



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://MesillaValleyMPO.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a Special Meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO) Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **September 17, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.** in the in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers**, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://MesillaValleyMPO.org).

The MVMPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The MVMPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the MVMPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Mesilla Valley: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 3.1 August 20, 2019 _____ **Chair**
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1 West University Multi-Use Path Presentation _____ **BHI Staff**
 - 5.2 Mesilla Valley MPO Safety Targets Presentation _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.3 MPO Update _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.4 Local Projects Update _____ **Jurisdictional Staff**
 - 5.5 NMDOT Projects Update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 5.6 Committee Members Update _____ **BPAC**
6. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
7. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

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 Advisory
5 Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was
6 held August 20, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Doña Ana County
7 Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
10 Andrew Bencomo (Pedestrian Community Rep)
11 Samuel Paz proxy David Cristiani (Doña Ana County Rep)
12 Ashleigh Curry (Town of Mesilla Citizen Rep)
13 Marcia Davis (Doña Ana County Citizen Rep)
14 Dona Devine (Bicycle Community Citizen Rep)
15 Jack Kirby (NMSU Staff Rep)
16 Hector Terrazas (City of Las Cruces Staff Rep)
17 Jess Waller (Bicycle Community Citizen Rep.)
18

19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
20 Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla Staff Rep)
21

22 **STAFF PRESENT:** Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
23 Valerie Sherman (MPO staff)
24

25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Cathy Mathews (CLC)
26 Dan Carter
27 Cheryl Strain
28

29 **1. CALL TO ORDER (5:03)**
30

31 Pearson: It's a little bit after 5:00, so I'll call to order the August meeting of the Mesilla
32 Valley MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee. I think
33 everybody knows everybody that's here but let's just go ahead and go
34 through introductions. Samuel.
35

36 Paz: Samuel Paz, Doña Ana County.
37

38 Terrazas: Hector Terrazas, City of Las Cruces.
39

40 Waller: Jess Waller, Las Cruces City Representative.
41

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

44 Devine: Dona Devine, Bicycle Advocate.
45

46 Davis: Marsha Davis, County Representative.

1
2 Bencomo: Andrew Bencomo, Pedestrian Rep.
3
4 Kirby: Jack Kirby, New Mexico State University.
5
6 Pearson: And George Pearson, City of Las Cruces Citizens' Representative.
7

8 **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
9

10 Pearson: So approval of the agenda is next up. Have any comments, changes to the
11 agenda? Hear a motion to approve the agenda as presented.
12

13 Bencomo: So moved.

14 Curry: Second.

15 Pearson: So we have a motion and second to approve the agenda. All in favor "aye."
16

17
18 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
19

20
21 Pearson: Any opposed?
22

23 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
24

25 **3.1 July 16, 2019**
26

27 Pearson: And now we have approval of the minutes for July 16th. Have any
28 comments on the minutes?
29

30 Curry: I have a few small edits. I'm looking at page 2, line 44, Phil Simpson "My
31 name 'is', not 'if.' Page 6-7, line 15 it's 'not ready,' not 'really.' And page 6-
32 7 line 42 it says, 'going point' instead of 'good point.'
33

34 Pearson: Anybody else? So I noticed David Cristiani was listed as absent but I'm
35 quite sure and Samuel can correct me.
36

37 Paz: Thank you for bringing that up. That's a good point.
38

39 Pearson: So it should have been Samuel Paz was here as proxy for David Christiani.
40 So I'll hear a motion to approve the minutes with those amendments.
41

42 Curry: So moved.

43
44 Paz: Second.
45

1 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to approve minutes as amended. All in
2 favor "aye."
3

4 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
5

6 Pearson: Any opposed?
7

8 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**
9

10 Pearson: We have an opportunity for public comment at this point in our meeting. We
11 also have another opportunity at the end of the meeting. Anybody from the
12 public wish to make a comment at this time? Seeing none.
13

14 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
15

16 **5.1 City of Las Cruces GO Bond Proposed Non-Motorized Facilities**
17

18 Pearson: We'll move on to our discussion items.
19

20 McAdams: We are still waiting for Cathy Mathews from the Parks Department with the
21 City of Las Cruces to give her presentation. We could skip ahead a little bit
22 about a special meeting if that will be okay with you.
23

24 Pearson: Sure.
25

26 McAdams: Okay, because.
27

28 **5.2 MPO Update**
29

30 Pearson: So we'll be at item 5.2, MPO update at this point.
31

32 McAdams: Okay. That'd be okay. Several weeks, about a week ago we had a request
33 from Bohannon Huston for another follow-up presentation on the W.
34 University study. And also we have a presentation on the safety targets we
35 have to do every year. So we'd request for the Committee if you'd like to
36 meet on September 17th at the same time, 5:00, in this building. Hopefully
37 not more than two hours. We're scheduled from 5:00 to 7:00. So I'd like to
38 request the Committee if they were available I guess by, we could do it how
39 every you want to Mr. Chair.
40

41 Pearson: So this, normally we skip the September meeting.
42

43 McAdams: Normally we do, that's correct.
44

45 Pearson: Is there anybody that has an objection to that? If they couldn't come to that
46 meeting which would be the normal, the third Tuesday meeting, third

