was at one of the City's Transportation Policy
4 Review Committee meetings expressing interest in cooperating with us so
5 hopefully the letter will be enough to let the State know that the process
6 will be smooth.
7
8 Mathews: I anticipate I could get that letter and then also submit an application too. I
9 mean it's a one-page application.
10
11 Pearson: Because part of the discussion with EBID is which side of the ditch should
12 the trail be on.
13
14 Mathews: True.
15
16 Pearson: And that's part of the process I think.
17
18 Mathews: Sure. Okay. Very good. Thank you Mr. Chair.
19
20 Pearson: This is the RTP application.
21
22 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. And there's one other thing that I would like to add also for
23 Ms. Mathews' benefit, but there is a standing MOU or MOA I can't
24 remember which it is between EBID and the City of Las Cruces stating
25 that the City of Las Cruces is allowed to apply. Now the way that the
26 permits work, it is on a case-by-case basis, but there is that standing
27 agreement that the City can apply. So I would suggest to Ms. Mathews
28 that in addition to a letter you might include the current MOU to staff as
29 well because I don't believe MPO staff has that most recent one. I believe
30 the one that we have on file was from 2009. So just additional
31 documentation I think would be helpful.
32
33 Pearson: Okay so this is the RTP so the the outstanding tab doesn't count on this
34 one is that right?
35
36 Herrera: It does.
37
38 Pearson: It does?
39
40 Herrera: Yes. It's the same guide for both and it's the same scoring criteria along
41 with the same deductions.
42
43 Pearson: Okay, so even more encouragement needed for the City to close out that
44 project. Any other discussion?
45

1 Nunez: Mr. Chair. Ms. Mathews did you mention a value? I can't remember, did
2 you mention a cost estimate for that section?
3
4 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. We do have a project total of \$504,000.
5
6 Nunez: Okay, interesting. We're about to put a HAWK system up. We're about to
7 go out to bid here in a few weeks. The one on University close to
8 Lorenzo's/Garcia Hall, and already the estimate is something around
9 \$200,000 I think. At any rate you had mentioned that the crossings and
10 stuff so I'm not sure my focus would be on the trail. And it's kind of
11 unfortunate that you maybe didn't put the HAWK system on the new hotel
12 right there on University that they're building. It comes out right there,
13 correct? So anyway I'm not sure how that would be eventually but I know
14 you mentioned the HAWK so I just thought I'd chime in with that. And then
15 also I mean at the other extreme and where it comes out on, where did
16 you mention by Las Cruces High School or something?
17
18 Mathews: Idaho and Main Street.
19
20 Nunez: Idaho and Main. I'm not sure what structure is there.
21
22 Pearson: But there's going to be a crossing at Missouri then.
23
24 Nunez: Or Boutz or whatever they call it, what is it?
25
26 Pearson: Boutz.
27
28 Mathews: Boutz, thank you.
29
30 Nunez: Very good. Anyway, that's my suggestion. Is to focus on the trail.
31
32 Mathews: Okay. Thank you.
33
34 Pearson: Any further discussion? Hear a motion to move this forward to the Policy
35 Committee for approval?
36
37 Curry: I put forth a motion.
38
39 Paz: Second.
40
41 Pearson: We have a motion and a second. Would you do a roll call please?
42
43 Wray: Mr. Nunez.
44
45 Nunez: Abstain.
46

1 Wray: Mr. Kirby.
2
3 Kirby: I'm for.
4
5 Wray: Mr. Paz.
6
7 Paz: Approve.
8
9 Wray: Ms. Curry.
10
11 Curry: Approve.
12
13 Wray: Ms Devine.
14
15 Devine: Approve.
16
17 Wray: Mr. Shepan.
18
19 Shepan: Approve.
20
21 Wray: Ms. Herrera.
22
23 Herrera: Yes.
24
25 Wray: Mr. Chair.
26
27 Pearson: Yes.
28
29 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Lastly we have application from Doña Ana County.
30 This proposed trail is proposed to be along Elk's Drive from Doña Ana
31 School Road to the Columbia north driveway. We have Mr. Paz here
32 present so I'll turn the presentation over to him.
33
34 Paz: I'll stand for any question. The main intent is to connect obviously county
35 residents to community amenities, parks and schools. We're looking at a
36 situation where we want to mimic or copy the Triviz Trail using that right-
37 of-way that abuts the State Highway and really that's it.
38
39 Pearson: So this is almost a Safe Routes to School Project.
40
41 Paz: In reality it does support the connection between Columbia and the park
42 and really the County's issues with infrastructure and lack of infrastructure.
43 So Columbia is a Safe Routes to School location, but it has limited
44 activities. You don't have a walking school bus program there. There is
45 no sidewalks, no connectivity in those areas, so in theory it supports both
46 Safe Routes to School and just connectivity in the community.

