MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held December 6,
2018 at 4:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las
Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:       Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
                        Sean Barham (LCPS)
                        Michael Garza (DAC Flood Commission)
                        Soo Gyu Lee (CLC)
                        Dale Harrell (NMSU)
                        Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
                        Harold Love (NMDOT)
                        Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
                        Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)
                        Jennifer Yoder (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT:         David Armijo (SCRTD)
                        Bill Childress (BLM)
                        Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)
                        Hector Tarrazas, (CLC)
                        Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)

STAFF PRESENT:          Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
                        Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)
                        Valerie Sherman (MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT:         Larry Nichols, (CLC Community Development)
                        Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (4:00 PM)

Love:       Okay we'll go ahead and get started. Call to order the meeting of the
            Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory
            Committee for December 6, 2018. We'll start with the roll call starting on
            my far right.

Shannon:    Larry Shannon, Town of Mesilla.

Lee:        Soo Gyu Lee, City of Las Cruces.

Molina:     Rene Molina, Doña Ana County.

Yoder:      Jennifer Yoder, City of Las Cruces.
Barham: Sean Barham, Las Cruces Public Schools.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

Garza: Michael Garza, Doña Ana County Flood Commission.

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

Love: And I'm Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Love: Move on to item number two, approval of the agenda, looking for a motion.

Garza: Motion to approve.

Bartholomew: Second.

Love: Motion and second all in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 November 1, 2018

Love: Move on to item number three, approval of the minutes.

Bartholomew: Mr. Chair I have just a couple of minor typo corrections in the minutes. I think it's Minutes page 10, but packet page 11, line 21 the word "lose" should be "lost", "Going to get lost in a small packet."

Wray: What line is that on?

Bartholomew: Twenty-one. And line 23 on Minutes page 15, I guess packet page 16, there is a reference to "trams" is all in lower case, but actually it was referring to the acronym "TrAMS" so it's all caps except the "r" in lower case the way FTA does it. That was it.

Love: Okay looking for a motion to approve with the corrections.

Garza: So moved.

Bartholomew: Second.
Love: All in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Love: Motion passes.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Love: Moving on to item number four, public comment. Seeing none.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 FFY 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Love: We'll move on to item number five, Action Items starting with our Transportation Improvement Program Amendments.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Love: Any questions? Seeing none. Looking for a motion to approve.

Bartholomew: I move we recommend this TIP Amendment to the Policy Committee.

Garza: Second.

Love: All in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Love: Motion passes.

5.2 Recommendation to the Policy Committee Endorsing an Application to NMDOT for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Non-Mandatory Open Call for Projects

Love: Moving on to item 5.2., recommendation to the Policy Committee endorsing an application to NMDOT for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Non-Mandatory Open Call for Projects.

ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Soo Gyu Lee GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Love: Any questions? Looking for a motion to approve.
Bartholomew: I'll recommend to the Policy Committee the endorsement of the application from the City for the C-MAQ Non-Mandatory Open Call for Projects.

Garza: Second.

Love: All in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Love: Motion passes.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 MVMPO Safety Presentation

Love: Moving on to item number six, discussion items, Mesilla Valley MPO Safety Presentation.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Dr. McAdams will be presenting on this item.

MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

Bartholomew: I have a question just as how you might look at data as we progress with all this advancing technology so, you see a lot more vehicles, more and more vehicles are having at least semi-automated or fully-automated features to help prevent crashes, is there going to be a way to maybe correlate that with the data?

McAdams: I think that since AV Technology is in its infancy I think we're going to see hopefully more of that and I know I was in a vehicle recently where actually it braked when you got closer to a car. I think those things really increase, but I think also it would be if we could have some kind of control of vehicles too as they interact in our intersections. And I'm expecting the AV will have a dramatic increase, but again, it's not an over-night thing. It will be very gradual and they're predicting that will be a major factor in decreasing collisions.

Bartholomew: I had a second question too, again trying to correlate with some of the activity happening, can we see improvements at certain intersections like up at North Main and Spitz in that area or what's going on in Valley Road are we going to be able to maybe see some effects of maybe safety improvements by those road improvements as well?

McAdams: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bartholomew. I think that this State is two years in arrears. We only get it a year and two years in arrears, so the next one
will be 2017. Hopefully we'll see improvement in crash reduction. I would think that there would be. If there's not, then the geometric improvements at Three Crosses were ineffectual. And I think now, I think there will be, but I think the real task will be are they reduced significantly. I think with our new standards where there's more emphasis on making sure that intersection and corridors do address safety problems.

Bartholomew: Thank you. That's all I had.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. I had a comment on the report in the packet. So it might seem minor given the nature of the report and what it's reporting, but there seems to be inconsistent use of North Main, Main, US-70. So I don't really know where some of these intersections are because there's inconsistent use of those road names throughout the report and the different tables. So maybe when you look at it again, if you can just be consistent with all those and if its US-70 call it US-70 instead of North Main just to make it clear; the City owned portion versus NMDOT owned portion, just because I think the goal of this report is to give it to the local agencies. Right? To say here are the issues, here are the areas of high-crash rates, we need to look at them, so I think that is important. Thank you.