1 Tuesday of the month, 5:00 here. I hear no objections, so let's go ahead
2 and schedule that meeting.
3
4 McAdams: Excellent. Okay.
5
6 Pearson: Do you have any other MPO updates?
7
8 McAdams: Other than we had a good presentation with the Policy Committee on our
9 interactive traffic map. They were very pleased with that. Other than that
10 we are waiting an award from the state about the Town of Mesilla project
11 to, about the additional one with the State Legislature. We haven't heard
12 anything but we expect news soon about that.
13
14 Pearson: Okay. We don't have Jolene to here to pick on to find out about that.
15
16 McAdams: Jolene e-mailed me and she said she could not attend this meeting. But I
17 e-mailed her about the special meeting too as well.
18
19 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. Again Mr. McAdams, what was the update you were talking
20 about?
21
22 McAdams: This was about, I don't know if you remember about a month or two ago,
23 the Town of Mesilla came to us and they applied for special funding for a
24 State Legislature grant. We didn't know exact amount. It was for the Mesilla
25 Lateral and the California Lateral at the Calle del Norte, that apparition, or I
26 guess alteration for that project.
27
28 Bencomo: Okay, so it was related to the trail system that.
29
30 McAdams: Exactly.
31
32 Bencomo: Okay.
33
34 McAdams: And we haven't heard. That was a, not a, it was processed through the
35 DOT, but it was not a DOT project. They were approved by special
36 committee at the State Legislature.
37
38 Bencomo: Okay. Thank you.
39
40 Pearson: And we haven't heard anything about that committee.
41
42 McAdams: We haven't heard anything.
43
44 Pearson: But in the MPO area that's the only project that applied.
45

1 McAdams: Right now that was the only one that applied. I guess Sam said he applied
2 for one with the El Paso MPO, is that correct Sam?

3
4 Paz: That's correct. In the Chaparral area.

5
6 McAdams: So we have not received it. It could because it come through Andrew so
7 maybe after Andrew's back from vacation we'll find out about that.

8
9 Pearson: Okay.

10 11 **5.3 Local Projects Update**

12
13 Pearson: Let's go through local projects update. We'll start at the end down there.
14 County do you have anything for local projects?

15
16 Paz: No updates today.

17
18 Pearson: And the City.

19
20 Terrazas: No updates at this time.

21
22 Pearson: Town of Mesilla is not here. NMSU.

23
24 Kirby: No project updates. However classes are back in session so university's
25 very busy, something I think we're all aware of.

26
27 Pearson: Okay.

28 29 **5.4 NMDOT Projects Update**

30
31 Pearson: And our NMDOT representative isn't here. So I guess the only thing I could
32 say is today's the normal schedule for the Valley Drive update, so I assume
33 that they're meeting at Brannigan Library.

34
35 McAdams: I think that's correct. But I'm not sure about that.

36
37 Pearson: That's the presumption. They were going to hold that meeting the third
38 Tuesday as long as the project's underway and so the project's still
39 underway.

40 41 **5.5 Committee Members Update**

42
43 Pearson: Let's go to Committee Members update.

44
45 Bencomo: Mr. Chair.

46

1 Pearson: Ashleigh's going to go.
2
3 Bencomo: Go ahead.
4
5 Curry: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say school is back in session for Las
6 Cruces Public Schools as well and we have, the majority of our programs
7 are up and walking and if not yet then they will be this week and next week.
8 And also just wanted to update you on the Safe Routes to School Action
9 Plan. I did present at the Policy Committee last week and it went well,
10 although they have a month to think about it before they put a final vote, but
11 that's our final stage and update from the presentation I gave at the last
12 meeting here.
13
14 Pearson: Okay. Andrew.
15
16 Bencomo: Thank you Mr. Chair. So since we're kind of in a waiting pattern here
17 anyway for Ms. Mathews to arrive. I had wanted to just kind of talk about,
18 and it's going to be NMSU. So we're talking about the trail systems that the
19 presentation's supposed to be on that would kind of link from the north side
20 of the City to the south side, but then the loop is still not going to be complete
21 because NMSU is still that missing link and we really haven't talked about
22 that piece I don't believe when we did our trail systems priority list or the
23 matrix. There wasn't a section through NMSU that was part of that
24 necessarily. So seeing as the overpass reconstruction's going to happen
25 at University and I-25 and they're going to run the road underneath and the
26 path underneath onto campus, I'm assuming it'll just dead end there. So
27 I'm curious as who do we talk to, how do we push the project through NMSU
28 to kind of get them to make that link or even just start talking about that leg
29 down there at the end. Not sure who that would be, how we get this going.
30
31 Kirby: I can comment on that. The office is the University Architect's office;
32 however I can also carry these items back to that office. Right now the, as
33 I understand it, the interchange, the bike path associated with the
34 interchange ends, I don't have a distance but slightly north of Stewart Street.
35 And Stewart runs east/west through campus with a bike lane all the way to
36 Union. So in a sense there is a path but if there's improvements to that I
37 can certainly carry that back and push the agenda with NMSU to have the
38 safest route through campus possible.
39
40 Bencomo: And that's excellent because one of the, we had talked about possibly going
41 down to Williams and then back around, but then you would also still have
42 to go to that control crossing down at Stewart so we talked about that going
43 down and cutting back maybe down Espina and over. But we had talked
44 about a multiuse path rather than just bike lanes. I don't know if we want
45 to, do we want to talk about that or is that something that NMSU might even

