



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://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the Amended Agenda for a special meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **June 11, 2014 at 1:00 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](#).

The Mesilla Valley MPO 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 Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO 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. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _____
Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee. _____ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ **Chair**
5. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 5.1. *May 14, 2014 _____ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. Resolution 14-08: A Resolution Adopting the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 6.2. Resolution 14.-09: A Resolution Approving a Memorandum of Agreement with the El Paso MPO on planning responsibilities in certain areas of Dona Ana County _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 6.3. Resolution 14-10: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 7.1. MPO Participation in Regional Leadership Consortium _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 7.2. Committee briefing: NMDOT Policies and Procedures Manual _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 7.3. Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 7.4. NMDOT updates _____ **NMDOT Staff**

7.5. Advisory Committee Updates _____ **MPO Staff**

8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**

10. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

Publish

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **POLICY COMMITTEE (PC) MEETING**

3
4 Following are the minutes from the Mesilla Valley MPO Policy Committee (PC) meeting
5 on Wednesday, May 14, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at the Dona Ana County Commission
6 Chambers, 845 N. Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
9 Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
10 Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
11 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
12 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
13 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
14 Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
15 Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)

16
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mayor Nora Barraza
18 Councillor Nathan Small (CLC)

19
20 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO)
21 Andrew Wray (MPO)
22 Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO)
23 Orlando Fierro (MPO)

24
25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Harold Love (NMDOT)
26 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
27 Homer Bernal (NMDOT)
28 Claude Morelli (NMDOT)

29
30 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

31
32 Commissioner Garrett called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

33
34 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY – No conflicts of interest**

35
36 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

37
38 **4. CONSENT AGENDA***

39
40 Commissioner Wayne Hancock motioned to approve the consent agenda.
41 Commissioner Leticia Benavidez seconds the motion.

1 Motion passes, vote 8-0 (2 Committee members absent).
2
3 Garrett: Any discussion about the minutes?
4
5 Garrett: Very good.
6
7 Pedroza: Mr. Chair?
8
9 Garrett: Yes.
10
11 Pedroza: Over here. Thank you, at some point and maybe at the end of the
12 meeting, I'd like to get a little bit of an update on some of the materials that
13 I don't believe I received, but I had been.....in the minutes in
14 themselves indicate that I was told yes, this will be sent to you.
15
16 Garrett: Okay.
17
18 Pedroza: Okay, thank you.
19
20 Garrett: Anything else? In that case, would you poll Committee?
21
22 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza
23
24 Pedroza: Yes
25
26 Murphy: Councillor Sorg
27
28 Sorg: Yes
29
30 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock
31
32 Hancock: Yes
33
34 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
35
36 Garrett: Yes
37
38 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez
39
40 Benavidez: Yes
41
42 Murphy: Trustee Flores
43
44 Flores: Yes
45

1 Murphy: Trustee Bernal

2

3 Bernal: Yes

4

5 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle

6

7 Doolittle: Yes

8

9 Motion passes, vote 8-0 (2 Committee members absent)

10

11 **5. *APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

12

13 **5.1 *April 9, 2014** – minutes approved under the Consent Agenda vote.

14

15 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

16

17 **6.1** Resolution 14-07: A Resolution Approval of the Functional Classification of
18 Road System within MPO area.

19

20 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chairmen. Chowdhury Siddiqui from our staff will be
21 presenting on the process that we did with updating the functional
22 classification. This is in cooperation with the NMDOT statewide effort of
23 updating the functional classification and we are going.....ask this Board
24 for approval of the Resolution, so that we may send the work product up to
25 Santa Fe.

26

27 Chowdhury Siddiqui gave a presentation.

28

29

30 Garrett: Do we have any questions from the Committee? I'll start on my right, any
31 questions?

32

33 Garrett: Trustee Flores?

34

35 Flores: I just have one comment. I think on the.....page 25, that it would just read
36 better, if the very last sentence said; that the proposed functional
37 classification of roads system within the MPO area attached here to, so
38 just to add.....that's it.

39

40 Garrett: Thank you.

41

42 Garrett: Anything else on the right, on my left?

43

44 Garrett: Councillor Sorg?

45

1 Sorg: So, do you have a list of the streets that were changed because of this
2 change in classification?
3

4 Siddiqui: Mr. Chair, Councillor, yes, the collector you see in the supplement
5 document, all of them were changed into the sub categories, so that....yes
6

7 Sorg: These are all the changes?
8

9 Siddiqui: No, only the collectors, I believe is the second column and if you look at
10 the second and third column, it would say current and proposed and you
11 you'll notice that only the collectors has a change.
12

13 Sorg: I see. Okay, so they were all collectors at one time, now their split into
14 minor and major.
15

16 Siddiqui: Yes sir.
17

18 Sorg: Okay. Thank you very much.
19

20 Garrett: Any other questions on my left?
21

22 Garrett: Let me give others time to think about this. One question that I have is, is
23 this supposed to be descriptive of the existing system? Or is this
24 descriptive of the system that supports planning and in that sense the
25 future that we would like to see?
26

27 Siddiqui: I think both. We looked into existing ones and also looked into (inaudible)
28 changes that we want to upgrade or degrade any of the functional classes,
29 but the list that we have prepared does not include any such changes.
30

31 Garrett: How often would this be updated?
32

33 Siddiqui: (inaudible) administration says like every 10 years is their guideline.
34

35 Garrett: Okay.
36

37 Murphy: FHWA requires that it's updated at least every 10 years, a few years
38 following the census, once we finish the process of adjusting the
39 urbanized area, (inaudible) which Chowdhury referenced in his
40 presentation. Additionally, each time that we do the Metropolitan
41 Transportation Plan update we reevaluate this on our level. We do it at
42 least every 5 years and, additionally to that, at any time any one of our
43 member agencies desires a change in the functional classification of
44 roadway, they may request to go through the MPO process before the
45 TAC and this Committee so this could be changed at any time. At least

1 every 10 year per federal regulations.

2
3 Garrett: The reason I'm asking, is we're going to talk a little later about work load
4 and work plan, and one of the things that's on there is a special project
5 that has to do with coordination with Viva Dona Ana and the regional
6 planning effort. I think as we get into the comprehensive plan for Viva
7 Dona Ana. An important question is the degree to which this map is a
8 given and the degree to which this is a guide, and I'll give you a very good
9 example, is that Highway 28 and Highway 478 are both identified as
10 principal arterials and in terms of the planning that is going on. We're
11 certainly, at least discussing the idea of thinking of Highway 28 as a
12 different kind of corridor than 478. If you have been on 478 recently, and
13 you drive that and you think of that going through San Miguel and La
14 Mesa, that would destroy those communities, if it was done at that same
15 standard, right? And so it's.....what I'm trying to understand here is, I think
16 it needs to be very clear that we need to be working in harmony with what
17 other kinds of futures we need to create, and in that sense, that may come
18 back and cause a need for modification of the transportation system. As
19 long as that's understood here and as we work with the rest of the folks in
20 terms of the regional planning we're going to be ok. But if we're saying
21 no, this is the way it's supposed to be, that's an entirely different message.

22
23 Murphy: Mr. Chair. I hear what you're saying and I think that we're in agreement
24 here. The designations...such Highway 28 and Highway 478 are.....we
25 have them identified as principal arterials because they connect important
26 places. One of the key factors in the transportation plan is that we need
27 to....whenever we are doing projects, we need to look at the
28 context.....utilize context sensitive solutions. We need to analyze the
29 context of which these roadways are happening. Just because we have
30 it.....Highway 28 is listed as a principal arterial and Lohman Avenue is
31 listed as an arterial, the MPO is no way endorsing that those roads look
32 the same at all. In fact we worked with County staff on your County
33 design standards and those principal arterials are, can be two lanes in
34 some instances, also then encouraging....looking at the contacts once it
35 gets it within a community. So by designating these on our functional
36 classification map, we are no way endorsing any particular road design,
37 for any particular facility. It's just a kind of statement of the importance of
38 the road to the community and to the region.

39
40 Garrett: Okay. I'm going to suggest that the MPO and in particular MPO staff,
41 have an important role to play in terms of working with the consultant as
42 we get into the final work of the comp plan and that one of the things we
43 should look for as a specific product would be any recommended changes
44 to this designation that better fit the selected scenarios, and so that's,
45 that's a very.....that's beginning to get down to specific products that

1 would be very helpful and also extensions in terms of time and staff time
2 and so forth. Okay, having giving you a little extra time, are there any
3 other questions.
4

5 Garrett: Councillor Pedroza?
6

7 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Following up on that, is there procedure for utilizing
8 these classifications or/and is there a procedure for changing the
9 classification, if somebody deems it necessary?
10

11 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councillor Pedroza, the procedure for utilizing them pretty much
12 determines the federal aides system of roadways within the Mesilla Valley
13 MPO area.
14

15 Pedroza: Is that money Tom?
16

17 Murphy: That is correct. That is money. These are the roads that are eligible for
18 federal transportation funds. Doesn't mean that anything is going to get it
19 and particularly those of you who have been paying attention to the
20 highway trust fund debates and in and around congress, realize we're
21 probably not going to get anything on those roadways anyway, but this
22 defines their eligibility. As far as the changing of them, I think what we
23 would want would be to have a communication from the engineering or the
24 public works, or even planning aspects or sections of your government,
25 and then we could take such requests and evaluate it through the
26 committee process. We'd have to hold some public meetings and then
27 get a recommendation from the TAC and then have this committee vote
28 on any changes in functional classification.
29

30 Pedroza: Thank you. Just one more question. I can't remember exactly where I
31 read, but I read about something we've been hearing a lot about, maybe
32 I'm just behind the times, but that west highway from the industrial areas
33 in the southern part of Dona Ana county going to I guess to I10, that's not
34 a highway that exists, that's only proposed highway, is that correct?
35

36 Murphy That's correct. Currently the department of transportation is in the final
37 process of a Phase A study on that. I think you got...may have got an
38 update on it in December on it, I have some vague recollection of that, but
39 that is
40

41 Pedroza: I just saw this a couple of days ago.
42

43 Murphy: It's currently still just a proposed road. This map is representative of
44 roadways that are constructed on the ground.
45

1 Pedroza: Will we have any kind of say as to how that road is designed? How
2 it's....where it's laid out? Etcetera or is that simply out of our purview, our
3 of our control?
4

5 Murphy: I think that's ultimately going to depend upon its, its final.....or the
6 alignment that's recommended. I think I do.....there's one potential
7 alignment that would fall outside the MPO area, which would, if connected
8 from the industrial park, I believe it's to the Corralitos interchange, or even
9 the next interchange to the west which is outside the MPO area. If it were
10 to eventually line up into either the Jackrabbit or the Airport Interchange,
11 then certainly this committee would have some say so over what happens
12 with that roadway.
13

14 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.