1
2 Pearson: Right. Any other questions?
3
4 Devine: I have a question. What would be the length of the trail, like maybe a
5 mile?
6
7 Paz: So the proposed length we have is a little bit over a mile, it's 1.15 miles.
8
9 Devine: So it'll go from Columbia to that park?
10
11 Paz: Yes, Doña Ana Park. Those are the two dots we're trying to connect.
12
13 Devine: Okay.
14
15 Paz: So we have a very similar project that we're doing in Chaparral which is in
16 the El Paso MPO, really built off of the same concept, connecting
17 community amenities, parks, schools, clinics so that's really where we're
18 picking up off that momentum.
19
20 Herrera: Mr. Chair.
21
22 Pearson: Yes.
23
24 Herrera: I have a comment maybe on that active transportation and recreational
25 programs application, it's on page 121. The funding is a little bit confusing
26 the way that it's listed there. It makes sense on the project prospectus
27 form, how it's broken out into the preliminary engineering, construction
28 management, and construction, but the way it looks on the actual program
29 application is that you're trying to split this out between three years. So I
30 guess to MPO staff can they update that? So it should just be two years
31 and the construction management can be included with the construction
32 cost in project here number two.
33
34 Wray: Yes, we will take that amendment if the county chooses to submit it.
35
36 Herrera: Thank you.
37
38 Paz: Yes, we agree with that. And I can provide that amendment if needed to
39 the documents or we can work with that so.
40
41 Pearson: Sounds rather necessary since it's a two-year funding cycle that we're in.
42 Any other comments? Hear a motion to send this to the Policy Committee
43 for approval?
44
45 Nunez: I'll make the motion.
46

1 Kirby: Second.
2
3 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to send this to the Policy Committee for
4 approval. Take a roll call please.
5
6 Wray: Mr. Nunez.
7
8 Nunez: Yes.
9
10 Wray: Mr. Kirby.
11
12 Kirby: Yes.
13
14 Wray: Mr. Paz.
15
16 Paz: Abstain.
17
18 Wray: Ms. Curry.
19
20 Curry: Yes.
21
22 Wray: Ms. Devine.
23
24 Devine: Yes.
25
26 Wray: Mr. Shepan.
27
28 Shepan: Yes.
29
30 Wray: Ms. Herrera.
31
32 Herrera: Yes.
33
34 Wray: Mr. Chair.
35
36 Pearson: Yes.
37
38 **5.3 Performance Measure 1: Safety Target Recommendation**
39
40 Pearson: Okay, so next is performance measure. We have three performance
41 measure items and the first one is the Safety Target Recommendation.
42
43 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair, I'll be turning the meeting over to Dr. Michael
44 McAdams.
45
46 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION

1
2 Pearson: So you're showing mostly the State numbers, but you don't really have a
3 chart of the MPO because what we are talking about is the MPO areas
4 right?
5
6 McAdams: These are State numbers, these are not MPO numbers. Total state and
7 vehicle miles traveled. We are developing a report right now, or I am, and
8 we'll do that in probably a couple of months.
9
10 Pearson: So are there separate, are we, we're using, we're following the State what
11 the State is recommending.
12
13 McAdams: Right.
14
15 Pearson: We're measuring it separately aren't we, I mean the whole state gets
16 measured at once and it gets chopped up into areas.
17
18 McAdams: We are looking at our portion of decrease which we're a small portion but
19 say we like the intent, we're going downward and our report will subset
20 either be against that or it will be lower or higher than the State standard.
21 So we are required to report, but right now we say we could develop our
22 own standards, but that's not, it would be too complicated and we're off
23 the State standards.
24
25 Pearson: So what else besides the numbers in the State standards?
26
27 McAdams: That's it, just say the targets. We'll adopt the targets.
28
29 Pearson: So then it's the other policies that the local MPO like the ATP was just
30 adopted by the City, so that could be a policy document that helps support
31 lowering.
32
33 McAdams: Yes, I think that definitely if you look at the state that'd be something to
34 support that and then actual numbers when our, if our numbers go down
35 or go up and we hope that they go down.
36
37 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I add some clarity maybe? So we're asking the MPO the
38 MPOs all five of them in this State to support the State targets which is
39 what was just presented to you, the numbers that were just presented.
40 Basically what goes along with this is a lot of reporting requirements and
41 at this point in time because this is still new this is only the second year
42 that we've adopted targets, we don't feel like the MPOs have enough
43 information or the capability to set their own targets and be able to report
44 on those at this time. That's not to say that that won't change in the future,
45 but at this time with the massive amount of reporting requirements that go

1 into this one in particular we would not advise that any of the MPOs set
2 their own targets.