1 entertain. I don't know how the rest of the Committee feels about bike lanes
2 versus a multiuse path connectivity.
3
4 Curry: Mr. Chair.
5
6 Pearson: Ashleigh.
7
8 Curry: Mr. Kirby, Mr. Bencomo. I would second the appeal for a multiuse trail. I
9 think bike lanes are great but the City loop really is a multiuse facility going
10 all around. And again as I always come back to, I always look at something
11 that's going to be safest to put a 4-year-old on. And I wouldn't put a 4-year-
12 old in a bike lane that's adjacent to traffic. So I think at some point many
13 meetings ago I think Mr. Kirby before you were on, we talked about maybe
14 Wells and just sort of the middle of Wells has a little bit of a parkway where
15 there seems to be a big right-of-way along Wells and it goes right past the
16 soccer fields and the fields along there. So I would be in favor of looking at
17 kind of a multiuse path. It seems like it's be a nice facility for the university
18 anyway for the small children that are there.
19
20 Bencomo: Thank you for that correction Ashleigh. It was Wells not Williams. I said
21 Williams. I misspoke.
22
23 Kirby: Right. Well I certainly don't disagree. I think a multiuse path would be the
24 best option. I can carry this back and if that's the appropriate way unless
25 there's another approach that this Committee would like to see and report
26 back at the next meeting on progress with NMSU on that.
27
28 Waller: May I add a comment to that? I just want to add or agree with what
29 Ashleigh's point is as well, you picked that up Andrew. Because I think most
30 cyclists will use that between Sam Steel Way which is a very nice road up
31 to South Triviz which can connect with the new interchange. And I mean
32 folks go right up Geothermal sometimes or cut off and get on Las Alturas is
33 very convenient. Stewart kind of dead ends there at a T, you have to go left
34 or right, but I think most cyclists will be amenable to Wells versus Stewart.
35
36 Pearson: So I remember some discussion of coming from the end of Triviz and then
37 coming down through campus and ending up maybe through Sam Steel at
38 the intersection with University and then connecting to the multiuse trail
39 across. But I agree with the point it should be a multiuse trail. It's the loop
40 trail. It's something that we should be able to put the strollers and young
41 children on bicycles and separated from traffic. The in-road facilities is a
42 whole different project. At our next presentation with Bohannon Huston
43 showing us what they're going to do on University, that's appropriate for that
44 class of user, but I would certainly like to follow through because this is one
45 of these projects that's going to take years and I don't remember how we

1 did the loop trail through this part to the university. Do we have it on our
2 map?
3
4 McAdams: Mr. Chair. We do have a map. In October we'll have a work session about
5 the MTP and that will be the best forum for those to be discussed. The MTP
6 will include the BPAC plus any members of the public that'll attend. That'll
7 include NMSU officials too as well. I think that probably will be the best
8 forum. We can take the map and we can just, how we want to do it and
9 deal with the loop system, deal with the trails etc. at that meeting, like we
10 did five years ago. So I think that is probably the best for forum. And I
11 agree with completely the NMSU is sort of a no-man's land about what we're
12 going to do in that area. So completing the loop is I think very important,
13 but also the multiuse path was sort of DOT said the same thing, it should
14 be accessible all users.
15
16 Pearson: Right.
17
18 Waller: Mr. Chair. May I interject one further point? And also in regards to this
19 connectivity between I guess the University/Triviz interchange to Mesilla
20 through NMSU campus. There is another contingent route that might be
21 able to be used and that's Arrowhead that has a nice four way. There's
22 only, what is it a magnet school there? It's a four-lane road. My recollection
23 it has bike lanes both ways that might be easy and less impactful to also
24 consider that. Just throw that on the heap as something to also possibly
25 consider in addition to Wells. Arrowhead to Sam Steel Way.
26
27 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So the work sessions you talked about, would it be maybe
28 appropriate to contact University Architect and see if maybe he could attend
29 that meeting just for a discussion just for, to hear what we've got to say. I
30 think, I did not realize that the trail was going to be built down to Stewart
31 which is great. That's awesome, because then right there is the Sisbarro
32 Park is right there, so it could actually connect into the park and you could
33 actually use that as a cut across there to go down. Ashleigh's giving me a
34 look like I'm off again. Am I off?
35
36 Curry: Well Stewart I don't think connects to the Sisbarro Park, does it? Stewart
37 dead ends at the horseshoe.
38
39 Waller: Stewart goes all the way down to East Union.
40
41 Curry: But the other direction.
42
43 Waller: The other direction connects by the Chile Bowl with S. Triviz there at the
44 parking lot, right before you get to I-10, excuse me I-25.
45
46 Curry: My apologies. I was thinking of College.

1
2 Bencomo: So if it goes there to that point then you could actually run it through the
3 park which is a great connect. People can go to the park and that's what,
4 connectivity to the parks. And then from there I don't disagree with the
5 possibility of using Arrowhead Drive to go past because then you have
6 Arrowhead High School is there, it's the Early College High School, so
7 students could actually bike into that, NMSU students. So I think we have
8 some opportunities and there's open land there too. Right now if you try to
9 go down Wells it's a little tight there maybe, they may not want to give up
10 space. I'd be great because the intramural fields and all that are there too
11 so that's a great connectivity. But anyway, if we could get the University
12 Architect to that meeting in October to discuss it, at least we could get a
13 start to talk about this and figure out something.
14