15

16 Garrett: Any other comments on the left?
17

18 Garrett: Alight, Councillor Sorg?
19

20 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairmen. I just so happened to pick one street out. Of
21 course I was looking at several in my district, but it happens to be
22 Peachtree Hills, and I see you have it listed as both a major collector and
23 a minor arterial, so I assume you've split that street or the road into two
24 different types, but I don't see it matched up on the map. We're not to go
25 by the maps much then I assume, as to try to understand which is which?
26 Do you know where Peachtree is?
27

28 Sorg: I'll help you out. On the map it shows it's a minor arterial until it gets to the
29 west where it looks gray, which perhaps maybe, according to your legend
30 there it's a local.
31

32 Siddiqui: Mr. Chair, Councillor Sorg. I'm just thinking if the urbanized zone area
33 boundary, which is yellow, is over lapping that street, then it could discolor
34 it.
35

36 Sorg: No it's not the case. It's all within the urban.
37

38 Siddiqui: Okay.
39

40 Sorg: At least the part of the road that's planned so far. There is parts that
41 aren't on the map that are I assume is going to be built someday, but
42 anyway thing like that, how should we learn more about that, or get
43 addressed. Can we talk privately or individually or should say maybe.
44

45 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councillor Sorg. You are certainly welcome to contact MPO

1 staff at any time.
2
3 Sorg: Okay.
4
5 Murphy: Specifically Peachtree Hill, at least on the future thorough fair plan, it's
6 going to be a minor arterial, because it extends long distance and
7 we've.....plan for a possible future under pass of I-25, so it's going to be
8 regionally important and in the future it'll be a minor arterial. Any
9 discrepancies on this map, because I do believe that it continues the
10 remains of this day discontinuous roadway. It starts, basically starts and
11 stops, and there might be some error in our GIS coding,
12
13 Sorg: Okay.
14
15 Murphy: But its future is as a minor arterial.
16
17 Sorg: Okay, so that it's only a .14 mile length that's listed here as a major
18 collector.
19
20 Murphy: That's probably something that as we refine the database
21
22 Sorg: Okay.
23
24 Murphy: we will get updated.
25
26 Sorg: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.
27
28 Siddiqui: And just to add since looking at the length of the segment. It might be too
29 small to be, have the color show up in this scale size. That can be
30 another possibility.
31
32 Sorg: I just don't understand. Well, I didn't get the definition that are changing
33 on the two different types of collectors. This is the first time I've seen it,
34 and so I don't understand it too well yet. But I'll ask you later. Thank you.
35
36 Murphy: Thanks.
37
38 Garrett: Commissioner Hancock?
39
40 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. I can assume that the square box on the screen, the
41 UNTY is missing a CO. It's just an overlap I assume and it's not some
42 acronym that I'm not familiar with. Other than that, if I understand there
43 should be a point up in the up right hand corner at US 70, where US 70 a
44 portion of it becomes rural, much the way we have interstate 25 and
45 interstate 10 on the rural map, is that correct?

1
2 Siddiqui: Um.
3
4 Hancock: Still within the boundary of the MPO, but
5
6 Siddiqui: Right.
7
8 Hancock: Just past the yellow.
9
10 Siddiqui: The way our urbanized zone boundary went. It went just through US 70
11 until Organ.
12
13 Hancock: Right.
14
15 Siddiqui: So, um.
16
17 Hancock: So actually Organ extends, is that area to the east there to the right of
18 NASA Road and kind of off that edge right there. So the yellow boundary
19 then comes kind of like sweeping 70 and including 70?
20
21 Siddiqui: Yes.
22
23 Hancock: Okay so it stays urban the whole distance.
24
25 Siddiqui: Yeah, until Organ.
26
27 Hancock: Okay.
28
29 Siddiqui: Yeah. So, I say from Brahman to NASA Road to Organ the boundary,
30 yellow boundary's just the US 70.
31
32 Hancock: Okay, so that little bitty piece there's just, that just....Okay, very good.
33 Just trying to be sure I understand the map. Thank you.
34
35 Siddiqui: Sure.
36
37 Garrett: And on my Right? Yes, Commissioner Benavidez.
38
39 Benavidez: Thank you. Can you explain, okay, they principal arterial versus a minor
40 arterial. Is it traffic versus eligibility for funding that makes it make a
41 difference?
42
43 Siddiqui: As far as funding eligibility, it does not, but for traffic it does. For the
44 principal arterial usually contains a higher degree of traffic volume
45 compared to minor arterial.

1
2 Benavidez: For example. Let me give an example, Solano for example, they have a lot
3 of traffic, so they still wouldn't qualify to become a principal arterial?
4
5 Siddiqui: Traffic volume is one of the things, one of the factors that we, that we
6 investigate but then there is also the land use pattern, residential versus
7 commercial. There is also the spacing between neighboring two arterials
8 and other planning factors. So, based on everything the decision that you
9 see in this list, are defined as principal and minor is an outcome based all
10 of these factors.
11
12 Benavidez: Okay.
13
14 Siddiqui: So, just having a road with higher degree of ADD triggers a flag that it can
15 be considered as principal arterial, but then also, you know we start
16 looking into other factors.
17
18 Benavidez: Okay. Okay thank you no more questions.
19
20 Garrett: Any further on my right? Yes Mr. Doolittle?
21
22 Doolittle: Yes Chair. I do have one comment. On your map, your legend shows
23 that red is interstate, but that section of US 70 is also showing red. US 70
24 is not an interstate. So, I don't know if your legend is wrong or if the color
25 on US 70 is wrong but those two don't match.
26
27 Siddiqui: Mr. Chair, Mr. Doolittle. You're referring to the segment that is on the east
28 of intersection 35. Is that right?
29
30 Doolittle: All of US 70 right now, right from I-25 all the way to NASA is showing red
31 but your legend shows that red is interstate.
32
33 Siddiqui: Oh okay. Okay Mr. Doolittle we'll address that and correct it. Thank you.
34
35 Doolittle: Thank you.
36
37 Garrett: Any other questions on my right?
38
39 Garrett: Okay. Let me just sort of summarize two points. One is whether the map
40 is correct or whether the print out is correct as a reference, I think that's
41 a....in other words it's an important kind of point, particularly since we are
42 having to approve this and have it sent in. Do you take the distances and
43 classifications off of the map in order to generate this information?
44
45 Siddiqui: Yes Mr. Chair.

1
2 Garrett: So the.....Okay so part of the problem is that US highway 70 is simply
3 incorrectly classified as an interstate.
4
5 Siddiqui: That is correct Mr. Chair that will go to other freeway category.
6
7 Garrett: Okay, and then it'll change color and it'll be in all in the right place.
8
9 Siddiqui: Yes Mr. Chair,
10
11 Garrett: Okay. No, I saw that I just wanted to make sure what the process was, so.
12 I think the second thing is that I.....some of the questions that were raised
13 about other street/roads, I think it's important that as the transportation
14 planning moves forward, that's also in a sense responsive to the other
15 planning efforts, and I mentioned Viva Dona Ana, but the City of Las
16 Cruces is going through a comp plan update too, and I don't know whether
17 they're, what that relationship is in terms of whether their existing plan is
18 going to change. If it changes, whether that will dictate changes to this
19 classification system. But I think that that's part of.....does that make
20 sense? What I'm asking? And what degree then is MPO also working with
21 the City of Las Cruces in terms of providing information and being
22 responsive to the possibility of changes in our classification of road.
23
24 Murphy: We are working closely with the Cities long range planning on their
25 comprehensive plan update. We do give them the information as they
26 request it, same thing with the County. As they decide that their plans
27 change we adapt our plans and we change with them. We kind of advise
28 them along the way, but once they make their decisions, they're the ones
29 that the decisions on those things.
30
31 Garrett: Then you'd be changing these if needed.
32
33 Murphy: We'd change them, yes.
34
35 Garrett: Okay, alright.
36
37 Murphy: We are required to utilize all of their plans that they develop and adopt
38 when we adopt our transportation plans, so that our transportation plan
39 really reflects what the region desires. If that answers the questions
40 you're asking.
41
42 Garrett: That, that's fine, and so Peachtree Hills is a certain classification in terms
43 of the comp plan for the City, then that would be reflected here, when
44 that's.....
45

1 Murphy: As it ultimately gets built. Yes.
2
3 Garrett: Okay. Let me just ask one question on the people from Mesilla. Do you
4 have an updated Comprehensive Plan now? When was the last time that
5 was dropped, you were I think working on getting it updated.
6
7 Flores: We have a consultant I believe, and Trustee Bernal can correct me if I'm
8 wrong, but I believe we have a.....that they either were working on the
9 PDF for the consultant and scope or they already (inaudible) I think it must
10 just be that they're working on it.
11
12 Garrett: Okay. That's just another potential connection in terms of all the
13 jurisdictions. Okay, any last things here? If not, I need a motion to
14 approve Resolution number 14-07: A Resolution approving of functional
15 classification of the road system within the MPO area.
16
17 Commissioner Wayne Hancock motioned to approve the Resolution.
18
19 Councillor Sorg seconds the motion.
20
21 Hancock: Mr. Chair, only with the modification that was made with adding the word
22 "the" in front of MPO area.
23
24 Garrett: Can you take that as a friendly amendment?
25
26 Flores: Yes.
27
28 Garrett: Okay. Did you catch that friendly amendment?
29
30 Doolittle: Mr. Chair.
31
32 Garrett: Yes. Mr. Doolittle.
33
34 Doolittle: It's probably worth them going through and checking all of it, because I
35 just happened.....just scanning through on page 25. One, two, three,
36 four, the fifth whereas, it says the same thing within MPO region, so it's
37 the location that Trustee Flores pointed out. I don't think is the only
38 location that that takes place. It's actually in the next whereas after that.
39
40 Garrett: And it's in the third whereas.
41
42 Doolittle: So, it's probably worth just making that suggestion all the way through the
43 entire document.
44
45 Garrett: Okay.