3
4 Pearson: But then the preventive measures are still a separate issue that each
5 entity, each jurisdiction should still be addressing.

6
7 Herrera: Right. And to go along with that if you notice, if you go back through the
8 packet into the TAP and Rec trails applications we just looked at we
9 added a section for performance measures. And so every single project
10 that's funded with Federal funding or State funding from the DOT has to
11 show how it is going to help the State and the MPO meet the performance
12 targets and unless that information is included, no Federal funding can be
13 expended. So that's how all of our projects are.

14
15 Pearson: So for the trails, the roadway crossings would need to have a plan for the
16 crossing at the trails too.

17
18 Herrera: Right. And most of the descriptions in the TAP and Rec trails applications
19 we just looked at under I think it's number 31 on the project prospectus
20 form, if you take a look at it, it's trying to get at the target number five, the
21 number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries, and so a lot of the
22 descriptions say things like separation between the bicycles and vehicles,
23 separation between pedestrians and vehicles, we hope is going to make it
24 safer just less conflict points. So those are some ways that those types of
25 projects can help the State and the MPO meet these targets.

26
27 Curry: Mr. Chair. May I ask a question? So Ms. Herrera what I'm understanding
28 is what we're voting on now is not so much these increases and
29 decreases and individual charts, but do we agree with the set State
30 standards?

31
32 Herrera: No, it's actually the targets. So in the slides and if you have the handouts
33 there is an NMDOT target statement under each of the graphs.

34
35 McAdams: Want me to go back.

36
37 Herrera: Yes, please. So any of them. This one, that's fine. So NMDOT target
38 statement, decrease the fatality rate from 1.343 in 2016 to 1.318 by
39 December 31, 2019. So that is the goal that the State has set and we are
40 asking for the MPO areas to help us meet that goal.

41
42 Curry: Got you. Thank you. And I did bring this up last year I have a really hard
43 time voting to approve an increase in fatalities.

44
45 Herrera: I agree and we have, I can just tell you at DOT, we have a really hard time
46 looking at the numbers and seeing an increase in fatalities, unfortunately

1 there's more distracted driving, there are more vehicles on the road
2 because gas is getting cheaper. We've had kind of a boom/bust situation
3 going on in some of our oil field areas that's adding to the fatalities. So we
4 definitely don't like to see an increase in fatalities either, unfortunately with
5 the way that the Federal government has framed these is we have to pick
6 a number and we have to pick a reasonable number. We would like it to
7 be zero, but we know that that's not reasonable.
8

9 Curry: Right. And I remember Mr. Wray commenting last year that if you put a
10 decrease and you didn't meet that need, then you have failed and don't
11 qualify for funding. Is that correct or something along those lines?
12

13 Herrera: Yes, you qualify for funding, but basically FHWA has more say over where
14 that funding should go, which kind of leaves us less flexibility for actually
15 taking care of issues. One thing I can tell you that we're doing at the State
16 level is we used to do an open call for projects for the Highway Safety
17 Improvement Program funding and I think what we found is that we've
18 looked at hotspot maps for a number of years and we keep seeing the
19 same hotspots over and over because we're doing this kind of open call
20 for projects and not addressing the high fatality areas in the State. And
21 so, we're no longer doing open calls for projects. We are taking the
22 hotspot maps and we are addressing the issues regardless of whether it's
23 a DOT road or a local road or whatever it is, we're not discriminating that
24 way we're just looking to actually solve, try to solve issues as best we can
25 through engineering in hotspot areas so hopefully, eventually we'll get to a
26 place where we will see the numbers decreasing.
27

28 Pearson: Any further discussion? Hear a motion to approve this to the Policy
29 Committee.
30

31 Paz: Make a motion.
32

33 Nunez: I'll second.
34

35 Pearson: So we have a motion and a second to approve this to the Policy
36 Committee.
37

38 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 Pearson: Any opposed? That passes.
41

42 **5.4 Performance Measure 2: State of Good Repair Target**
43 **Recommendation**
44

45 Pearson: We're on to.
46

1 McAdams: Let me go to the next. State of Good Repair.

2
3 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

4
5 ANDREW WRAY AUGMENTED THE PRESENTATION.