15 Kirby: Once I'm aware of the date I'll extend the invitation to her and hopefully she
16 will make it.
17

18 Pearson: Okay. Okay, any other Committee Members? So I noticed and
19 unfortunately Jolene's not here to hear, but also there's the same situation
20 in one of the City roads. With a bicycle facility that is either straight or right
21 turn coming to a intersection where it has a right turn only lane or a right
22 turn and straight lane, NMDOT example is westbound on Avenida de
23 Mesilla at Hickory which is part of the new project, so there's the bicycle
24 lane that goes, has a dashed line up to the intersection and the travel lane,
25 the vehicle lane is either a straight or people will make a right turn, so they're
26 making the right turn across the bicycle lane. So I'm wondering what best
27 practices might be if that was really the best practice. They put a dashed
28 line for the bicycle lane. It seems like not having the dashed line so that the
29 vehicle and the bicycle can negotiate where they go would be better, or it
30 seems like an opportunity for a bike box. And the City example is at Solano
31 approaching University traveling south. And last time we had our visibility
32 ride we had example where we're in the bike lane that has one of the dashed
33 lines, puts us, we're going to make the right turn, but a vehicle comes next
34 to us in the vehicle lane and they expect to make the right turn on red which
35 would cut in front of us on the bicycle, so had to kind of wave back that
36 vehicle. But that seems like another place where the dashed line all the
37 way up to the intersection may have been a mistake. And not being an
38 engineer I don't what the best practice would be, whether stopping the
39 dashed line for the back where the vehicles and bicycles can figure out
40 where each belong. I don't know if that's a bike box situation.
41

42 Terrazas: I can answer that. As far as Avenida de Mesilla. I don't the specifics of it
43 but on Solano/University what we try and do is we try and carry that bike
44 lane across. The reason we have that dashed portion is because by law a
45 car cannot pass a solid white line, so that's what we, when we have, when
46 we're trying to carry a bike lane through, we need to give both the car and

1 the bike lane the ability, the bicycle the ability to do that. So that's why we
2 dash it. Sometimes when we can't carry the bike lane through, we usually
3 just end the bike lane. So in preference I think the Bicycle Committee would
4 like to have that bike lane be carried through so you have a designated
5 location at the intersection even if you're going through or you're making a
6 right, that's the case on Solano. On Avenida de Mesilla I'll have to look at
7 it because sometimes it just depends on the geometry. You don't have
8 those extra five feet or whatever width of the bike lane there is on there. But
9 that's typical. I need to see the Federal guidelines on how to carry a bike
10 land through so you have those stripes that you're talking about Chair.

11
12 Pearson: Yes, well my feeling as a bicyclist and as a bicycle educator my feeling is
13 that that's less safe than stopping the dashed lines before the intersection
14 and then allowing the bicycle and the vehicle to figure out that this is really
15 just one lane. Because right now it's two lanes; it's a bicycle lane and the
16 vehicle, and the vehicle thinks that they can just turn without regard to the
17 bicycle which is your classic right hook, which is extremely dangerous,
18 especially for larger vehicles. That's how bicyclist gets killed.

19
20 Davis: I don't, the line on the ground doesn't seem to make any difference. They
21 turn in front of the bicycles. I mean I don't, they just seem to think bicyclist
22 doesn't have a right to be there. I noticed on the nice new paving and nice
23 new line painting on Valley Drive they have these nice painted with the
24 picture of the bicycle, bicycle lanes but they just evaporate when you come
25 to the intersection, like the bicyclist is supposed to evaporate when you
26 come to the intersection or something.

27
28 Terrazas: And to go along with that what you said Mr. Chair, there's a sign, well on
29 Solano/University there's a sign that says yield to bikes, or right turning
30 vehicles yield to bikes.

31
32 Pearson: Right.

33
34 Terrazas: So there's signage in there. The cars should be yielding to bike's if they're
35 going to be making that turn.

36
37 Pearson: I didn't notice that sign, I believe that it's there, I just didn't notice it. And I
38 don't think the NMDOT has one of those signs at Avenida de Mesilla and
39 Hickory.

40
41 Terrazas: Yes, and I'll follow-up with them to make sure that they have it.

42
43 Pearson: Because that's. And I wonder if the NACTO guidelines have any different
44 suggestions for this type of situation. Because looking at, I did a quick
45 internet search and it seems pretty clear that they've figured out how to put
46 the right turn lane to the right of the through bicycle lane which is what, if

1 you're eastbound at Valley at Avenida de Mesilla, that's what they did there
2 which works out wonderful. But when it's a shared turn and straight, then
3 the bike lane is to the right of the traffic and that's where the conflict comes
4 in for the right turning traffic.
5

6 Terrazas: Right. And that's where we get into these do we have, if it's a forward
7 construction we prefer to carry the bike lane just like you said to give
8 bicyclists room at the intersection. Sometimes we can't, especially if it's a
9 retrofit project, we kind of either dead-end, we end the bike lane or we go
10 into that, you have that bicycle car/conflict.
11

12 Pearson: Right. So I guess how to avoid the conflict is what I'm looking for.
13

14 Terrazas: Right.
15

16 Pearson: And I don't have the answer and I don't think there is a good answer
17 probably.
18

19 Terrazas: Short of getting more cars aware of bicyclists.
20

21 Pearson: Or getting more right-of-ways.
22

23 Terrazas: Exactly.
24

25 Pearson: Okay. That's all my comments. I guess we're not going to have Ms.
26 Mathews.
27

28 McAdams: I guess we're not Mr. Chair. I'm really sorry about this but it's not in the
29 MPO's control.
30

31 **6. PUBLIC COMMENT** 32

33 Pearson: So we'll move on to our last opportunity for public comment. Anybody from
34 the public want to make a comment at this time?
35

36 Carter: So my name is Dan Carter. I'm the President of the Southern New Mexico
37 Trail Alliance. I'm here to talk about the trails that were on the agenda so I
38 was hoping to hear an update on that. But I have been attending a lot of
39 the meetings with the Parks and Rec Advisory Board so somewhat aware
40 of that just through our work. Some of the things that we've been working
41 on and we've brought up in the past to the Parks and Rec Advisory Board
42 and to this group as well is the importance that we feel of putting safety first
43 before paving the surfaces. I know the paving conversation's been going
44 on and that's its own thing, but just from doing some search and others like
45 \$2.7 million to work in the GO Bond funds to improve the trails which
46 includes EBID laterals. I have the map here of the proposed laterals for

1 those trails. And so there's probably about 10-15 miles worth of trails there
2 that are proposed. I know part of that funding is for wayfinding and safety
3 including road crossings as well as potential improvements to the surface.

