

1                                   **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
2   **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
3

4   The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the  
5   Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held December 6,  
6   2018 at 4:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las  
7   Cruces, New Mexico.  
8

9   **MEMBERS PRESENT:**   Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)  
10                               Sean Barham (LCPS)  
11                               Michael Garza (DAC Flood Commission)  
12                               Soo Gyu Lee (CLC)  
13                               Dale Harrell (NMSU)  
14                               Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
15                               Harold Love (NMDOT)  
16                               Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)  
17                               Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)  
18                               Jennifer Yoder (CLC)  
19

20   **MEMBERS ABSENT:**   David Armijo (SCRTD)  
21                               Bill Childress (BLM)  
22                               Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)  
23                               Hector Tarrazas, (CLC)  
24                               Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)  
25

26   **STAFF PRESENT:**       Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)  
27                               Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)  
28                               Valerie Sherman (MPO)  
29

30   **OTHERS PRESENT:**    Larry Nichols, (CLC Community Development)  
31                               Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary  
32

33   **1.    CALL TO ORDER (4:00 PM)**  
34

35   Love:            Okay we'll go ahead and get started. Call to order the meeting of the  
36                       Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory  
37                       Committee for December 6, 2018. We'll start with the roll call starting on  
38                       my far right.  
39

40   Shannon:        Larry Shannon, Town of Mesilla.  
41

42   Lee:             Soo Gyu Lee, City of Las Cruces.  
43

44   Molina:          Rene Molina, Doña Ana County.  
45

46   Yoder:           Jennifer Yoder, City of Las Cruces.

1  
2 Barham: Sean Barham, Las Cruces Public Schools.  
3  
4 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.  
5  
6 Garza: Michael Garza, Doña Ana County Flood Commission.  
7  
8 Bartholomew: Mike Bartholomew, City of Las Cruces RoadRUNNER Transit.  
9  
10 Love: And I'm Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.  
11  
12 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**  
13  
14 Love: Move on to item number two, approval of the agenda, looking for a motion.  
15  
16 Garza: Motion to approve.  
17  
18 Bartholomew: Second.  
19  
20 Love: Motion and second all in favor.  
21  
22 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
23  
24 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
25  
26 **3.1 November 1, 2018**  
27  
28 Love: Move on to item number three, approval of the minutes.  
29  
30 Bartholomew: Mr. Chair I have just a couple of minor typo corrections in the minutes. I  
31 think it's Minutes page 10, but packet page 11, line 21 the word "lose"  
32 should be "lost", "Going to get lost in a small packet."  
33  
34 Wray: What line is that on?  
35  
36 Bartholomew: Twenty-one. And line 23 on Minutes page 15, I guess packet page 16,  
37 there is a reference to "trams" is all in lower case, but actually it was  
38 referring to the acronym "TrAMS" so it's all caps except the "r" is lower  
39 case the way FTA does it. That was it.  
40  
41 Love: Okay looking for a motion to approve with the corrections.  
42  
43 Garza: So moved.  
44  
45 Bartholomew: Second.  
46

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

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.

1 Bartholomew: I'll recommend to the Policy Committee the endorsement of the  
2 application from the City for the C-MAQ Non-Mandatory Open Call for  
3 Projects.  
4

5 Garza: Second.  
6

7 Love: All in favor.  
8

9 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
10

11 Love: Motion passes.  
12

## 13 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

14

### 15 **6.1 MVMPO Safety Presentation**

16

17 Love: Moving on to item number six, discussion items, Mesilla Valley MPO  
18 Safety Presentation.  
19

20 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. Dr. McAdams will be presenting on this item.  
21

22 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.  
23

24 Bartholomew: I have a question just as how you might look at data as we progress with  
25 all this advancing technology so, you see a lot more vehicles, more and  
26 more vehicles are having at least semi-automated or fully-automated  
27 features to help prevent crashes, is there going to be a way to maybe  
28 correlate that with the data?  
29