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I agree. Those will be corrected. But the purpose is really not to be an exercise in futility just to satisfy DOT regular (inaudible) to really give this and hopefully to lead to (inaudible) improvements in the future.

Lee: Mr. Chair. I have a few questions. The first question is did the MPO talk to Las Cruces PD to get some of the information or have some discussion of what the cause or any some the intersections you identified as a lot of the high-crash rate?

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. That is really for further studies, like Corridor Intersections. We are given the data by the State, which means its two-years is for looking (inaudible) and also GPS-ing the crashes too. So those are, unfortunately, all though database is very intricate in detail, it doesn't tell too much by the causes. That would have to go through the City of Las Cruces or the Town of Mesilla or the State to look at the cause. I think that's, the purpose of the report was not to do that, but really give a general indication of crash locations. And I think that we would gladly work with the City or the County or the State and look at the actual causes of that. But I think that's for perhaps another in the MTP we could look at that. I would like that. Or we could have a special corridor study done with a consultant maybe for that, but that's really what Ms. Herrera mentioned that. We want to leave that till we look at different areas where we can make improvements and then also after we make improvements does the situation improve or stay the same.
Lee: Okay, the follow-up question is do you have any data to specifically identify are there any high-crash rate around the school zone or the school areas?

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. No. We just look at, we can actually have every single crash in the County, in our MPO area. And so we can look at really detailed, but we can see, we can concentrate like a buffer around the schools and see if there is any indication about the crash around schools. But as far as I can see, there's not a real, as far as pedestrian collisions, or traffic collisions there's no really indications they're happening around schools per say, but I think it depends on how you slice the data. We'll be glad to look at that if you would like us to.

Lee: Okay the last question. In your recommendation number five, it says the traffic calming to reduce the crash and the severity. Could you elaborate a little bit about how end up recommend the traffic calming? So it depends on the location, but what you present to us is your main focus on the intersection and the corridor and then if we try to do any traffic calming in the major corridor or the intersection and from my perspective and my experience it's kind of a little difficult to implement. And then also what type of unity the traffic calming you guys have the idea in your mind to help or mitigate some of the issue?

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. I don't have exact, but I think that one thing we look at presentation on pedestrians having a really square intersection, strict not have a turn lane or (inaudible) traffic and we know that for a fact that decreasing speed by traffic calming chicanes will reduce speed which will reduce severity. So I think that will be, again I'd be foolish to say there's one size fits all again, but it would depend on the corridor or the intersection. Where the traffic calming is appropriate or not, that's just one of several tactics to be used.

Lee: Okay Mr. Chair. I have one more question.

McAdams: Okay.

Lee: Your study of the intersection and the corridor which is the recommendation three, is there any funding available to use for this kind of study? Because if you voted on the each the local jurisdictions like the City or County or even NMDOT, they may not be able to identify the additional funding to do it because the average cost of a traffic study at one intersection alone it could be $50,000 to $100,000 it depends on the unit complexity. So if you want, let's say the City wants to do several intersections to the study then we need about $300,000 to maybe worse
case maybe $500,000 the extra money we needed. That's the reason I
want to ask you, is there any funding available?

McAdams: Mr. Lee, I would defer to Ms. Herrera about that because we don't know
of any funding available.

Herrera: There is a category of federal funding called the Highway Safety
Improvement Program so that funds specifically safety projects. Right
now we have a backlog of safety projects on the books that we've kind of
had for quite some time. We've been working through some issues, but
that type of funding is available or it will be available once we kind of get
through our backlog; to do things like road safety assessments, so on
corridors and at specific intersections. So my recommendation I think
would be that we need to figure out I think how to prioritize some of these
because obviously we can't do everything all at once and so if there's a
way to put up some kind of priority on some of these intersections or
corridors that's at least one way that we can maybe start moving them
forward. But again, that's one source of funding and it's available for all
entities and the NMDOT Statewide. So there is quite a bit of competition.

The other thing I'll tell you as far as traffic calming and some of the
recommendations on Michael's list is in the State Highway Safety Plan
there are some approved counter measures for things like traffic calming
and other things I'm sure you've seen some of those. So maybe more
discussion on that could help this report also. Because I don't think that
they're bad recommendations, but I think without some of the backup
documentation we don't really know what the intent is I think.

Lee: Mr. Chair. Can I add a little bit more comment? You know the two
prioritize recommendations from my perspective the MPO staff better give
us a more prioritize this recommendation instead of you give us the seven
different recommendations. I understand that there are specific reasons
you guys to not prioritize it, but in terms of the efficiency from my
perspective give us the prioritized list based on the available funds or
based on the MPO's experience so far. I believe it's going to help.