4 And so just again kind of as an example we feel strongly that to
5 encourage you to actually use the ditches which they already use them quite
6 a bit in their current state without improvements, but I think a lot of the things
7 that we have heard is just people want to know where they are so wayfinding
8 if really, really important and road crossings, safety is really, really
9 important. And those are the, I feel like really, like where we should spend
10 our money first I guess is the point. Because those are pretty low-cost items
11 with like a huge return. People recognize the ditches, they will use them
12 more, they know where to go, they know where they're actually going to
13 take them, and then the road crossings are safe. There's some sort of
14 visibility. I think too it comes back to drivers, they're going to have to get
15 used to like respecting pedestrians and bicycles, but I think the road
16 crossings just even a simple striping and signage will help immensely. And
17 looking at the cost is from; these are 2013 numbers from a study of US
18 bike/ped infrastructure costs. I mean their average cost of a striped
19 crosswalk is \$770 and maybe you all have estimates for here since you're
20 working that, but versus a paved multiuse path which the average cost is
21 \$481,000, so I believe that's per mile. Since we have 10 to 15 miles of trail
22 to work with, that's not going to get a whole lot of trails paved. I think we
23 can get a lot more bang for our buck with that safety. And again I think it's
24 more important is having that safety component in place. And also it was,
25 we were made aware that the current expectation at all road crossings are
26 that trails users will travel down to the closest marked intersection with
27 striped road crossing which I just over the last week traveled all these trails
28 and in some cases you're going to be going up to probably half a mile,
29 maybe more, out of your way to go to a striped road crossing which is one
30 just discouraging use and it also puts the pedestrian and the bicyclist in the
31 wrong where they, something actually happen at that road crossing.
32 Because they were expected to go down like unrealistically out of their way
33 to make a road crossing. And people will just aren't going to do that
34 because it's just human nature; when you're 20-feet away from where you
35 want to go you're not going to hike, you're not going to walk a mile out of
36 the way.

37 So I think it'd be really good to revisit that element of the plans and
38 to make sure that that's not the expectation, and again putting in these
39 striped, these safety crossings because people are going to do it anyway.
40 We see what happens on University, people get hit, they cross everywhere
41 and that's like an actually busy street so people are going to do the same
42 there, that's just human nature.

43 And then also focusing on the safety of it as well as using, retaining
44 the existing vegetation that's there, even enhancing that with more native
45 vegetation so we can keep those areas cool and shaded, reducing the heat
46 for people. Again to encourage people to actually use these bike/pedestrian

1 ways, because it's another big concern, say they don't want to go out and
2 use them because there hot, it's hot, they don't want to walk and exert their
3 energy because it's warmer. So if we can keep those shaded and cooler
4 with vegetation. Also reduce some stormwater issues, but also encourage
5 people to want to get out there and create like a real greenway, lateral park
6 environment instead of just a paved, desolate, multiuse trail which we kind
7 of have on Triviz trail at the moment. And surprisingly people still use it a
8 lot even though it's not the most appealing environment. So yes, that's my
9 input on the multiuse trails. So thank you.

10
11 Pearson: Thank you.

12
13 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. I have a question for Mr. Carter if possible. So and I've had the
14 same discussions you've had about the crossings and things like that, so
15 looking at those trail systems you're feeling that there needs to be direct
16 crossings rather than going to a controlled crossing that exists now. Is that
17 your feeling?

18
19 Carter: Yes, that's my feeling. I think the most direct route usually again is just
20 directly across the street is the continuation of the trail. So you know it's
21 like 20, 50 feet depending on how long, how wide the road is at that point.
22 So yes.

23
24 Bencomo: Okay. So and I looked at those trail systems and where they're going to go
25 and all that, and I don't recall anyone control crossing being that far away.
26 Which was the furthest away one that you saw?

27
28 Carter: I felt like the one on maybe it's Parker. It's along that area in the Alameda
29 Neighborhood. It's either Parker or the next one up which is, is that
30 Hoagland or McClure?

31
32 Bencomo: McClure.

33
34 Carter: Those are pretty far away. Either you're going to Valley or you're going to
35 Alameda Street. Those are both hardly within sight actually. So those are
36 the probably the furthest. And even Picacho Avenue, if you follow that
37 metric you would be going all the way up to Valley when you already have
38 a refuge in the middle of the street there that's actually ideal next to the
39 railroad, but if you follow this logic you're going to be going again all the way
40 to Picacho or all the way to Alameda Street to cross.