30 McAdams: I think that since AV Technology is in its infancy I think we're going to see  
31 hopefully more of that and I know I was in a vehicle recently where  
32 actually it braked when you got closer to a car. I think those things really  
33 increase, but I think also it would be if we could have some kind of control  
34 of vehicles too as they interact in our intersections. And I'm expecting the  
35 AV will have a dramatic increase, but again, it's not an over-night thing. It  
36 will be very gradual and they're predicting that will be a major factor in  
37 decreasing collisions.  
38

39 Bartholomew: I had a second question too, again trying to correlate with some of the  
40 activity happening, can we see improvements at certain intersections like  
41 up at North Main and Spitz in that area or what's going on in Valley Road  
42 are we going to be able to maybe see some effects of maybe safety  
43 improvements by those road improvements as well?  
44

45 McAdams: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bartholomew. I think that this State is two years in  
46 arrears. We only get it a year and two years in arrears, so the next one

1 will be 2017. Hopefully we'll see improvement in crash reduction. I would  
2 think that there would be. If there's not, then the geometric improvements  
3 at Three Crosses were ineffectual. And I think now, I think there will be,  
4 but I think the real task will be are they reduced significantly. I think with  
5 our new standards where there's more emphasis on making sure that  
6 intersection and corridors do address safety problems.  
7

8 Bartholomew: Thank you. That's all I had.  
9

10 Herrera: Mr. Chair. I had a comment on the report in the packet. So it might seem  
11 minor given the nature of the report and what it's reporting, but there  
12 seems to be inconsistent use of North Main, Main, US-70. So I don't really  
13 know where some of these intersections are because there's inconsistent  
14 use of those road names throughout the report and the different tables.  
15 So maybe when you look at it again, if you can just be consistent with all  
16 those and if its US-70 call it US-70 instead of North Main just to make it  
17 clear; the City owned portion versus NMDOT owned portion, just because  
18 I think the goal of this report is to give it to the local agencies. Right? To  
19 say here are the issues, here are the areas of high-crash rates, we need  
20 to look at them, so I think that is important. Thank you.  
21

22 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I agree. Those will be corrected. But the  
23 purpose is really not to be an exercise in futility just to satisfy DOT regular  
24 (*inaudible*) to really give this and hopefully to lead to (*inaudible*)  
25 improvements in the future.  
26

27 Lee: Mr. Chair. I have a few questions. The first question is did the MPO talk  
28 to Las Cruces PD to get some of the information or have some discussion  
29 of what the cause or any some the intersections you identified as a lot of  
30 the high-crash rate?  
31

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

1  
2 Lee: Okay, the follow-up question is do you have any data to specifically  
3 identify are there any high-crash rate around the school zone or the school  
4 areas?  
5  
6 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. No. We just look at, we can actually have every  
7 single crash in the County, in our MPO area. And so we can look at really  
8 detailed, but we can see, we can concentrate like a buffer around the  
9 schools and see if there is any indication about the crash around schools.  
10 But as far as I can see, there's not a real, as far as pedestrian collisions,  
11 or traffic collisions there's no really indications they're happening around  
12 schools per say, but I think it depends on how you slice the data. We'll be  
13 glad to look at that if you would like us to.  
14  
15 Lee: Okay the last question. In your recommendation number five, it says the  
16 traffic calming to reduce the crash and the severity. Could you elaborate a  
17 little bit about how end up recommend the traffic calming? So it depends  
18 on the location, but what you present to us is your main focus on the  
19 intersection and the corridor and then if we try to do any traffic calming in  
20 the major corridor or the intersection and from my perspective and my  
21 experience it's kind of a little difficult to implement. And then also what  
22 type of unity the traffic calming you guys have the idea in your mind to  
23 help or mitigate some of the issue?  
24  
25 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. I don't have exact, but I think that one thing we look at  
26 presentation on pedestrians having a really square intersection, strict not  
27 have a turn lane or (*inaudible*) traffic and we know that for a fact that  
28 decreasing speed by traffic calming chicanes will reduce speed which will  
29 reduce severity. So I think that will be, again I'd be foolish to say there's  
30 one size fits all again, but it would depend on the corridor or the  
31 intersection. Where the traffic calming is appropriate or not, that's just one  
32 of several tactics to be used.  
33  
34 Lee: Okay Mr. Chair. I have one more question.  
35  
36 McAdams: Okay.  
37  
38 Lee: Your study of the intersection and the corridor which is the  
39 recommendation three, is there any funding available to use for this kind  
40 of study? Because if you voted on the each the local jurisdictions like the  
41 City or County or even NMDOT, they may not be able to identify the  
42 additional funding to do it because the average cost of a traffic study at  
43 one intersection alone it could be \$50,000 to \$100,000 it depends on the  
44 unit complexity. So if you want, let's say the City wants to do several  
45 intersections to the study then we need about \$300,000 to maybe worse