1
2 Hancock: I withdraw mine.
3
4 Garrett: So we'll just insert the word "the". Correct, Trustee?
5
6 Garrett: Alright. Can we take that as a grammatical minor edit, okay and.....but
7 we'll make sure that that gets in there.
8
9 Murphy: We'll completely search the Resolution on that.
10
11 Garrett: Okay. Thank you, any further discussion, on my left?
12
13 Garrett: In that case, would you poll the Board. Those in favor say yes, those
14 oppose say no.
15
16 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza:
17
18 Pedroza: Yes
19
20 Murphy: Councillor Sorg:
21
22 Sorg: Yes
23
24 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock
25
26 Hancock: Yes
27
28 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
29
30 Garrett: Yes
31
32 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez
33
34 Benavidez: Yes
35
36 Murphy: Trustee Flores
37
38 Flores: Yes
39
40 Murphy: Trustee Bernal
41
42 Bernal: Yes
43
44 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle
45

1 Doolittle: Yes.
2
3 Motion passes, vote 8-0 (2 Committee members absent).
4
5 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
6
7 **7.1 FY15-FY16 Unified Planning Work Program**
8
9 Tom Murphy gave a presentation
10
11 Garrett: Any questions regarding the work program?
12
13 Garrett: On my right?
14
15 Garrett: On my left?
16
17 Garrett: Commissioner Hancock
18
19 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. That last element that you mentioned. That's not
20 listed here in the packet, or it is?
21
22 Murphy: The sustainability accelerator?
23
24 Hancock: Right.
25
26 Murphy: Yes, that's correct. I received the request post printing this out.
27
28 Hancock: Okay. Is South Central Regional Transportation District included in that
29 group?
30
31 Murphy: Yes it is, South Central Regional Transit District. I cannot seem to find it
32 either.
33
34 Hancock: Not a problem, if we can just be sure they get done.....
35
36 Murphy: Right. No it's in the current one. It's supposed to be in there.
37
38 Hancock: I think that's a major element of that.
39
40 Murphy: Yes it is.
41
42 Hancock: Mr. Chair, it's not a conflict to ask about other boards that were on other
43 commissions or other things.
44
45 Garrett: No, We're all part of an interlocking directorate.

1
2 Hancock: That sounds cosmic. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
3
4 Garrett: Any other comments on my left?
5
6 Garrett: I have one that I think we need to.....I'm just going to put this up
7 consideration, in terms of this particular document, but I think we also
8 need to have a discussion, probably at our next meeting. Regarding the
9 continued participation of the.....this MPO. In the work of the Consortium
10 as it extends beyond the HUD grant period. This is identified as Viva
11 Dona Ana, but our relationship is actually with the Consortium, and so the
12 question really is whether we're going to continue, because there are
13 discussions underway as a good numbers of us know. About how do we
14 continue to work together after the grant is finished? And I think if we're
15 going to be talking about regional planning. Have the MPO, this MPO
16 involved in that is going to be very, very important to the success of that
17 effort. So, I think we need to.....without knowing exactly what shape it
18 would take, it might be good for us to get a sense of the board as a whole,
19 in terms of those discussions, so that.....because that has an implication
20 on the work load. It would mean that we would be continuing to look for
21 grants to continue to participate in planning activities, in terms of
22 implementation and so-forth beyond the time that the HUD grants actually
23 concludes, so you could have dotted x's or something that continue to the
24 right.
25
26 Murphy: Mr. Chair, I think staff would need to know, is the board comfortable with
27 the language referring to as Viva Dona Ana with that? Or would it be
28 better of referring it to as the Consortium and kind of making Viva Dona
29 Ana a sub task of the Consortium as a whole, just so that we have it for
30 publication.
31
32 Garrett: I mean personally, I would prefer or recommend that we do a Consortium.
33 That's our relationship and then we have a project that we're working on at
34 this point. But what does the rest of the board think?
35
36 Flores: I'm just thinking that people will understand Viva Dona Ana and they'll be
37 familiar with that. I don't know about Consortium, so as long as Viva Dona
38 Ana is included in that and so that people.....oh okay.
39
40 Garrett: So, in other words, that maybe the heading is the Camino Royal
41 Consortium and the project that we're working on is Viva Dona Ana, and
42 that goes.....I think right now we're sort of hoping that that....we're going
43 to get a couple months extension on that project, which will take us
44 probably to June, something like that.
45

1 Garrett: Yes, Councillor Pedroza
2
3 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. It would be really helpful if all the different entities
4 could explore what your particular entity, like Mesilla and County and the
5 City. What would require.....there's a possibility of you know more MOA's,
6 or memorandum of MOU's, memorandum of understanding. There's also
7 another option, which is you know just....group that's going to continue
8 further after the grant is over, be friends with a representative existing
9 body already, but if you could start to explore those things and see what
10 best suites in each entity, that would help a lot. Thank you.
11
12
13 Garrett: Certainly. Yes Trustee Flores.
14
15 Flores: Just have one. Looking at page 36 planning factors under federal law, I
16 just really quickly.....increase the security of transportation, I can see
17 safety above, but I just kind of wonder what we're thinking about, when we
18 consider increasing the security of the transportation system for motorized
19 and non-motorized users?
20
21 Murphy: I think that that is a direct quote from the federal legislation. It's really up
22 to us to interpret what Congress meant by that.
23
24 Flores: Okay. So, you don't have any ideas either?
25
26 Garrett: Anything else? So, with the...did you have something.....
27
28 Benavidez: I have one question.
29
30 Garrett: Alright, certainly.
31
32 Benavidez: On task number 5: Special Studies and Miscellaneous activities under
33 University Avenue Corridor Study. I see that there's no activity. Is this
34 part of the transportation letter that you're waiting for? From I don't know
35 where but....
36
37 Murphy: Yes, we are currently in negotiation for price and schedule with a
38 consultant on developing those products. I hoped to, by the time I bring
39 these back to you next month that I hope should be ironed out and I
40 should be able to put x's in those boxes.
41
42 Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. No more questions.
43
44 Garrett: So, are we okay with the shifting the title of 5.1 to Camino Real
45 Consortium, and then the task has to with Viva Dona Ana, alright with

1 everybody?
2
3 Garrett: Okay, and with that exception, then this would be ready to go out or be
4 posted or whatever it's already posted.....
5
6 Murphy: It's already posted. We'll be taking these and other recommended
7 changes from the TAC and the general public. Melting them into a new
8 document, taking them back to the TAC and then bring them back to here.
9
10 Garrett: Could you go to the schedule, just so that everybody's clear about the
11 schedule on this, in terms of our actions and it was.....yeah it was in
12 the...up towards the top. Yeah it's there, there you go.
13
14 Murphy: There's a calendar, you know we develop.....basically in February,
15 March, April staff works with Mrs. Herrera and other staff developing a
16 draft, publish that draft, post it on the website, hold a meeting at the TAC,
17 and then we start accepting public comment. Then from June 1st thru
18 June 15th, MPO staff revises it based on comments received. Then we
19 bring that to this board for approval. We enter June meeting and then we
20 submit that to NMDOT. They review it, comment, maybe ask for some
21 changes and then they submit it to FHWA.
22
23 Garrett: So basically, it's mid-June. That meeting is when we are going to be
24 acting on this.....
25
26 Murphy: Right, which is.....?
27
28 Garrett: And it's going to be minor things that might need to be clarified after that.
29
30 Murphy: Yes.
31
32 Garrett: Just that everybody's aware of the time frame, because although this goes
33 to October, that's it and then we won't see this for about two more years.
34
35 Murphy: Well, and we can amend it as the committee desires.
36
37 Garrett: Okay.
38
39 Murphy: But October is, this is this is UBWP is the document that basically is our
40 staff funding, so our fiscal year begins on October 1st.
41
42 Garrett: Very good, anything else?
43
44 Garrett: Very good. Thank you very much. Good presentation.
45

1 **7.2 COMMITTEE BRIEFING: STATEWIDE LONG-RANGE PLAN (SLRP)**
2

3 Claude Morelli gave a presentation.
4

5 Garrett: Questions, comments on my right?
6

7 Garrett: My left?
8

9 Garrett: Alright, Councillor Pedroza.
10

11 Pedroza: Thank you. Mr. Morelli, thank you very much. Were you suggesting that
12 you would give us a better idea of exactly what is meant by security?
13

14 Morelli: We're trying to figure that one out. Yeah so, I guess the way we
15 approached this planning process generally is, it's sort of a blank slate.
16 So, we go in, we have groups that we know are important, some are
17 defined under federal law. And we say, you know what, what's important
18 to you? And then we start thinking about those issues from the
19 perspective of the people that we talked to. So when we talk to the
20 security people, we're going to ask them pretty much, what's important to
21 you in the transportation system?
22

23 Pedroza: Who are the security people? I don't think I have any idea.
24

25 Morelli: Yeah, I'm going to start with a group called the ATAC, which I forget what
26 it's called it's like the Antiterrorism Advisory Committee I think. They meet
27 monthly, there's a meeting here in Las Cruces and in Albuquerque. They
28 have a remote link and there's people from....I went to one here last
29 month, we couldn't get the connection to Albuquerque, (inaudible) the
30 meeting, but it was Air force, Army, I think there was somebody from the
31 FBI.....those kind of people. We are going to reach out to them and find
32 out what their concerns are.
33