6
7 Pearson: What was in the packet is the State targets.

8
9 Wray: Yes, Mr. Chair. There's been a lot of work that has gone into this
10 performance measure in particular. We actually have only I guess finally
11 come to this particular agreement with NMDOT last Friday. As a matter of
12 fact, it was last Friday when we finally came to consensus as to what the
13 targets that staff would recommend this MPO adopt. So we did not have
14 this information available at the time that your packet was put together. If
15 we had, we would have, but it was just a question we were still working
16 with the DOT at that point to figure out exactly what staff was going to be
17 recommending to this Committee and to the TAC and to the Policy
18 Committee.

19
20 Pearson: So the State level for Good Repair non-NHS is 34.2% and the MPO is
21 10%. Is that an indication that our roads down here are in much worse
22 condition than the State overall?

23
24 Wray: That's actually a more difficult question than it may seem on the surface
25 Mr. Chair. I guess the short and dirty answer to that is yes, but we do
26 have a couple of things to keep in mind with regards to that. We do have
27 a major international border just immediately to our south which is the hub
28 of trade. We do have I-10 which is a major east/west connection that is on
29 the interstate NHS obviously, but it is also supported by non-interstate
30 NHS facilities around it US-70 some of the connections down in the south
31 etc. As far as specific reasons as to why the roads are proportionally
32 worse, that was actually a question that was raised by the Policy
33 Committee last week when we gave this presentation to them as well.
34 Unfortunately, and Mr. Doolittle spoke at some length, but DOT at this
35 point in time doesn't really have information to explain why the roads in
36 this particular area are worse, and same thing with Farmington and Santa
37 Fe, that was just not something, all due respect to Ms. Herrera whose
38 here and her department, I don't think that DOT was necessarily
39 anticipating finding this when they did this analysis and so I don't think that
40 they expected to have to do that analysis. I don't know if Ms. Herrera
41 wishes to speak any further on this particular topic.

42
43 Herrera: I think one of the things that's affecting the numbers in this area and
44 possibly in Farmington, I haven't looked into them as much just because
45 they're outside of my area. But I have looked at the data for Mesilla Valley
46 and we're a year behind so there are some roads on the non-interstate

1 NHS that are City owned that have had some work recently. Valley Drive
2 is another one that is on the NHS that's a non-interstate one, obviously
3 we're doing full reconstruction and so I think some of the data is behind.
4 So I think once we get through this year and data is collected next year,
5 that number will be lower and it will be below the State target. At least
6 that's what we anticipate. The thing about this target is, well all of these
7 targets is that we haven't had a whole lot of guidance at the DOT from
8 FHWA on exactly how this works. There have been multiple peer
9 exchange programs between State DOTs and we're all kind of in the same
10 boat. We don't really know exactly what FHWA is trying to get at with this.
11 We think we have a pretty good idea they want us to use the pavement
12 management system but the fundamentals that go into that can be very
13 different depending on what methodology you use. So even us trying to
14 compare our pavement management system and our targets to TXDOT to
15 ADOT, to our neighbors around us, Colorado DOT, we're getting
16 something totally different. So the good news is that we can't find
17 anywhere in the law where there's consequences written in so if we don't
18 meet our target in two years we don't really know what's going to happen.
19 I guess to take that a step further, the law doesn't have any consequences
20 written in for MPOs not meeting targets. So all of the consequences if an
21 MPO area or the State don't meet the targets is on the State. I don't really
22 know what that looks like at this time though.

23
24 Pearson: Because the underlying driver for this presumably is funding.

25
26 Herrera: Right.

27
28 Pearson: And looking at the State charts going from the two year to the four year
29 the bridges in poor condition is going down so, but the bridges in good
30 condition is also going down, which implies that you're putting the money
31 in bridges that need to be fixed and the bridges that are okay will wait for a
32 while on those.

33
34 Herrera: Right. So in order to get a bridge out of poor condition you have to
35 replace it. So that's where the number is going down. But if a bridge is in
36 good condition it can get to fair condition and still be okay. So we're letting
37 more bridges go to fair condition and rebuilding the ones exactly like you
38 said Mr. Chair that are in poor condition.

39
40 Pearson: Because if a bridge fails, it's a bad thing.

41
42 Herrera: Exactly. If pavement fails there's some cracking, it's bumpy. If a bridge
43 fails we don't want that to happen. We're not going to let that happen.