1 case maybe \$500,000 the extra money we needed. That's the reason I  
2 want to ask you, is there any funding available?  
3

4 McAdams: Mr. Lee. I would defer to Ms. Herrera about that because we don't know  
5 of any funding available.  
6

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

20 The other thing I'll tell you as far as traffic calming and some of the  
21 recommendations on Michael's list is in the State Highway Safety Plan  
22 there are some approved counter measures for things like traffic calming  
23 and other things I'm sure you've seen some of those. So maybe more  
24 discussion on that could help this report also. Because I don't think that  
25 they're bad recommendations, but I think without some of the backup  
26 documentation we don't really know what the intent is I think.  
27

28 Lee: Mr. Chair. Can I add a little bit more comment? You know the two  
29 prioritize recommendations from my perspective the MPO staff better give  
30 us a more prioritize this recommendation instead of you give us the seven  
31 different recommendations. I understand that there are specific reasons  
32 you guys to not prioritize it, but in terms of the efficiency from my  
33 perspective give us the prioritized list based on the available funds or  
34 based on the MPO's experience so far. I believe it's going to help.  
35

36 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Mr. Lee. I think that's beyond the capacity of the staff to do that  
37 stuff. I think it may be addressed in the MTP, because we have very  
38 limited staff and that would probably take the majority of my time for about  
39 three or four months maybe.  
40

41 Herrera: Mr. Chair. If I can just follow-up on that. I definitely understand that that's  
42 an ominous task, but I think if we want to get any of this moved forward,  
43 it's going to need to happen. So if it's being addressed through the MTP  
44 it's going to be addressed by staff because staff is doing the MTP update  
45 so I mean I think that it doesn't have to fall 100% on staff. I think you can  
46 bring some recommendations back to the Committees and have us look at

1 some things and get input from the jurisdictions, but I definitely think, all of  
2 these are important, but we need to figure out how to prioritize, otherwise  
3 nothing's going to move forward.  
4

5 McAdams: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera. I agree. I think one way we put our priorities I  
6 thought was using if persons have been killed or severe that would  
7 automatically weight it and that would be a good way to prioritize. I think  
8 that's a good suggestion.  
9

10 Love: Any other comments?  
11

## 12 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

### 13 **7.1 City of Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces** 14 **Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, SCRTD Project Updates** 15

16  
17 Love: We'll move on to item number seven committee and staff comments. 7.1  
18 City of Las Cruces.  
19

20 Yoder: The City of Las Cruces has nothing at this time.  
21

22 Love: Doña Ana County.  
23

24 Molina: I have pretty good news, in my opinion. We bid Soledad Canyon and we  
25 have an apparent low-bidder. We now have a pre-concept for December  
26 18th and we will roll into construction early January. But that's what I  
27 have. Thank you.  
28

29 Love: Town of Mesilla.  
30

31 Shannon: Town of Mesilla has nothing at this time.  
32

33 Love: Las Cruces Public Schools.  
34

35 Barham: Thank you Mr. Chair. We continue with our weekly walk to school events  
36 through Safe Routes to School. And I know that this coming Wednesday  
37 at Sonoma Elementary, they'll be walking to school and hot cocoa will be  
38 waiting for them, and you're all invited to that. So if you would like to  
39 come, let me know and I'll meet you there. That's all.  
40