34 Pedroza: Is there any possibility that the public could attend those meetings?
35

36 Morelli: Not the initial one. We may not be able to get them into a room if we do
37 that. Not that we wouldn't want to do that, it's just you know we're not
38 sure what the issues really are, and it'll be similar to the working group
39 meetings. We're trying to bring in subject matter experts. We haven't
40 necessarily made those public meetings. I think people need to feel free
41 to speak their minds at some of these meeting and I think they had a kind
42 of a spotlight on them they may not. We can....we'll certainly take notes
43 and those notes will be publicly available ultimately.
44

45 Pedroza: Alright. Thank you very much.

1
2 Morelli: You're welcome.
3
4 Garrett: Councillor Sorg:
5
6 Sorg: Mr. Chairmen. Thank you. Remind me who are the members of the
7 working group?
8
9 Morelli: Which one? We have sixteen.
10
11 Sorg: The one that, you'll plan to meet down here in July.
12
13 Morelli: Oh okay, that working group has grown to something quite large. I think
14 we have, it'll be everybody who is at the meeting we had in Las Cruces.
15 Every single person in there, as long as you wrote a legible email address
16 will get you. If you didn't write a legible email address, we won't get you.
17 Plus, we had some people on that list already and those are people from
18 elsewhere in the state, they'll be invited, and the COG economic
19 development folks have said they want to be involved. So, we may
20 expand the list to include them. It will be a big list. We do need help with
21 a meeting location, and
22
23 Sorg: Yes, I was going to come to that next.
24
25 Morelli: That'd be wonderful.
26
27 Sorg: We'll have to work that out. The last one was a little cramped. Yes, okay,
28 we'll fix it.
29
30 Morelli: And there's a little twist to it. Speaking of meeting location, the freight
31 group we want to meet together with the economic development group
32 and kind of do the stuff that's common and then have the freight people go
33 off and maybe a different room and continue their conversation.
34
35 Sorg: Brake out type of thing. Okay.
36
37 Garrett: How big are they, if I could just interject.
38
39 Morelli: The last, freight ones, it depends on where in the state. We're going to
40 have a freight meeting similar to this in the Southeast part of the state, and
41 we're going to get a bunch of oil and gas and potash and people like that.
42 They're not going to come here, so it depends on where we are. We had
43 a meeting here in I think it was November or December down in Mesilla,
44 and we got maybe 25 people in the rooms, something like that. So, we
45 may get more or fewer, I don't know.

1
2 Sorg: Alright. Thank you very much.
3
4 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairmen.
5
6 Morelli: Welcome.
7
8 Garrett: Anyone else?
9
10 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. The one element that I.....it's quite interesting, the
11 University UAS folks. Are they involved in the planning because they
12 seem to be left out of a lot of stuff? They have that new FAA corridor that
13 covers their space that almost of Dona Ana County now, for the
14 unmanned vehicle testing.
15
16 Morelli: We will certainly invite them to whatever appropriate venue we have to get
17 their input. In fact if you could, or actually through Tom, probably get any
18 contact information you have, we will engage them. If we need to identify
19 issues at this point, this is why I said we are not out of Phase 1 yet. We
20 are trying to figure out things. Any issues, we can still
21 incorporate.....we're going to run out of time on that at some point but I
22 would say by mid-June we're going to be like out of time, but get Tom
23 some contact and I'll call them personally or email them.
24
25 Sorg: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26
27 Garrett: How specific do you see the end product being in terms of individual
28 projects?
29
30 Morelli: Yeah, great question. So under federal law the MPO's have to have
31 fiscally constrained Metropolitan Transportation Plans. What that means,
32 is you have a budget and then you have to projects that fit into that budget
33 over a 20 year time frame. We, the way we set the scope of work up, we
34 are affectively doing the same thing, we're doing revenue projections, I
35 can talk about how we're doing that if you'd like, having a budget for a 25
36 year time frame, because we're going to 2040. Near term, the budget and
37 the program is basically the STIP. It's already...we got 6, 5, 4 years out,
38 and from there it gets increasingly more ambiguous, but what we're
39 thinking, is we'll kind of have buckets or categories of projects and we'll
40 say okay, we probably want x number of dollars in maintenance for
41 pavements and x number of dollars in bridges for instance. Or transit
42 service, x number of dollars there, or other types of things. Some of the
43 categories, we don't have a pot of money really for it, like visitor travel,
44 scenic byways, Amtrak, we don't have money for those so we have to
45 figure out if we're going to prioritize those. Where would that money come

1 from and we may have to identify other sources that we're not even in play
2 yet somehow. Or propose sources that don't even exist yet.

3
4 Garrett: I'm asking that question for very practical reasons. As we have been
5 working on Viva Dona Ana and looking at regional planning based on the
6 County as the planning unit, we're dealing with two MPO's and area that
7 are not covered by an MPO at all. A good example of a project that has
8 slipped through the cracks is the interchange at Upham between the south
9 road going to the Spaceport and I-25.

10
11 Morelli: Yeah.

12
13 Garrett: And my concern quite frankly has to do with the fact that as far as I'm
14 concerned the state missed that. Okay. Dona Ana County missed that
15 too, but somehow just in terms of thinking about the commitments of state
16 government to that as a project and so-forth, somebody should have
17 raised a flag and said you know what, you need more than just money for
18 the south road, you've gotta get started on planning, and part of what
19 we're hearing is, well there's no traffic there, so there's no basis for
20 planning an interchange. Well, that's the thing that's going to chase itself
21 around and around and around and quite honestly becomes a self-fulfilling
22 prophecy. If we look at just STIPs and those kinds of thing, then we're
23 behind even more, 4 years out just in terms of getting things going. So,
24 some of this has to do with how, I mean we can go through the exercise of
25 talking about values and all that kind of thing, and hope and pray that out
26 of all this sort of....it kind of deductive process, we're going to get
27 eventually to recognition that this is a project that should be a high priority.
28 As opposed to saying no, it needs to get on the list next year, and so part
29 of what I'm trying to do is understand how this process and I mean that's
30 one of at least two that I think are important to the region. How do we,
31 how do we deal with those kinds of issues?

32
33 Morelli: Well, if it's reassuring or not. You're not alone, we've heard similar
34 comments from other regions who have projects and so I think the issue of
35 the spaceport is a couple of things. 1. it's a visitor travel issue very much.
36 I mean the numbers I've seen are quarter of a million in visitor a year or
37 something like that. Where are they coming? Are they coming from down
38 here, are they coming from Albuquerque, are they staying in T or C, are
39 they staying down here, are they flying in, are they taking rail runner
40 down? That's been proposed. Are they on....there's a proposal to run like
41 a train, like the American Orient Express kind of thing down from Santa
42 Fe. All those things are maybe's and what ifs. Probably what we can do
43 through this process is get a little bit more realistic sense of what the
44 volumes are of people who might be going to a place like Spaceport. And
45 once we talk about volumes, then you can say, well maybe there's some

1 justification that hasn't been thought about yet or not. That exists
2 everywhere in the state. There are other projects elsewhere in the state
3 that other regions talk about that are along the same lines. We do want to
4 do some reality checking. Spaceport is a real thing, if it were.....I was just
5 a conference in Texas on, it was on energy development. There was a
6 guy from Midland, Odessa and they want to do a Spaceport there too.
7 They want to put it right next to Midland, Odessa in the middle of oil
8 country and all this traffic and this and that, and I'm thinking.....what I was
9 thinking when I was hearing this presentation, was you want to do that,
10 you're trying to get approval, but we already have a Spaceport. So, we're
11 probably ahead of them. I don't know if that's a satisfying answer to your
12 question. I couldn't be able to say yes, that interchange will be on the list,
13 I mean that's going to be a conversation that we have, that will involve the
14 budget that we think is available and all of the other priorities in the state.
15 But I think for the first time that I'm aware of, we're looking at the question
16 of how many people are likely to go to a pretty important thing like a
17 spaceport, and then think carefully about what's the most appropriate
18 transportation investment to support that.

19
20 Garrett: And what I'm going to suggest is that this is a specific process, which is a
21 good process, and I'm a strong advocate of planning and I've been
22 involved with lots of planning in the course of my career. The problem that
23 I see is that there are unique conditions sometimes that apply to a
24 situation. There are only two counties that are paying for the Spaceport.
25 Dona Ana and Dona Ana is paying almost all of the Spaceport, and Sierra
26 County. Don't tell me that Santa Fe wants to run a rail down here and
27 bring tourist, okay, especially when they won't buy in and support the
28 thing.

29
30 Morelli: That's not our proposal for that.

31
32 Garrett: I'm just saying. So, there's a part here which doesn't in a certain sense
33 that has to do with just a practical reality. We're paying 6 million dollars a
34 year out of tax payer money, from this county into the bonds for that
35 project and it doesn't matter what the projections are, we won't be able to
36 get more than like 10 thousand if we don't have an interchange that will
37 handle the volume. So part of it is it's partly how we look at the thing and
38 justify it. I'm all for it, making justifications, but it's also that this is simply a
39 missing piece that the roads not going to be built for huge volumes of
40 traffic, but we don't want to build an interchange and then tear it up and
41 build another interchange as we get increased volume.

42
43 Morelli: Right.