44
45 Pearson: You see the news reports from Minneapolis, other places.

1 Herrera: Exactly. Yes and so that absolutely will not happen. The other thing I can
2 tell you is that the NMDOT spends a lot of money on all this data collection
3 and we have been doing that for quite some time. I mean the bridges we
4 have a really robust bridge inspection program. It's run out of NMSU and
5 UNM. We contract with the two universities and the bridges are inspected
6 on an every other year basis unless they have been noted that there's
7 potentially issues and then they're inspected every year. The pavement
8 data for interstates and NHS is collected yearly. So we will have data.
9 We just don't exactly know how to report it correctly to FHWA yet.
10
11 Pearson: Any other comments? James.
12
13 Nunez: I did have a couple of questions. Ms. Herrera and Dr. McAdams. On the
14 NHS List does that include like the whole MPO area and does every, like
15 Ms. Herrera you mentioned that every, all of the roads on there are
16 inspected every year and they're on the list? Is that correct? Because I
17 know, what I was getting at is that I know that the City we have our own
18 plan to improve our roads and how we're going to tackle that. So I'm not
19 sure which of the City's roads would be included on that list and I know
20 that, well anyway, I know that we are increasing, we're doing, our plan is,
21 in our funding we plan to make our roads better.
22
23 Herrera: Right. There is a list. We're only talking about the NHS, the National
24 Highway System Roads that are in the MPO area. And some of them are,
25 actually the majority of them are owned by NMDOT, but there are a few
26 that are owned by the City. And I have the list in front of me; so there's
27 Telshor Boulevard, University, Motel, and Lohman are the ones that are
28 on the NHS system, owned by the City of Las Cruces.
29
30 Nunez: And so to that end, I know that we've been, we just did some more work
31 mill overlay right there, you guys went down Lohman and Solano and then
32 we last year did some work on Lohman and Amador, but so okay then not
33 just the City of Las Cruces correct is probably I would assume Anthony
34 and other places?
35
36 Herrera: Right. Yes, the City of Las Cruces is not the only agency that has roads
37 on the NHS. There's a bunch in Albuquerque, there's oddly enough some
38 in Roswell and Clovis, Alamogordo has one and then well it says El Paso,
39 Texas/New Mexico, but it's actually in the City of Sunland Park. So there
40 are other entities that have NHS roads.
41
42 Pearson: So does NMDOT do the pavement or do the measurements on these the
43 State/City owned roads or do you rely on the City pavement preservation?
44
45 Herrera: No, for all of these roads that are on the National Highway System the
46 NMDOT does data collection. And like I said, it's a little bit behind so all of

1 the work that was just done by the City, basically anything done in 2018
2 has not been accounted for in the targets, because we're a year behind.
3 So I imagine a lot of the, like I said the target for NHS non-interstate in
4 poor condition is likely a lot lower than what it's showing at 13% currently
5 just because of all the work that's going on or has happened this year. But
6 we won't know that until the data is collected. I believe the time frame on
7 that is March for when all the data will be collected and we'll actually have
8 a new target to look at. We won't be able to reset the target until 2020, is
9 the first opportunity that the State has to look at our targets. But that's
10 kind of what we think is going to happen.
11

12 Kirby: Mr. Chair. I have one question. Ms. Herrera your discussion somewhat
13 preempted my question, but I still want to be clear on it. I'm sorry, can you
14 go back to the slide that was the table showing the targets? Right there.
15 No I'm sorry, one more I think. Okay for instance that last one the bottom
16 one, just for debate's sake, if we recommended a target of 0% on poor
17 condition is, what's the negative implication? Is it unknown or is it none?
18

19 Herrera: Both. So it's unknown what the impact to the NMDOT will be. There is no
20 consequence to the MPO as far as we know right now. So it's a little bit of
21 both. There also, I have to say because we have had this discussion
22 where some MPOs think well if we set a lower target then the State will
23 have to fix our roads. That's not the case either, because our pavement
24 management system prioritizes routes that are already in good condition.
25 So if it's dropped to poor condition basically our pavement management
26 system is kind of saying well you need to keep your good roads good
27 because you only have \$68 million dollars statewide to spend on
28 pavement.
29

30 Kirby: Well I understand it's complex and that 13% may actually be lower, but
31 again kind of like voting for increased injuries, it seems like we're voting for
32 worse conditions. But I understand there's a lot of moving parts. All right,
33 thank you.
34

35 Wray: Mr. Chair. Just one general note that I'd like to add. Ms. Herrera is
36 correct that as of right now it doesn't seem like there will be negative
37 implications for the MPOs and unclear what the implications would be for
38 DOTs. But I would caution just in a general sort of way, not necessarily
39 speaking specifically to this audience, but it would be very foolish to
40 presume that a state of no negative consequences is going to last in the
41 future. Failure to meet performance targets in pretty much every other
42 area of life results in negative consequences. I think we should probably
43 anticipate that at the next Federal Transportation enabling legislation that
44 this may very well be clarified and the negative consequences spelled out.
45 So we should not anticipate operating for long in a system where negative
46 consequences are not present.