41
42 Bencomo: Okay. And so maybe I had a different understanding of that, so maybe that
43 needs to be a discussion and I wish Ms. Mathews had been here because
44 in the discussions that we had, the control crossing was not going to be
45 necessarily like a lighted control crossing. When I say control crossing, I'm
46 misspeaking. I'm not using the proper terms. But it is a regular cross. So

1 at Picacho and, where the ditch crosses, you would go down to Melendres
2 and then back, was the discussion we had with Ms. Mathews. Of course
3 it's all in the planning process still so that doesn't mean that's how it's going
4 to go. But it was going to go down to like Melendres and then back around
5 to an intersection rather than just a mid road crossing.
6

7 Pearson: Right. I think that was my understanding from when I spoke to her. It would
8 go to in a crosswalk either implied or ...
9

10 Bencomo: Correct.
11

12 Pearson: A painted one. And so at an intersection. So coming across the trail near
13 the railroad tracks, maybe go to second street and cross and come back.
14

15 Bencomo: Correct. And then in the ...
16

17 Pearson: But of course without having Ms. Mathews here we don't know what the
18 plans are.
19

20 Carter: That would be I guess better than my current understanding, but it's like if
21 you're going to put a new striped crosswalk in anyways, you might as well
22 put it exactly where people are going to cross instead of trying to change
23 their behavior. Because even if it's that much closer, there's still, I would
24 not bet on them going down there, like it's just, people don't even stop at
25 stop signs.
26

27 Bencomo: Correct. To some degree from the City's perspective there has to be some
28 of that because for example what she brought up a while ago, that there's
29 bicyclists and there's these lane markings and all this, but the cars don't
30 respect them anyway, they just do whatever they want around bicycles.
31

32 Pearson: Okay. So I'm going to hold this discussion now, and ask Ms. Mathews is
33 here.
34

35 Carter: I have one more item after that.
36

37 **City of Las Cruces GO Bond Proposed Non-Motorized Facilities**

38

39 McAdams: Mr. Chair. I'd like to introduce Cathy Mathews and she'll need a few
40 seconds to put her PowerPoint in the flash drive.
41

42 CATHY MATHEWS GAVE HER PRESENTATION.
43

44 Pearson: Let me interrupt you for a moment, ask you, are you also speaking with
45 NMSU?
46

1 Mathews: Mr. Chair. At the moment we're not in contact with NMSU because we don't
2 actually go through any of NMSU property with regard to the projects we're
3 talking about right now, however they are important partners in creating the
4 remaining then sections of the loop per se.

5
6 Pearson: They've got a chunk of the loop is why I asked the question.

7
8 Mathews: Yes sir. Mr. Chair. Through the other entities we're working with and then
9 through this southern loop, southwest loop project we definitely need to be
10 in contact with NMSU and they will be important partners if not on these
11 specific projects, then future ones for certain.

12
13 CATHY MATHEWS CONTINUED HER PRESENTATION.

14
15 Curry: Ms. Mathews, Mr. Chair. May I just interrupt quick. Just to note that's
16 Mesilla Park Elementary which is different than Mesilla Elementary, just for
17 the sake of confusion.

18
19 CATHY MATHEWS CONTINUED HER PRESENTATION.

20
21 Pearson: So part of the Las Cruces Lateral that you talk about, does that include the
22 existing multiuse trail from the vicinity of near Madrid, behind Madrid that
23 goes to the police station.

24
25 Mathews: Mr. Chair. Yes, absolutely.

26
27 CATHY MATHEWS CONTINUED HER PRESENTATION.

28
29 Curry: Mr. Chair, Ms Mathews. Can I add in? I think that the current plan for the
30 Mesilla piece is that it does start down by La Llorona and then it goes up to
31 about Calle de Oeste there. No, down towards the river, so take Calle del
32 Norte towards the river, so go up there. I'm going to follow your cursor and
33 tell you where to stop. Keep going. Keep going. Keep going. Keep going.
34 And stop. And it would take a right turn right here and then it, the California
35 Lateral, go back to above the C of Calle Del Oeste. Yes, right there, that's
36 the California Lateral and then that continues up through there. There was
37 some problems with right-of-way on that top portion of Calle del Norte so it
38 jig-jogs up and then right where it says Calle de Santiago the O of Calle de
39 Santiago is about where it joins the Mesilla Lateral again. Does that make
40 sense?

41
42 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. It makes sense. It does. Thank
43 you. I just can't see that far.

44

1 Curry: Okay. And I think that's the one that they're looking at funding. Dr.
2 McAdams talked about NMDOT soon to announce whether that piece got
3 funded.
4

5 McAdams: That's correct.
6

7 Curry: But it just takes it off the top end of Calle del Norte so it won't be up there
8 by Andele's because that was just tighter right-of-way. So if you just follow
9 Calle del Oeste and then sort of near Calle de Santiago, but it's on a lateral
10 which is the California Lateral.
11

12 CATHY MATHEWS CONTINUED HER PRESENTATION.
13

14 Pearson: So is that in Las Cruces City limits, the green line or is that, are you getting
15 in the Mesilla there?
16

17 Mathews: No sir Mr. Chair. All of those alignments that are shown here are outside of
18 the City limits.
19

20 CATHY MATHEWS CONTINUED HER PRESENTATION.
21

22 Devine: I have a question.
23

24 Pearson: Okay.
25

26 Devine: Is there anyway that we could get copies of these two maps?
27

28 Mathews: Yes. Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Absolutely. I'd be happy to.
29 Of course I hope you'll allow me to make those corrections as we noted.
30

31 Devine: Sure.
32

33 Mathews: So that I'm not you know misleading or putting information out there that is
34 not correct. But yes I'd be happy to through the MPO be able to provide
35 those.
36

37 McAdams: Yes, we will be glad to provide those to the Committee.
38

39 Pearson: Any other Committee comments?
40

41 Bencomo: Mr. Chair. So addressing what Dan had come up and asked about,
42 intersection crossings. When I met with you and Sonya previously there
43 may be some misunderstanding so I just want to make sure I'm
44 understanding correctly. So at the roadway crossings when we for example
45 take the Mesilla Lateral, or not Mesilla ...
46