44
45 Garrett: So, I'm asking you to think about those kinds of projects and how they

1 come into the process,
2
3 Morelli: Yeah.
4
5 Garrett: Because I don't see them filtering through the system very well.
6
7 Morelli: I have an idea for how we can get it more on the radar screen, so what
8 you just said I don't think is on our radar screen yet. Maybe it was a point
9 you made at the, or somebody made at the workshop we had and I was
10 reviewing the notes in draft form, and I didn't see that. But if that
11 information about how the funding is coming from Dona Ana County can
12 get into our, or at least into our existing conditions report, that's the basis
13 upon which we're going to base a lot of what we do next, and so it would
14 be helpful to have Tom, maybe send information to Tom, then send it to
15 me, about what's going on, so that we know more clearly how much of an
16 investment you're making and then weigh that along with all the other
17 things we are looking at.
18
19 Garrett: The other project that I'm really interested in having the evaluated and
20 getting into the system, because we are losing money every year that
21 we're behind is the 404 interchange. That's the one I talked about as a
22 (inaudible) Santa Teresa.
23
24 Morelli: Right.
25
26 Garrett: So, these are projects that are sort of are beyond what's in existing
27 condition, but they open up opportunities. And because all the information
28 isn't quite in place, it makes it hard and I think it's going to be harder to
29 kind of push some of these things thru if they don't at least get on the
30 screen.
31
32 Morelli: Existing conditions is slightly a misnomer. We....we're also trying to
33 identify existing issues. So, that'll be part of that conversation.
34
35 Garrett: Okay.
36
37 Sorg: Mr. Chairmen?
38
39 Garrett: Yes. Councillor Sorg.
40
41 Sorg: If I could add to that Spaceport comments you're making. I've been told
42 by Virgin Galactic that they may have 60-70 people commuting from Las
43 Cruces to the Spaceport daily.
44
45 Morelli: Yeah.

1
2 Sorg: So, add that to your bucket list there. Thank you.
3
4 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
5
6 Garrett: Yes.
7
8 Hancock: Since we're on Spaceport. I'm hearing that part of the problem with that
9 exchange, is that that interchange, is that we're losing all of the Space Ex
10 business because 180 foot rockets can't negotiate that area.
11
12 Garrett: Right, thru the interchange, geometry of the interchange.
13
14 Hancock: Interchange. Right, because those are very big trucks and they have to
15 get on and get off and it's.....we're losing all of that business. So, it's not
16 only, it's not the....it's not just the tourism; it's a lot more than that. I mean
17 we're putting in a huge amount of money into this; it's just amazing that it
18 was left off the radar. There must be a way to, to expedite that and,
19 because I mean we've already done it. It's there. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20
21 Morelli: It's funny. I don't know how many.....I could check them off, the issues
22 that come up at every meeting usually transit over weight/over sizes
23 trucks, so that issue is a really critical one there and what would be helpful
24 to have again, and I'll read the minutes to this meeting, but again it would
25 be helpful to have some dimensional data on what those rocket
26 assemblies are. Are they bigger than wind turban blades? Are they, you
27 know what kind of....what's the scale. That would be helpful to document.
28
29 Garrett: Okay. But I would just.....I hear you about that. Part of this is, this is an
30 evolving....we're in the sort of ramp up to possibilities there, and the smart
31 money is not going to say, it's all tourism. It's going to be, it's going to be
32 tourism and whatever else we need to make that economically viable and
33 to capitalize on those resources. That's a piece of this, is that I think it's a
34 huge investment and we just need to, we need to figure out how to return
35 capital you know get a return on the capital for the tax payers.
36
37 Morelli: Right.
38
39 Garrett: And, so.....any other thoughts?
40
41 Garrett: Yes. Mr. Doolittle.
42
43 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I just have...since we're on Spaceport. I don't want to focus a
44 lot on Spaceport, because I know we're talking about planning, but just to
45 give the board a quick update. We talked about Space X, we did have a

1 project on (inaudible) on New Mexico 51, we actually modified our traffic
2 control to allow Space X to bring in some of their infrastructure, to include
3 my understanding, portions of the rocket. So granted they're not coming
4 from the south portion of the roadway, but we have made
5 accommodations our current construction project to bring them in from the
6 north. I tend to agree that at least the implementation of Spaceport and
7 how we're, well initially even how we built it, you know the northern access
8 road is a temporary alignment. Portions of that roadway are actually in
9 railroad right of way. So, I agree with you, I think the state or whomever
10 didn't necessarily plan on long term what was going to happen at
11 Spaceport, but right now we are, at least doing what we can to make
12 accommodations from the north part of the, north access. I have been in
13 contact with Chad Raybon with Spaceport to try to figure out and brain
14 storm options on what we can do to try to fund Upham interchange. But
15 like we discussed, if we're planning on including it in the districts STIP with
16 projects like Missouri, that's a \$13M project, just maintaining our current
17 infrastructure on our interstate is, is eating my budget. But we are having
18 those discussions with Spaceport and we'll continue to do so, but I think
19 as a group, if we could continue to be vocal and try to find ways of getting
20 this in the planning and find funding, I agree with you. I think it's a priority,
21 I just don't know to get there from here.

22
23 Garrett: It sounds as though one of the things that's important it to be able to
24 provide some level of technical description of how big the openings need
25 to be and any other technical descriptions, and it may very well be that
26 because of the work that you've done, in terms of access from the north,
27 that you might have some ideas about what might be considered.

28
29 Doolittle: We don't.

30
31 Garrett: No.

32
33 Doolittle: Unfortunately, what happened with the last project, they gave us about a
34 weeks' notice. Luckily the contractor was in a transition period between
35 one side of the road and the other, so we shifted some stuff around. We
36 didn't have any idea what they were bringing thru until about a week
37 before. A lot of that stuff, I don't know if its classified or top secret or
38 typically we don't know those types of dimensions until it's on its way here.

39
40 Murphy: It's funny Trent's comments, or Mr. Doolittle's comments about that
41 sounds so much like oil and gas. The...when they're drilling, the drillers
42 don't want to tell you beforehand where they're going to drill because they
43 don't want to release that information, so the next thing you know
44 our...you know our district 2 folks are out there trying to fix a road that's
45 been damaged by these heavy, heavy trucks. By the way. I would say,

1 not just linear dimensions but also the weight of the vehicles or the rockets
2 is probably an important piece of information to have.

3
4 Garrett: Let me ask. Mr. Murphy. Is that something that you could get information
5 on in terms of.....find out what they do around Houston? You know it's
6 like, I don't know go somewhere and get something. Florida, yeah, I mean
7 let's just find out what, get something as a reference point.

8
9 Murphy: Yeah, it'd be very helpful.

10
11 Garrett: You know, bigger than a bread box.

12
13 Murphy: We don't need a tome, we need just the executive summary kind of
14 information.

15
16 Garrett: Alright, and then like I said, I think the other one is been of some interest,
17 has to do with 404 and the whole connection and there's congestion,
18 there's freight issues, there's economic development and you know social
19 equity issues, all that down there.

20
21 Murphy: We did here about that at our workshop.

22
23 Garrett: And there's an overlap with the MPO in El Paso that we're going to be
24 talking about shortly. So there's plenty of opportunities for our continued
25 involvement. We want to thank you for coming and (inaudible)
26 presentation and we look forward to helping us move this along.

27
28 Morelli: Thank you so much for having us. Alright, thank you.

29
30 Garrett: We'll help you. Okay. Thank you.

31
32 **7.3 EL PASO MPO DRAFT AGREEMENT**

33
34 Tom Murphy gave a presentation

35
36 Garrett: On my right? Trustee Flores.

37
38 Flores: I was just.....the very last on page 104, 5. It says El Paso MPO and the
39 Mesilla Valley MPO agree to host a joint public meeting outlining current
40 and future planning activities identified in the UPWP's and MTP's and
41 TIPS or as deemed necessary. We could either change that to as
42 necessary or put in a specific time, a minimal amount of time and I would
43 prefer to put at least a minimal amount of time in, but I'm not for what that
44 minimal time should be so.....
45

1 Garrett: Any other....
2
3 Pedroza: Mr. Chair?
4
5 Garrett: Yes. Councillor Pedroza.
6
7 Pedroza: Thank you. This is a question for Trustee Flores. Are you saying a
8 minimal amount of time within which to host the meeting or?
9
10 Flores: Yeah. That that way we would automatically have....because otherwise
11 you might never get together and you know have a meeting if it's as
12 needed, so I suggest that there, that we think of what a minimal amount of
13 time is, or you know that we ought to meet together, and I'm open to what
14 that amount of time would be, but I think we ought to put down, instead
15 of....we could either do two ways. One say as needed or and cut out that
16 "or", or put in a minimal amount of time and then say "additionally as
17 needed".
18
19 Pedroza: I think that's a good idea.
20
21 Garrett: Which one?
22
23 Pedroza: To set an amount of time within which that meeting should take place.
24
25 Garrett: Alright, and what would you recommend?
26
27 Pedroza: Within.....within the next six months. And then if it has to be changed.
28
29 Garrett: So it could read that this is the last point is on 104. Correct?
30
31 Garrett: That El Paso MPO and Mesilla Valley MPO
32
33 Pedroza: Right.
34
35 Garrett: Agree to host a joint public meeting on a six month time table, or a
36 deemed necessary.
37
38 Flores: Right.
39
40 Garrett: So it's basically bi-annually. Is that bi-annually, twice a year? Would that
41 meet your intent Councillor?
42
43 Pedroza: Yes it would.
44
45 Garrett: Okay.