1
2 Nunez: If I could chime in here Mr. Chair. I've gotten a little bit more familiar with
3 our rating system and on the percentage of our roads for the City and for
4 us even to go down 1% on our percentage of low/poor condition means
5 we did a lot of work and we put a lot of money in. So talking about going
6 from 17 to 0, even going from 17 to 16 you are doing a magnificent job.
7 So in my opinion, I mean, so and I don't know enough about what you're
8 dealing with Dr. McAdams, Mr. Wray, but if it becomes the point where
9 they're going to be criticizing or we're going to be losing funding or
10 whatever I don't know that extra information and explanation of what had
11 been done would help with that. Do you see what I'm saying or mitigate
12 the damages of whatever decision makers are towards this report
13 compared to what it looked like the year before or whatever. So I'm not
14 sure I conveyed my message very well here but, talking about these
15 percentages going up and down drastic amounts is it's a lot of effort and a
16 lot of money so if you're going even slightly in the right direction I think
17 you're doing a great job.
18

19 Pearson: Any other comments? I'll hear a motion to approve these targets to the
20 Policy Committee.
21

22 Curry: I'll put forth a motion.
23

24 Herrera: I'll second.
25

26 Pearson: I have a motion and a second to forward these targets to the Policy
27 Committee. All in favor "aye."
28

29 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
30

31 Pearson: Any opposed?
32

33 **5.5 Performance Measure 3: System Performance Target**
34 **Recommendation**
35

36 Pearson: And now we're on to.
37

38 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
39

40 Pearson: So I guess my take away from this is adding capacity doesn't really add to
41 the performance levels.
42

43 McAdams: Well, I think Mr. Chair, in theory it should add to performance, but I think in
44 this situation it really doesn't make a difference in that according to this
45 calculation. This calculation came from the State.
46

1 Pearson: Because in general you it seems you add capacity you're adding
2 congestion.
3

4 McAdams: That's a little, when you're at capacity at first it's called a vicious cycle of
5 transportation. You have like C, but eventually development current land
6 use and you have a level service D, so actually capacity at first does
7 decrease travel time because it's easier travel development per hours and
8 then it goes back to another situation. So you really don't ever have roads
9 that are you know well enough for the capacity.
10

11 Pearson: So if we didn't have that third lane added on I-10 between here and El
12 Paso as a performance it would still be about the same probably overall.
13

14 McAdams: I can't really talk on that point per se, but in theoretically and what I know
15 in my experience that capacity is short-lived and probably this situation is
16 too. It depends also like Andrew was saying, as a border increase you
17 know more activity I-10 will also get a lot of that too.
18

19 Pearson: Right. Well of course it's a lot nicer driving with three lanes than with two,
20 but was it a good investment of money is the other question. I think it was
21 like \$36 million could we instead hit some of those other performance
22 standards we talked about on the road condition and the non-interstate
23 highway system?
24

25 Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I can maybe just add a little bit of clarity or not, I'm not sure.
26 This is the most confusing one actually I think for all of us at the DOT as
27 well and the one that we had the least amount of guidance for. So we
28 tried our best, but if you look at the justifications for what we did, basically
29 we looked at the STP and the projects that are currently programmed in
30 the four-year STP and said if we kept funding levels as is, and we project
31 the traffic volumes out, what would our reliability look like? So that's what
32 these numbers are saying. That if we kind of kept business as usual with
33 the same amount of funding programmed out and it increased forecasted
34 traffic models, traffic volumes, then the reliability will go down slightly, but
35 not enough to make a difference.
36

37 Pearson: Not significantly.
38

39 Herrera: Right. So actually I think it kind of shows that we're doing okay for the
40 most part and I don't know if that's because we just don't have a lot of
41 population and so we don't have a lot of congestion issues at least outside
42 of really Albuquerque area. I'm just not sure why that is, but it seems like
43 we're doing okay.
44