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. I think that's beyond the capacity of the staff to do that
stuff. I think it may be addressed in the MTP, because we have very
limited staff and that would probably take the majority of my time for about
three or four months maybe.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I can just follow-up on that. I definitely understand that that's
an ominous task, but I think if we want to get any of this moved forward,
it's going to need to happen. So if it's being addressed through the MTP
it's going to be addressed by staff because staff is doing the MTP update
so I mean I think that it doesn't have to fall 100% on staff. I think you can
bring some recommendations back to the Committees and have us look at
some things and get input from the jurisdictions, but I definitely think, all of these are important, but we need to figure out how to prioritize, otherwise nothing’s going to move forward.

McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I agree. I think one way we put our priorities I thought was using if persons have been killed or severe that would automatically weight it and that would be a good way to prioritize. I think that’s a good suggestion.

Love: Any other comments?

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

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

Love: We’ll move on to item number seven committee and staff comments. 7.1 City of Las Cruces.

Yoder: The City of Las Cruces has nothing at this time.

Love: Doña Ana County.

Molina: I have pretty good news, in my opinion. We bid Soledad Canyon and we have an apparent low-bidder. We now have a pre-concept for December 18th and we will roll into construction early January. But that’s what I have. Thank you.

Love: Town of Mesilla.

Shannon: Town of Mesilla has nothing at this time.

Love: Las Cruces Public Schools.

Barham: Thank you Mr. Chair. We continue with our weekly walk to school events through Safe Routes to School. And I know that this coming Wednesday at Sonoma Elementary, they’ll be walking to school and hot cocoa will be waiting for them, and you’re all invited to that. So if you would like to come, let me know and I’ll meet you there. That’s all.

Love: RoadRUNNER Transit.

Bartholomew: Really nothing different than last time. We’re still planning on our service expansion where we’ll extend weekday hours of service from 7:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. We’re probably not going to be able to start it quite as early as we wanted. We were planning in January. We’re having difficulties hiring
drivers. We're having to hire to fill the new positions, plus we've had some
turnover with existing staff, so that's kind of been the limiting factor, but
right now we're looking at still doing it in late February or early March. For
the Electric Bus Project, we hope to have a RFP out on the street in early
January for project management for the project manager, we'll help
develop the specs for the electric buses and do the coordination for the
infrastructure with El Paso Electric. That's all I have.

Love: South Central RTD is not in attendance.

7.2 NMDOT Projects Update

Love: Let's move on to NMDOT Project Updates.

Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have a specific update from the Project
Manager for Valley Drive, but that project is still under construction in case
you haven't been by there lately. It's going to be for quite some time, so
be careful while you're out there.

Bartholomew: I had a question. You're supposed to open bids this month for was it
University?

Herrera: That's a good question. Yes. We were supposed to open bids this month
for University, however we are having some issues with funding at the
Federal level so we're not able to that this month. We're hoping that it's
only pushed back for a month, but it's looking more like February/March at
this point in time.

Bartholomew: So that means actual construction will be pushed back?

Herrera: Will be pushed back, yes, about six months after the actual bid openings.
So I mean unfortunately we just keep moving that timeline down.

Bartholomew: Okay, thank you.

7.3 MPO Staff Projects Update

Love: MPO Staff Update.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. We're currently in the middle of our first round of
public meetings for the Public Input Phase for the Metropolitan
Transportation Plan Update. We've had two meetings so far. We have
two yet to come. Staff is moderately pleased with the attendance that we
have had at both of these meetings so far. Both of the meetings have had
increased attendance from the final meetings in the Public Comment
Phase for the current MTP, the 2015 MTP, so staff is very pleased about
that. Next meeting we have is this coming Monday. It's going to be at Radium Springs and then that will be followed by a meeting a week from today on Thursday. That will be down at the Vado Del Cerro Community Center. That is our final scheduled public meeting that we have before the conclusion of 2018. We will have some more public meetings after the start of 2019 and we will also start our efforts of attending some of the jurisdictional meetings of our member agencies etc. etc.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Love: Item number eight, public comment.

Herrera: Mr. Chair. Sorry. I'm not a member of the public, but I have a question for RoadRUNNER Transit actually and South Central RTD whose not here. What is happening with that joint plan that the two of you were going to undertake?

Bartholomew: Basically, based on direction that we've gotten from the City administration, we're going to move forward the City separately, but coordinated with the RTD. But we're not going to do a joint plan as I was talking about before where we would have a single contractor that we would have our contractors do the two plans. And I've been trying to get some more feedback from Dave Harris at the DOT about you know whether it's how they would split it or would they actually give us a little more if we, and still, haven't heard back from him yet.

9. ADJOURNMENT (5:42 PM)

Love: And I think we're to item number nine adjournment. Looking for a motion.

Bartholomew: I move we adjourn.

Garza: Second.

Love: All in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Love: We are adjourned.

[Signature: Chairperson]