1
2 Flores: I think that's a lot, but I just said I was open to it, so. I kind of wanted to
3 ask the staff what they thought, if they had a suggestion?
4
5 Murphy: Staff suggestion was going to be once a year or more as needed. I think
6 just from historically trying to organize meetings with the El Paso MPO,
7 given the complexity of getting their 23 members to agree to come to a
8 meeting. I think once a year would probably be the most we could ask,
9 unless of course a pertinent issue was, did arise and then we could have
10 second or even third meeting within a year.
11
12 Flores: Okay.
13
14 Garrett: So there's an alternative then proposed.
15
16 Pedroza: And I can understand the complexity of trying to get all this together, so I
17 would be happy to withdraw my suggestion and make it the same as what
18 Tom has said.
19
20 Garrett: Okay. Mr. Doolittle?
21
22 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, I just have a couple of questions I guess for clarification. When
23 you talk about joint public meeting are you talking about having the policy
24 boards from Mesilla Valley and El Paso MPO getting together or are you
25 talking about having public meetings, where both present to the public, the
26 MTP's and the TIPS, and the STIP's and what is the intent of that
27 statement, when you start talking co-ed meeting? And the reason I ask, is
28 you mention, I agree with you. It's going to be extremely difficult to have
29 the policy boards to get together. I can guarantee you that the
30 representatives from Texas are not going to participate in something
31 dealing with Berino, so I don't know if the intent is to bring the two MPO's
32 together, maybe the executive committee's would be an option. I just
33 don't know what the intent of that statement is.
34
35 Murphy: I do want to reiterate that this was drafted by El Paso staff. That it is a
36 joint meeting that both of us host. That could include any...from a joint
37 open house up into a joint policy board meeting. I think...narrowly a
38 meeting of the two policy board or committee's would satisfy this
39 condition, but then so an open house that where both MPO staffs were
40 there in attendance within the Berino area affected, would also satisfy this
41 condition. I think either, either or anything in between could satisfy that.
42
43 Doolittle: Okay. Again the only reason I bring it up is for instance, lately we've been
44 dealing with the Lincoln Center a lot in El Paso and they've been talking
45 about the El Paso MPO policy board, if there was a separate joint meeting

1 to discuss the Lincoln Center. I wouldn't go. And I think that's going to
2 kind of be the same position with a lot the El Paso MPO policy board, if
3 were there to talk about Berino. I don't know how much involvement we're
4 going to have from the policy board. You know I do hope that Mike
5 Medina and his staff are certainly open to attending, I think that's their
6 responsibility to attend; I just worry about the Policy Board. We only have
7 one representative from Dona Ana County; we have one from Anthony,
8 one from Sunland Park I just worry about the participation from El Paso
9 Policy Board.

10
11 Garrett: Can I interject something?

12
13 Murphy: By all means do.

14
15 Garrett: Berino is not the issue. It's nice that, that you know we were kind of
16 looking at, at where the edges are. But the issue is the entire southern
17 part of the county that's in New Mexico that is in El Paso MPO, and that's
18 a critical area in terms of transportation systems and transportation
19 systems and the way they're developed are going to dictate in many,
20 many ways what happens in terms of land use, growth.....I mean all the
21 other kinds of things that are going to go on down there. So I think that
22 the bigger question here in a sense has to with other planning activities
23 and really the question is whether we should say, you know we'd like to
24 basically I think either create a sub, you know sort of a joint task force or
25 something that between the two with the staff can meet regularly, and I
26 mean probably monthly in some cases for a while. To make sure that
27 what's being planned in by the El Paso MPO is in concert with some of the
28 work that's going on in New Mexico and in particular in Dona Ana County.
29 That's really the big issue, to me at least. Does that make sense?

30
31 Pedroza: I think that's exactly what I was talking about, because it's very, very nice
32 to see that somebody's moved ahead and actually gotten some
33 agreement about when to....place Berino. But it's certainly is not the
34 whole concern and so I think you've expressed it very well and I think that
35 it would need much more of an executive regularly meeting group, rather
36 than public hearing in some distant future.

37
38 Garrett: Okay. Did you have something? Okay

39
40 Benavidez: Yes

41
42 Garrett: Commissioner Benavidez.

43
44 Benavidez: Thank you. Commissioner Garrett, with what you said. That the El Paso
45 MPO will be, I guess working with the Mesilla Valley MPO on the

(inaudible) of understanding on section B. It says the purpose of this agreement is provide the frame work for the responsibilities of the E MPO and MV MPO in regards to federal mandated planning, programing and funding for the portion for a portion of EI Paso urbanized area within Dona Ana County New Mexico. On the first section, it says the governor. Are we talking about the New Mexico Governor or are we talking about the Texas Governor.

Garrett: This refers to the New Mexico Governor.

Benavidez: Okay, so do we have a memorandum of an understanding from the Texas Governor as well?

Benavidez: I mean, do we need to get something saying that the Texas Governor is also in agreement with this memorandum of understanding?

Garrett: I may need to differ to NMDOT staff, but I do believe that the EI Paso MPO exists within both states, with agreement between both Governors'. The particular boundaries of the EI Paso MPO within the state of New Mexico really are just a concern between the New Mexico Governor and the EI Paso MPO and that the Texas Governor's really not involved in that. Mr. Doolittle if I have the wrong impression. Do you know any different?

Doolittle: Actually Mr. Chair, if you will allow, I think Jolene because she's been interacting with both MPO's; I think she's got some information that may be helpful.

Herrera: Thank you. Just so you all are aware, I'm the NMDOT liaison for both MPO's. I did work with Mike Medina on this, well I didn't work with him on the draft, but he originally approached me about doing this memorandum of understanding and we gave him the go ahead to do it and to bring it to this policy board. I think, yes Tom you're right. The Texas Governor doesn't need to be involved. They were involved originally when setting up the boundaries of the MPO's and how it went into a different state, so that general larger agreement has already been made, any adjustments that we do to planning within the state of New Mexico is just under the purview of our Governor. If we were looking at actually changing MPO or urbanized area boundaries, that's where we'd have to get the other Governor involved. But since we're not doing that, we don't need to go that route. If I could add some clarification on I think the last point number 5, on page 104, that we were previously talking about, the public meeting. The intent there was, I think if you would like it to involve policy boards, that's perfectly fine, but I think the intent there was really to present to the public, because the boundary is kind of....it's in an odd place and so we want to make sure that the public along that entire corridor...if they have

1 any questions they can ask the appropriate MPO. Depending on what
2 side of the boundary they're on. I think it's more for things like functional
3 classification because those roads do span both boundaries. Things like
4 planning obviously don't stop at the MPO boundary; we need to be
5 coordinated with that so I think it's really just a way to get both MPO staffs
6 to provide information to the public if they need it. I don't think the intent
7 was to involve the policy boards and that's actually already written into the
8 bylaws of the MPO. That you would do a meeting with El Paso MPO and
9 it's in their bylaws as well, so I'm not sure that it's appropriate to put that
10 here as well. And then to address kind of a larger question about the fact
11 that this talks specifically about Berino, and not about other planning
12 activities within Dona Ana County, Commissioner Garrett, that was kind of
13 your concern. I just want to say that El Paso MPO is not for the lack of a
14 better term going rogue. They involve Dona Ana County in all of the
15 planning that they do. They involve the City of Sunland Park, The City of
16 Anthony as much as they can. DOT is involved, so I do feel like there is
17 coordination there. I think that probably some of those things aren't being
18 brought back maybe to you all and you're not getting the report back on
19 the coordination that is going on. Maybe theirs is something that we can
20 do there but I just want to make it clear that they are taking everything into
21 consideration and they're not planning in a bubble and they're not just
22 paying attention to the Texas side.

23
24 Garrett: I appreciate that and I'm not suggesting that they've gone rogue or that
25 they are only looking at Texas interest. On the other hand, It would be
26 hard for me given the makeup of that particular group and the
27 preponderance of representation from Texas, to say that necessarily all of
28 our interests are being adequately represented, in perspectives and so
29 forth. I think that this, this is really a great idea, partly because it's not
30 about changing jurisdiction. So, actually if you look at section 1B and that
31 it has to do with federally mandated planning program and funding instead
32 of saying a portion and we said "the portion" of the El Paso urbanized area
33 within Dona Ana County New Mexico, which is exactly the same language
34 as under 2A. That actually is the area that we're talking about, and
35 if.....then were to say the geographic area responsibility will be referred to
36 as South Central Dona Ana County. That's actually clearer in terms
37 of...that's the area we want to be making sure that we have a more robust
38 and finer grained discussion about...with information going to both policy
39 committee's and both state MPO's and you know DOT's. I think that if we
40 did that and then if under other planning activities, well actually that by
41 itself would probably be a good enough response going back to that just to
42 say okay let's be clear about this is the area we want to talk about, and if
43 we can start talking about that area and figuring out how to have that
44 conversation. Then we'll figure out whether we need anything formalized
45 in terms of that. But I would suggest that that's a pretty significant

1 clarification. Is to say it's, it's the area within Dona Ana County that's
2 within their MPO boundary. Now does that cover Chaparral? Okay, and it
3 goes all the way over to Santa Teresa right?
4
5 Herrera: Yes sir.
6
7 Garrett: Okay, so....I mean it's that whole area that we're really wanting to have
8 conversations about, and make sure that we're all in sync.
9
10 Herrera: Right and Mr. Chair. That makes perfect sense. I think the intent of this
11 specific MOU was to address the planning boundary that's within Mesilla
12 Valley MPO that's in the El Paso urbanized area specifically, so that was
13 what their issue.....not issue, but what the confusion really was. Is that
14 part of their urbanized area is in Mesilla Valley MPO.
15
16 Garrett: Oh.
17
18 Herrera: And really, how that came to be is still a little bit fuzzy. I mean that was
19 before my time and I believe speaking to Mike Medina it was a project or
20 something like that, but the point being that El Paso MPO because that is
21 part of their urbanized area, they need to be really sure that planning is
22 happening.
23
24 Garrett: In Berino?
25
26 Herrera: For that area, in their urbanized area. That's the responsibility of Mesilla
27 Valley MPO. And that was the intent of this document. I think the points
28 that you're making are a much broader discussion and that's okay. I'm
29 just not sure if we need to amend this document or if we need to have kind
30 of a different approach to that broader discussion.
31
32 Garrett: I would suggest that lets just have it together, because.....Berino's in my
33 district and so I understand what's going on there. It's not that there's
34 going to be huge issues with transportation.
35
36 Herrera: Yeah.
37
38 Garrett: Unless they're going to get into private roads, but I think this is an
39 opportunity to, to address the issue of Berino, but then.....and, and all
40 other aspects. I mean that would the editing then that I would propose
41 that you look at
42
43 Herrera: Okay.
44
45 Garrett: And to say that you know that just to clean it up so that we know now that