45 Pearson: But this kind of indicates any new money should go to maintenance rather
46 than new construction.

1
2 Herrera: Right. And that's sort of what all of our Phase A/Bs which is like kind of
3 the preliminary planning stages when we're looking at new roads even like
4 the West Mesa Road or High Mesa Corridor whichever name you know it
5 by, the no build option was the best option for that one because of the
6 enormous amount of money that it would take and really the small amount
7 of traffic that it would divert. So it is kind of showing us that capacity
8 projects aren't necessarily the way to go.
9

10 Pearson: Any other comments? James.
11

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

21 And then the other comment or question I have for you Dr.
22 McAdams and somebody can elaborate on what I just commented on, is
23 on your second bullet right here, MPO Staff is asking for a
24 recommendation on system performance targets at this meeting from us?
25 So I guess can you, what have we had in the past and what is, can you
26 maybe elaborate on that second bullet.
27

28 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Nunez. I think again we're dealing with amorphous phase;
29 we're saying we're adopting what the State is going through and basically
30 it's not really much change as a rule, as far as (*inaudible*) performance.
31 Does that answer your question or no?
32

33 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Can I answer that question maybe? We haven't had anything
34 previously. We've never had targets before. We've never had
35 performance measures so we don't have anything to base this off of. This
36 is the first year that we're doing this and basically what the State is asking
37 the MOP staff the recommend to this Committee, the TAC, and then
38 ultimately the Policy Committee, is to support the State targets, which are
39 the ones that were just presented to you.
40

41 Pearson: Any further discussion? Hear a motion to approve this recommendation to
42 the Policy Committee.
43

44 Nunez: I make the motion.
45

46 Shepan: Second.

1
2 Pearson: So we have a motion and a second to recommend this to the Policy
3 Committee. All in favor "aye."
4

5 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
6

7 Pearson: Any opposed?
8

9 **6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

10
11 **6.1 MPO Staff Update**
12

13 Pearson: And we're on to discussion items.
14

15 Wray: One thing from MPO for this month's meeting, we do have an open call for
16 projects for non-mandatory CMAQ money. We are however kind of
17 drawing near the end of the phase for that because similar to the TAP and
18 RTP that the Committee considered earlier this evening is a Project
19 Feasibility Meeting that's required and any jurisdiction that has not made
20 arrangements for that Feasibility Meeting basically at this point is out of
21 time. I have until November 1st to get the applications into MPO staff.
22 We have had one Project Feasibility Meeting set up between DOT and the
23 City of Las Cruces. We have not had that one yet. But if there are any
24 other jurisdictions that have any interest in that CMAQ money you need to
25 speak to me tomorrow in order for there to be any hope of us getting a
26 PFF Meeting set up. And that's the only MPO update for this month.
27

28 Pearson: Okay
29

30 **6.2 Local Projects update**
31

32 Pearson: Local projects. City.
33

34 Nunez: I have no report.
35

36 Pearson: Okay, I guess on the City side, the City Council approved the Active
37 Transportation Plan which also is MPO funded in part?
38

39 Wray: Yes.
40

41 Pearson: So that has been accomplished so that's City policy now. NMSU?
42

43 Kirby: I do have one project update. It's an informational item. We'll be repaving
44 Espina Street between University Avenue and South Horseshoe, so south
45 of Espina starting this December finishing in July. It won't have an
46 ultimate effect on bike traffic or even vehicle traffic. It's ADA

1 improvements, storm water drainage improvements, restriping, repaving,
2 curb and gutter that type of job so that's coming up.
3
4 Pearson: So maintaining the current striping.
5
6 Kirby: Yes.
7
8 Pearson: Okay. Thank you. County.
9
10 Paz: No updates today.
11
12 Pearson: Mesilla.
13
14 Shepan: No updates.
15
16 **6.3 NMDOT Projects update**
17
18 Pearson: So we're on to the NMDOT.
19
20 Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We just have the one project going on right now, it's
21 Valley Drive. You might have noticed that traffic control has shifted a little
22 bit on Picacho going through, we're still moving right along on that. The
23 City utilities we finally I think caught back up so we're back on schedule,
24 but we're still looking at quite a few months. So just be careful as you go
25 through there.
26 The University project we finally got all of the right-of-way settled
27 and we I think are going out to bid on that one in November if I remember
28 correctly. We're talking internally about having that potentially start in May
29 after school is over. At least we're trying to go that route.
30
31 Pearson: Okay. Any information on when Hadley will be open again? Looked like
32 they were filling in the hole when I drove by today.
33
34 Herrera: I don't have any information on that. From my understanding, reading the
35 update last week it shouldn't be more than a couple more weeks at the
36 most.
37
38 Pearson: Because that also has an impact on the Safe Routes to School Program.
39
40 Herrera: Right. It is. The other thing I think to keep in mind is that there's a lot of
41 work on city streets happening in that area also that's not related to that
42 NMDOT project. So it's causing kind of double headache for traffic.
43
44 Pearson: The Hadley work and Second Avenue.
45
46 Herrera: Right.