1
2 Mathews: Mesilla drain.
3
4 Bencomo: The Armijo Lateral, sorry. from the Outfall Channel south, so when we cross
5 roadways such as McClure, Hoagland, the more residential roadways,
6 those are going to be direct crossings, correct?
7
8 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Absolutely. That's what we're
9 proposing. Where it would make sense in a narrower right-of-way situation
10 just to be able to allow people to cross directly. That's the intention.
11
12 Bencomo: Okay. And then for example Picacho crossing, we were talking about going
13 down to Melendres and across and then back over, correct?
14
15 Mathews: Yes, absolutely. The idea is some of the larger crossings where the trail
16 crosses in essence a mid block of a larger arterial street or one of the larger
17 streets, that it would probably be safer to direct trail users down to the
18 nearest street crossing where there are lights and signals and crosswalks
19 and where vehicles are anticipating that other road users would be crossing
20 to take them there and then bring them back to the trail along the other side
21 of the street.
22
23 Bencomo: Okay. Also for example like Amador crossing there, there's already a
24 pedestrian signalization for Community of Hope there. Would that be used
25 or would you need to go down to Valley Drive to do that?
26
27 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. I'm not sure. In that instance I think
28 we had initially proposed to take folks down to Valley, cross them at the
29 brand new intersection, brand new widened and signalized intersection at
30 Valley and then take them back up to the trail. It definitely could be an
31 option to cross at the Community of Hope crosswalk as long as that makes
32 sense and it's doable. It's obviously signalized with the flashing lights and
33 the reduced speed limit. On my way here I was speeding, but managed to
34 stop at that crosswalk for a person who was using that crosswalk
35 appropriately as they should, not all trucks stopped, but he did manage to
36 cross without being hit and that's the idea is to take folks to a safe place to
37 cross that can function with the goals of the project.
38
39 Bencomo: Correct. And that was another one of the concerns that Dan brought up
40 was that focusing on the safety first and wayfinding, signage so people
41 know distances and direction and where they're going when they're on
42 these trails. And it's not an either/or proposition, correct? They're going
43 both the safety crossings, the wayfinding and the trail systems also, correct?
44 Because I think there's the fear that they're going to build the trails, they're
45 not going to do the other stuff because we run out of money.
46

1 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. I totally understand that. In the
2 budget, well it is quite large, the scope is even larger, as always. So during
3 the design process there will definitely be discussions about what kind of
4 surfacing we need, what kind of crossings we need and wayfinding. All of
5 those things will be accomplished; to what degree they get accomplished
6 and what portion of the budget each of those requires will be part of the
7 design process and part of the public input process.
8

9 Bencomo: Okay. And so in your opinion and you may not want to answer this, you can
10 just say "I will not answer this." Just because I get it. This is a big scope of
11 trail systems and with the money that's there available we're tight I'm sure,
12 so in your opinion or in discussion with the design people does it sound like
13 the budget is doable to get the wayfinding, the safety issues, and the trails
14 put in place with the current budget?
15

16 Mathews: Mr. Chairman, Committee. Absolutely. Our budget is sufficient to cover
17 those items, to what extent and how intensely they get covered is another
18 issue. For instance, we may not be able to do mid block signalized
19 crossings with HAWK crossings and the like because those are quite
20 expensive, but the idea is to be able to create either through wayfinding or
21 signage and paint and other kinds of signals and indications to people about
22 where they can safely cross is to make sure that people can safely cross
23 one way or another. I understand, I mean there may be, since we're just in
24 the planning process right now and we're about to enter into the design
25 process, there may be different kinds of decisions that are made; maybe
26 the surfacing is reduced in cost if we can find a way to reduce in cost so
27 that we can bring up additional spending on the crossings, or wayfinding.
28 Maybe wayfinding folks decide that is actually the most important part of it,
29 so we focus the budget on wayfinding and safe crossings and then trails,
30 surfacing of the like, all of those will be design decisions. We do have to
31 maintain these trails as well and so that also will play into the discussions,
32 ensuring that we have a system that can be maintained at a safe and
33 appropriate level as well. Those kinds of considerations will play into the
34 design decisions are well.
35

36 Bencomo: Okay. And just one more comment, sorry I won't hog the whole thing here,
37 like I usually do. So there's the path that goes on the drain, Mesilla Drain
38 and goes past Burn Lake, goes right through Burn Lake actually area.
39

40 Mathews: Yes.
41

42 Bencomo: Then there's the, we talked, you had mentioned about another connection
43 from basically by Caliche's that comes in behind it and makes another
44 connection to Burn Lake. So I'm just a little concerned about that, we're
45 expending more funds on making two connections to Burn Lake instead of
46 just the one and then focusing on the rest of completing the other one and

1 the other priorities instead of having two connections there. Is there a
2 prioritized list of we're going to do these first and then hopefully because
3 you know budgets are like we have the money and then over time we're like
4 "Oh my gosh," cost overruns or whatever. So is there a Plan A, Plan B,
5 prioritized system?
6

7 Mathews: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Right now we do not. That part of
8 the system has not been prioritized. We do, as I indicate here on the
9 proposed plan, we do show the route that, the Armijo Lateral that actually
10 becomes the Porter Lateral I believe and something else here that comes
11 and joins into Burn Lake, as well the second branch then that extends along
12 the actual Armijo Lateral and brings it to Avenida de Mesilla. Right now
13 both of those legs are indicated in the plan, so from Burn Lake along Porter
14 to connect up with Armijo basically around Caliche's, right in here, or to take
15 it along the actual length of Armijo Lateral all the way to Avenida de Mesilla.
16 Both of those legs are indicated and they both are being considered on our
17 planning process. During the design process probably that's where if we
18 need to eliminate one, one would be eliminated of the like based on public
19 input. I know you had mentioned in our discussions that you prefer the
20 other, the leg that goes to Avenida de Mesilla rather than to Burn Lake
21 again, and so definitely that is being taken into consideration where we
22 haven't eliminated anything at this point.
23