1 there's an overlap of jurisdiction and we want to sort that out but also, we
2 want to say yes, but we also want to share planning responsibilities and
3 discussion about the rest of what of what's in Dona Ana County that's in
4 the MPO.
5
6 Herrera: Okay. Yeah I'm.....
7
8 Garrett: Does that make sense to everybody?
9
10 Hancock: Mr. Chair. Well if we're going down that road, why not straighten out the
11 problem. I imagine that it was originally included because they needed
12 enough population to meet some criteria that was out there and there was
13 enough population that or, why would we cross state boundaries like that
14 just makes no sense.
15
16 Garrett: You mean why did the Governors sign off part of Southern New Mexico to
17 Texas?
18
19 Hancock: 1:52 Yeah
20
21 Herrera: It has to do with urbanized area, it's they're.....identified by the census
22 bureau. So it's I think written that you, it's not in the benefit of anyone to
23 try to split an urbanized area and since that southern part of county is truly
24 within the El Paso urbanized area, meaning there aren't any gaps in
25 between. It's one area. You can't split them like that, which is why we
26 have the situation we do. And this isn't the only place where it happens. I
27 mean it happens in other states as well, where you have one urbanized
28 area that startles the state line.
29
30 Murphy: Donate it to Texas.
31
32 Garrett: Okay. Yes Councillor Pedroza
33
34 Pedroza: Thank you. Thank you very much. I wonder, you said that you don't know
35 who it is who should be reporting to us. Would you be able to find out that
36 information, because I think that's really important and maybe it isn't but if
37 we knew who it is that's going and getting information or possibly, possibly
38 representing us and then not coming and giving us the report and
39 informing us. We need to correct that, so would you be able to do that?
40
41 Herrera: Sure, that information is on the El Paso MPO website. All of the members
42 of the Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Committee are listed
43 there, to include the Dona Ana County representatives.
44
45 Pedroza: Alright, and you can send me the website information or is it just El Paso

1 MPO. Thank you very much.
2
3 Garrett: Any further discussion about this, so I guess direction....just in order to
4 keep the discussion going and at least for the discussion. I think the idea
5 of dealing with the Berino portion is just fine as far as I'm concerned. I
6 think that the larger issue is we want to start having this figuring out how to
7 have this other kind of discussion and actually joint planning involvement
8 in that particular area. That's less about the overlap between two MPO's
9 then it is between New Mexico and Dona Ana County and the El Paso
10 MPO.
11
12 Herrera: Right.
13
14 Garrett: And that's really where the issue I think comes in.
15
16 Herrera: Okay.
17
18 Garrett: Okay.
19
20 Herrera: So, just for my benefit and for Mesilla Valley MPO staff benefit, you want
21 to move forward with sort of this draft with just the Berino portion or no,
22 you want to go ahead and try to amend this document to include the
23 broader issues
24
25 Garrett: I would suggest that.....we're going to be talking about an MOU's, so let's
26 go ahead and bring the....It might be that that's a larger question for them,
27 we want to make sure that this other issue is also addressed.
28
29 Murphy: Mr. Chair, if I may. I hear what Jolene is saying about splitting in two
30 issues. I do think that this is a larger question that would probably be
31 worthy of having as an item at a joint meeting between the two boards, so
32 that this particular interest....the portion, the urbanized area within Dona
33 Ana County can be addressed because you know it is...I think that's a
34 decision up at the policy member's level and both of the two boards
35 probably need to get together in order to iron that out.
36
37 Garrett: I don't know a better way to make sure that they understand that we want
38 to have the conversation then to have it in a draft that goes back to them.
39 I mean I'm not saying how this is all going to play itself out. We've been
40 talking about this since I came on the committee, this relationship and
41 questions of jurisdiction and stuff like that and it just seems that we need
42 to make sure that maybe this will help precipitate that meeting.
43
44 Murphy: Okay. So you would recommend that we send a counter proposal
45 language rather than.....okay.

1
2 Garrett: See what the result, what the reaction is? I mean what we're saying is that
3 there are these differing jurisdictions and planning and all that kind of stuff
4 and it just makes sense.....I mean part of what we're dealing with is that
5 we've got an urbanized area and then we got our area here with the MPO
6 and all kinds of other indicators are, you don't want to silo things. It's
7 partly why you don't want to split the urbanized area, but it's also speaking
8 to the issue, well we don't want to also split southern Dona Ana County off
9 from the rest of this area. I think that that's simple.
10
11 Garrett: And I don't know what would come out in terms of planning and
12 discussions and project priorities, but that that is a concern.
13
14 Garrett: Yes Mr. Doolittle.
15
16 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Jolene, I think one thing that would be helpful and you and I
17 kind of talked about this is, what is the El Paso MPO doing for Dona Ana
18 County? Can we get a list from Mike of what our funding does, what they
19 utilize the funding that we provide them for, for Dona Ana County? I think
20 that's one of the missing pieces of information that we have, is I don't think
21 we're sure of what the El Paso MPO does with our money for New
22 Mexico.
23
24 Herrera: Sure. Yeah we can do that. It's actually written into their UPWP and its
25 specifically broken out the New Mexico portion and in New Mexico funding
26 that is spent on doing that. I mean we do have that document but we can
27 certainly make that accessible to the policy board.
28
29 Doolittle: The other reason I ask that, is in my opinion I think Jolene will agree with
30 me. Based on the amount of money that we give the El Paso MPO, I think
31 they go way above and beyond what we fund, and so even if there's items
32 that aren't listed in the EPWP or things that they're doing, utilizing funding
33 that's not New Mexico, I'd like to see that list on that list as well.
34
35 Herrera: Right. Well I can give you an example, just right now is the modeling, all
36 of the modeling that goes into getting air quality conformity, because their,
37 that area is non-attainment for air quality. They have to do modeling
38 before any of the MTP's or TIP's or anything can be approved. So they do
39 that for the New Mexico portion of their boundary as well. We pay them
40 approximately 47,000 dollars a year. Those models are really expensive,
41 so they're doing some of that with money that maybe isn't necessarily
42 being paid out of New Mexico. That's a huge thing that they service that
43 they provide.
44
45 Doolittle: But I think it would be....that that's a good first step and then we could

1 start having the discussion with the El Paso MPO on what we can use
2 their services for to help out transitioning across the boundary I guess for
3 all of Dona Ana County. I agree with you completely Mr. Chair, that I think
4 it's important for us to know up front what they're doing for us first.
5

6 Herrera: Yeah we can certainly do that. I also wanted to make it clear that this draft
7 was sent as a draft, it's just a starting point. It was never meant to be like
8 here sign this. It was just something that they wanted to start the
9 conversation and at least have something....a starting point. So I think it
10 would be appropriate for Tom to go ahead and communicate all of your
11 comments back to Mike and come up with a new draft that's more suiting.
12

13 Garrett: Any other comments. Let me just add one last thing. Because I think Mr.
14 Doolittle brings up an important point. The money that goes to the El
15 Paso MPO for New Mexico is from the state. Correct? And so we might
16 very well find that as a policy board in conjunction with the county and
17 some other entities that we might want to petition the state to make sure
18 that there's additional funding that goes to the El Paso MPO if they're
19 going to continue planning and modeling and other kind of things, if we
20 need additional work there in order to deal with the unique problem in
21 southern Dona Ana County. It's not about beating up the El Paso MPO it
22 really is about our understanding, what's going on and figuring out what
23 we can do to work with them, what additional steps we can help to make
24 their work more informed and what additional things need to be done to
25 increase their capacity to deal with our issues. I mean I'm saying our in
26 the largest sense of the, of southern New Mexico.
27

28 Herrera: Right and those conversations do happen. I mean Mike contacts me
29 whenever there's anything that they're thinking about doing for the Texas
30 side that he thinks could be beneficial to the New Mexico side. And at this
31 point, a lot of it is trying to find funding. Here's just something, some more
32 food for thought, so the planning funding that NMDOT does give to El
33 Paso MPO, because of the work that they do for us and maybe the local
34 governments don't have the capacity to provide the local match. They're
35 not required to pay a local match for the planning funds for the work that
36 El Paso MPO does in the New Mexico portion. Whereas Mesilla Valley, I
37 mean you all paid a local match for planning that you do here within their
38 boundaries. I think there's something to be said for that. We understand
39 the importance of what they do for us and we made it so that nobody has
40 to pay that local match because it would be a burden on the local
41 governments there, and then also if I could clarify, because El Paso MPO
42 is a TMA (transportation management area) they do get funding directly
43 funneled to them from FHWA, so it does go through the DOT but they get
44 it from the TXDOT side and they get the funds from the New Mexico DOT
45 side, aside from the planning money. What we see with that is that none

1 of the local governments can match the funds, which is why there aren't
2 any projects in the southern Dona Ana region in the El Paso MPO TIP.
3
4 Garrett: Can that be matched by the County?
5
6 Herrera: Yes. It can be matched by whoever the lead agency is on a project. So if
7 the county were to come to El Paso MPO with a project and the match it
8 would be in the TIP.
9
10 Garrett: Okay. I mean the more that we learn about this the more we're going to
11 see that there are other possibilities. Okay
12
13 Murphy: Mr. Chair. Along those same lines, you know we've got the match that we
14 did for Airport Road. Okay, well that's within their district, could we have
15 leverage that more by running it through the El Paso MPO? We only
16 leveraged it 2:1, could we have leveraged it 3:1 or 4:1 by pushing it
17 through the other direction?
18
19 Herrera: Right. So you're talking about the state, the funding that was given by the
20 legislature
21
22 Murphy: Yes.
23
24 Herrera: So that funding could have potentially been used as match funding.
25
26 Murphy: Right. So we could have leveraged it many times over?
27
28 Herrera: Right. And can I just say that with that project in particular, because it kind
29 of is of regional significance it will have to be coordinated with the El Paso
30 MPO at some point because it is within their boundary. And the county
31 staff is actually coordinating on that already through the El Paso MPO. I
32 just received an email from Jorge Castillo this week about project
33 proposals.
34
35 Murphy: Okay that's great. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36
37 Garrett: My guess is there's a lot of coordination's happening at the staff level. It's
38 at the policy level we don't always get the connections
39
40 Herrera: Right. Yes.
41
42 Garrett: Okay. Alright thank you.
43
44
45

7.4 NMDOT UPDATES

Trent Doolittle presents NMDOT updates.