41 Love: RoadRUNNER Transit.  
42

43 Bartholomew: Really nothing different than last time. We're still planning on our service  
44 expansion where we'll extend weekday hours of service from 7:00 p.m. to  
45 10:30 p.m. We're probably not going to be able to start it quite as early as  
46 we wanted. We were planning in January. We're having difficulties hiring



1 drivers. We're having to hire to fill the new positions, plus we've had some  
2 turnover with existing staff, so that's kind of been the limiting factor, but  
3 right now we're looking at still doing it in late February or early March. For  
4 the Electric Bus Project, we hope to have a RFP out on the street in early  
5 January for project management for the project manager, we'll help  
6 develop the specs for the electric buses and do the coordination for the  
7 infrastructure with El Paso Electric. That's all I have.

8  
9 Love: South Central RTD is not in attendance.

## 10 11 **7.2 NMDOT Projects Update**

12  
13 Love: Let's move on to NMDOT Project Updates.

14  
15 Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have a specific update from the Project  
16 Manager for Valley Drive, but that project is still under construction in case  
17 you haven't been by there lately. It's going to be for quite some time, so  
18 be careful while you're out there.

19  
20 Bartholomew: I had a question. You're supposed to open bids this month for was it  
21 University?

22  
23 Herrera: That's a good question. Yes. We were supposed to open bids this month  
24 for University, however we are having some issues with funding at the  
25 Federal level so we're not able to that this month. We're hoping that it's  
26 only pushed back for a month, but it's looking more like February/March at  
27 this point in time.

28  
29 Bartholomew: So that means actual construction will be pushed back?

30  
31 Herrera: Will be pushed back, yes, about six months after the actual bid openings.  
32 So I mean unfortunately we just keep moving that timeline down.

33  
34 Bartholomew: Okay, thank you.

## 35 36 **7.3 MPO Staff Projects Update**

37  
38 Love: MPO Staff Update.

39  
40 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. We're currently in the middle of our first round of  
41 public meetings for the Public Input Phase for the Metropolitan  
42 Transportation Plan Update. We've had two meetings so far. We have  
43 two yet to come. Staff is moderately pleased with the attendance that we  
44 have had at both of these meetings so far. Both of the meetings have had  
45 increased attendance from the final meetings in the Public Comment  
46 Phase for the current MTP, the 2015 MTP, so staff is very pleased about

1 that. Next meeting we have is this coming Monday. It's going to be at  
2 Radium Springs and then that will be followed by a meeting a week from  
3 today on Thursday. That will be down at the Vado Del Cerro Community  
4 Center. That is our final scheduled public meeting that we have before the  
5 conclusion of 2018. We will have some more public meetings after the  
6 start of 2019 and we will also start our efforts of attending some of the  
7 jurisdictional meetings of our member agencies etc. etc.

8  
9 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

10  
11 Love: Item number eight, public comment.

12  
13 Herrera: Mr. Chair. Sorry. I'm not a member of the public, but I have a question for  
14 RoadRUNNER Transit actually and South Central RTD whose not here.  
15 What is happening with that joint plan that the two of you were going to  
16 undertake?

17  
18 Bartholomew: Basically, based on direction that we've gotten from the City  
19 administration, we're going to move forward the City separately, but  
20 coordinated with the RTD. But we're not going to do a joint plan as I was  
21 talking about before where we would have a single contractor that we  
22 would have our contractors do the two plans. And I've been trying to get  
23 some more feedback from Dave Harris at the DOT about you know  
24 whether it's how they would split it or would they actually give us a little  
25 more if we, and still, haven't heard back from him yet.

26  
27 **9. ADJOURNMENT (5:42 PM)**

28  
29 Love: And I think we're to item number nine adjournment. Looking for a motion.

30  
31 Bartholomew: I move we adjourn.

32  
33 Garza: Second.

34  
35 Love: All in favor.

36  
37 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

38  
39 Love: We are adjourned.

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 Chairperson