1
2 Pearson: Yes.

3
4 Herrera: So that's not.

5
6 Pearson: The previous time I tried to come this direction I had two detours.

7
8 Herrera: Right. That's not part of the NMDOT project. That's city work that's
9 happening at the same time.

10
11 Curry: Mr. Chair. May I just ask Mr. Nunez if he has any updates on that project
12 that's happening around MacArthur Elementary? Do you know anything
13 about the timeline on that?

14
15 Nunez: I do not. I did drive through there the other day and I noticed that the
16 roads around the school were in better shape right? I think some of them
17 are completed. But I can look into that. I'll find out if they're on schedule.

18
19 Curry: Thank you.

20
21 Pearson: Okay and I'd asked you about the State Bike Plan last time. Do you want
22 to comment on that?

23
24 Herrera: Sure, I actually just got an update on it today. It is out for 45-day public
25 comment. The comment period ends November 9th. And if you don't
26 have a link to that, let me know now just nod at me or something I can
27 forward that to MPO staff to send out to you all.

28
29 Wray: Yes, please we'll post that on the website.

30
31 Herrera: Okay, I'll send that to Andrew right now.

32
33 **6.4 Committee Members Update**

34
35 Pearson: Okay, do we have any other Committee Members who wish to comment?

36
37 Curry: Yes, I'd like to just give a quick update on our International Walk to School
38 Day. This was the fourth year that we had a walk and event at every
39 single elementary school. I don't actually have numbers off the top of my
40 head right now. Again two years ago we were rained out on Friday and
41 we were rained out this year for our Friday schools and I think we had
42 about twelve schools walking on Friday. So our numbers won't be as
43 good as they normally are although a lot of the schools. I was at White
44 Sands that day and we had about 78 kids. So we still had decent turnout,
45 but it wasn't nearly as good as it would have been if we didn't have rain.
46 But we did have a really big kind of success.

1 We had for the first time ever the school buses dropped off at
2 Mesilla Park Elementary so we had about a hundred kids who were
3 dropped off at Mesilla Park for the International Walk to School Day, which
4 was a really great collaboration with the school buses. So kids who
5 normally wouldn't be able to participate were, we did field trip permission
6 slips for those and so my hope is in the future we'll be able to do that
7 either at more schools or on a more continual basis there.

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

17
18 Pearson: Any other members? Okay, we'll move on to public comment.

19
20 Wray: Mr. Chair we do have kind of one final sort of community interest
21 announcement. We have a date of November 8th for the Doña Ana
22 County Trail Summit. It's sponsored by the Southern New Mexico Trail
23 Alliance. It's going to be at the Farm and Ranch Heritage Museum 9:00
24 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., so basically a daylong event for the Doña Ana County
25 Trail Summit.

26
27 Pearson: Okay and there was an email from Mr. Leisher. Did you have any further
28 communication with him?

29
30 Wray: I didn't see any email from Mr. Leisher. It may have, if it came after 4:00
31 we did see it because we all left.

32
33 Pearson: No previous. I saw your reply actually. He expressed interest in
34 resigning, but he didn't give an actual date or anything you asked for a
35 date.

36
37 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. He has informally expressed an interest in resigning, but
38 has not actually done so as of yet.

39
40 Pearson: Okay, so until that happens we won't.

41
42 Wray: We can't open a call for candidates.

43
44 Pearson: Okay, so we'll move on to public comment

45
46 **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

1
2 Pearson: Okay, so we'll move on to public comment. Looks like it's pretty empty for
3 public comment.
4

5 **8. ADJOURNMENT (6:33)**
6

7 Pearson: So we'll move on to adjournment. Hear a motion to adjourn.
8

9 Curry: I put forth a motion to adjourn.
10

11 Pearson: Do we have a second?
12

13 Shepan: Second.
14

15 Pearson: We have a motion and second. All in favor "aye."
16

17 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY
18
19

20
21 
22 _____
23 Chairperson