24 Bencomo: Correct. Yes. The one that goes down Avenida de Mesilla actually cuts
25 through residential neighborhoods. It gives people access to that trail to
26 use it. The one that goes behind Caliche's to Burn Lake is pretty barren
27 back there. I understand there's going to be, it was rezoned and it's going
28 to be redeveloped, but that's not even there yet. And we already have a
29 connection to Burn Lake, so that was my only point on that. So thank you
30 Mr. Chair.
31

32 Pearson: Okay, any other Committee Members? So Mr. Carter spoke before you
33 were here so it might be worthwhile once the minutes are available for you
34 to review those and include that as part of the public input process to what's
35 going on with these plans. I think probably the most important thought that
36 came out of that, is my thought also, is during the design we need to deal
37 with how people will behave at intersections as opposed to what you want
38 them to do. You come up to a crossing, I'll just pick whether it goes there
39 or not, but the Armijo Lateral crossing at Picacho. It's pretty straight, you
40 can see the other side of the trail. They're going to cross at the Picacho
41 rather than go down to Second Street or go down to Melendres. So that's
42 the kind of behavior that, unless you put up a fence that crosses all the way
43 down the median, you're going to have to deal with human nature and that's
44 where the safety issue that I'm worried about that people will disregard their
45 safety because, that the design doesn't take into consideration how people

1 will actually behave and that's what we need to do in order to keep the safe
2 trails.
3

4 Mathews: Mr. Chair. I agree with you. I ride that lateral and I do go down the street
5 to Melendres because I want to take my life into my hands responsibly. But
6 there is one bike rider who does that of her own volition. That said, we do
7 need to take into account actual behavior.
8

9 Pearson: Right. Okay. I guess I'll open to public comment. If you have any
10 comments that you didn't make already previously. Go ahead. If you can
11 come up to the mic and give your name.
12

13 Serino: Hi. My name is Cheryl Serino. This is my first meeting so I apologize if I
14 bring up anything that might be redundant. I'm a marathon runner here in
15 town. I have actually run that entire loop one morning and I really appreciate
16 that there are efforts being made to put in an extension along Calle del Norte
17 because right now there is no shoulder and it's extremely dangerous when
18 you're coming off of the Rio Grande segment connecting to Mesilla.
19 I also just wanted to, I don't know if this has been brought up before
20 but I have been running here for about a decade now and noticed there's
21 not really any public restrooms along Triviz, especially between NMSU and
22 Kohl's. It's also, I mean it's a long stretch and several times you know if you
23 have to use a restroom it's almost like there's Wal-Mart and you have to
24 cross Triviz which is also dangerous and then go through the parking lot
25 and use the restroom there, but other than that it's mainly residential along
26 the Triviz path, along I-25. So if there would be an opportunity for a public
27 restroom to be put in place kind of near Kohl's perhaps since there's already
28 water fountains there. It's also like a main meeting point of trails because
29 you've got, what three trails connecting there as well as, that's just kind of
30 my thoughts.
31 Other than that, maybe more shade. There's a lot of exposed areas,
32 especially connecting from Kohl's to the Rio Grande that don't have any,
33 they have benches but there's no shade over them, just in case anybody
34 that's running or walking or riding their bike through there has an opportunity
35 to take a break. And additional water fountains as well. That's just my
36 thoughts.
37

38 Pearson: Okay. Thank you.
39

40 Devine: Thank you.
41

42 Pearson: Okay, staff you have some closing comments?
43

44 McAdams: We do not Mr. Chair.
45

1 Pearson: We've run through our agenda a little bit out of order and we're at the very
2 end.

3
4 **7. ADJOURNMENT (6:04)**

5
6 Pearson: Hear a call to adjourn.

7
8 Curry: So moved.

9
10 Bencomo: Second.

11
12 Pearson: We have a motion and a second to adjourn. All in favor.

13
14 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

15
16 Pearson: And we're adjourned. Thank you.

17
18
19
20
21
22

Chairperson



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 17, 2019

DISCUSSION ITEM:

5.1 University Avenue- Phase B

DISCUSSION:

Staff members of Bohannon-Huston, assisting NMDOT, will discuss the findings and recommendations for the preliminary engineering phase (Phase B) for the NMDOT multi-use trail on West University Avenue from NM 28 to South Main. This is listed in the 2018-2023 TIP as LC00290. Monies are allocated for preliminary engineering in FFY2019. The project is programmed for construction in FFY2022.

In 2016, the Mesilla Valley MPO with Bohannon-Huston and in cooperation with the NMDOT, spearheaded a Phase A Corridor Study for a multi-use trail on University from South Main to NM 28. This Study resulted in preferred alternatives for further study along the corridor. The University Avenue Corridor Study Phase A can be found at: <http://mesillavalleympo.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/UniversityPhaseA11416.pdf>.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 17, 2019

DISCUSSION ITEM:

5.2 Mesilla Valley MPO Safety Targets

DISCUSSION:

MPO Staff members of will discuss the Federal Fiscal (FF)2020 Targets for Safety for New Mexico as required by the 23 CFR 490, Final Rule on the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) published March 15, 2016 (effective April 15, 2017.) Recommendation to the Policy Committee by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee is expected in November 2019.