- I-10/Avenida De Mesilla project- Westbound off ramp expecting to open up the first week of June.
- North Main project – Working on the utilities, addressing business issues.
- US 70 paving project – project is finished
- US 70 barrier project – Rinconada from I-25 60 day ramp up time to acquire materials, state date is May 27th.
- Mesquite Interchange project – working on detour to demolish bridge.
- Santa Teresa Port of Entry – Drive pads into the inspection facility
- Chip sealing all of 28 – public meeting of delays

Garrett: How far down does that go?

Doolittle: All the way to the state line.

Garrett: Right. Could I suggest that you consider having the other meeting in La Mesa?

Doolittle: Certainly.

Garrett: And the County does have a small community facility there.

Doolittle: And who would they coordinate with to...we'll have contacts. Bridget knows who to contact.

Garrett: Yeah. That's, that's going to be with facilities and parks.

Doolittle: Okay.

Hancock: Mr. Chair?

Doolittle: My expectation is it probably won't be finished, it's a 330 day calendar project and we started late last summer. You're probably looking at late summer, early fall before we get finished with that project.

Garrett: Very good. For those who couldn't quite here that, that has to do with the I-10 Interchange and Avenida De Mesilla.

Doolittle: Correct.

Garrett: With the estimated or projected finish in late summer, early fall.

1 Doolittle: Yes
2
3 Garrett: Okay, other questions or comments?
4
5 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
6
7 Garrett: Yes, Commissioner Hancock.
8
9 Hancock: Mr. Doolittle, have the arrangements been made for the bus stops down
10 28, the 32 bus stops?
11
12 Doolittle: Yes.
13
14 Hancock: Okay. We have agreements in place and everything's ready for that?
15
16 Doolittle: Yes. From my understanding we have the posts already installed, is that
17 correct? And now we're working on invoicing and sign are being made to
18 be placed on the posts.
19
20 Hancock: Very good. Thank you, appreciate it.
21
22 Garrett: Anything else? Very good, thank you for that update.
23
24 Doolittle: Thank you.
25

26 **7.5 ADVISORY COMMITTEE UPDATES**

27
28 Murphy: One update, the technical advisory committee will be considering the draft
29 plan. It was referenced in your packet that we be giving it separately, I
30 think we forgot to bring paper copies here today, we can email you it, this
31 document I have here up on the.....Oh we did it. Sometimes they don't
32 tell me what we do. Alright, so the TAC will be considering it next month
33 and then we will be taking it here for adoption shortly after. Please review
34 and if you have any questions don't hesitate to contact anyone on staff.
35
36 Garrett: Thank you, any questions about that? Okay
37

38 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

39
40 Garrett: Just one that I would offer, that is that the more that we get into this, the
41 more that we get into this, the more I realize how slow and difficult it is to
42 make changes. I think it's important that we're looking for flexibility, but
43 there's a lot in terms of coordination with the state and with federal, with
44 making sure that we're doing all the due diligence that this is not only does
45 the system itself get kind of fixed in the ground, but the process of actually

1 making adjustments becomes pretty tough and we seldom have real
2 opportunities to sort of get ahead of the curve and I think that that's part of
3 the opportunity that we have with the state plan and that we need to be
4 really looking at what we can do, because once that gets set, that's going
5 to be even harder to change some of these other things that we might
6 want to see in terms of what the future would look like for our area. Staff
7 comments?
8

9 Murphy: None.

10

11 Garrett: Any other public comments? Yes?

12

13 Sorg: I might like to concur with you on that, and to punctuate what you're
14 saying, is the North Main from Solano to Elks Drive Highway, that is in
15 terrible shape and if the member from...DOT, Mr. Doolittle can make any
16 comment on any future planning for that particular piece of road. This has
17 been back in the background, like the interchange at Engler too. Is there
18 any additional planning on that part of the Highway 70?
19

20 Doolittle: Honestly we were hoping the city would make the developers six lane it
21 all. There isn't, at this point we continue to have those discussions. It's
22 just as important for us. I mean we're continuing to have to do grinding at
23 Elks and 70 because the pavement is shoving and moving. It's important
24 for us, it is not in our 4 year planning STIP.
25

26 Garrett: And if I may add to that, it is in the long range plan. The six lane was part
27 of the US 70 study that was done a while back. The broken up into six or
28 seven, eight, nine phases, the portion that they're doing now between
29 Chestnut and Solano is Phase 8 of the nine and Phase 9 is the portion
30 from Solano thru Elks, so even though it's not in the former it does, it is in
31 the long range plan and at some point we would hope that it will flow
32 down.
33

34 Sorg: May I add to that? Another question, these interchange....intersections
35 like Solano and Main for example and Elks and Main, can those
36 intersections be done separately from the sections of road in between?
37

38 Doolittle: They could.

39

40 Sorg: Okay.

41

42 Doolittle: But ultimately because that continues to be a corridor. We would certainly
43 want to look at if traffic volume requires a six lane facility, which in my
44 opinion it does.
45

1 Sorg: Well I just looked at the numbers and it has the highest numbers on the
2 whole list.

3
4 Doolittle: Right.

5
6 Sorg: Of the ones you've done so far.

7
8 Doolittle: But with that being said, if we're going to do improvements for instance at
9 Elks, we would want to make sure that we design it and build it for a six
10 lane facility so that we don't have to come back and tear into that
11 intersection when we do the connections between Three Crosses and
12 Elks.

13
14 Sorg: Okay. I just wondered if you could do them separately, but still have it all
15 planned out the same you know together I should say.

16
17 Doolittle: One comment I will share with you is, typically at nothing comes of it, but
18 every year at legislature they ask for unfunded urban projects. That is my
19 number one priority projects submitted every single year.

20
21 Sorg: Thank you. Thank you very much.

22
23 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairmen that's all I have to say.

24
25 Garrett: Very good.

26
27 **9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

28
29 Garrett: Anything from the public or others who are here? In that case I just want
30 thank everybody for the hard work that they have put in on making this
31 work.

32
33 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

34
35 Meeting was adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

36
37
38 _____
39 Chair

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 11, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 2015-2016 Unified Planning Work Program

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval by the Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Resolution 14-08 Approving the 2015-2016 Unified Planning Work Program

Draft copy of the proposed 2015-2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) will be provided at the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

The UPWP is a biannual document that outlines transportation planning activities to be conducted by MPO Staff as well as processes that MPO Staff will participate in, but not oversee. The UPWP also includes a budget, allocation of staff time and money toward accomplishing the tasks. The UPWP must be in compliance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 14-08

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 2015- FY 2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, preparation of Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.308.b & c) ; and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for developing and maintaining the UPWP to reflect the planning activities and funding within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, MPO staff has developed a two-year UPWP as permitted by federal regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the UPWP at their meeting on June 5, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution adopting the FY 2015- FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program to be approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I)

THAT the Unified Planning Work Program of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is adopted.

(II)

THAT staff is authorized to submit the final Fiscal Year 2015 and Fiscal Year 2016 Unified Planning Work Program to the New Mexico Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

DONE and **APPROVED** this 11th day of June , 2014.

APPROVED:

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Garrett	
Vice Chair Bernal	
Councillor Pedroza	
Councillor Small	
Councillor Sorg	
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez	
Commissioner Hancock	
Mayor Barraza	
Trustee Flores	
Mr. Doolittle	

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 11, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

6.2 Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley MPO and the El Paso MPO

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Resolution 14-09 Approving the Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley MPO and the El Paso MPO

Draft agreement between the Mesilla Valley and the El Paso MPOs

DISCUSSION:

There was a discussion at the May Policy Committee meeting on a proposed MOA with the El Paso MPO (EPMPO) that dealt with transportation planning responsibilities in the portion of the El Paso Urbanized area that now lies within MVMPO Boundaries (Berino). The Committee gave staff direction to expand the scope of the MOA to address areas beyond Berino and discuss ways to have a cooperative planning process with EPMPO in other portions of Dona Ana County that lie within the EPMPO boundaries.

Staff has proposed modifications to the MOA to the EPMPO that delineate the different planning responsibilities for two MPOs and structures a process in which the boards of both MPOs would better informed of planning activities conducted. Each MPO would continue to plan within the geography that it currently does, however, we will formalize a requirement to meet annually with the EPMPO. Additionally, staff from each MPOs will present information on planning activities each year to the other MPO's board at least on an annual basis.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Coordination of the Transportation Planning Activities Between the
El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization and the
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

I. Background and Purpose

- A. The Governor approved changes to the planning boundaries of El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (EPMPO) and the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization, now Mesilla Valley Planning Organization (MVMPO), within Doña Ana County, New Mexico on November 30, 2009. The update of the El Paso Urbanized Area (EP UZA), released September 27, 2012, extended the EP UZA into the MVMPO Planning Area generally containing the unincorporated community of Berino.
- A.B. Additionally, several planning and infrastructure initiatives within the EPMPO Planning Area are of concern to all communities within Doña Ana County. The areas that are impacted are generally in and around the cities of Anthony and Sunland Park and the unincorporated communities of Santa Teresa and Chaparral. This area will be referenced as Southern Doña Ana County.
- B.C. The purpose of this agreement is to provide the framework for the responsibilities of the EPMPO and MVMPO in regard to federally mandated planning, programming and funding for a portion of the ~~El Paso Urbanized Area~~EP UZA within Doña Ana County, New Mexico.

II. General Points of Understanding and Agreement

- A. A. ~~The MVMPO accepts the authority for the planning, programming and reporting of transportation related activities for the portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County~~the Mesilla Valley MPO. The geographic area of responsibility is [we need to include the Section Lines/Township description] ... and will be referred to as Berino.
- B. The MVMPO will address all federal and state requirements for the Berino portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County.
- BC. The MVMPO will address all federal and state requirements for the Berino portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County. The EPMPO retains the authority for the planning, programming and reporting of transportation related activities for the portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County but outside the MVMPO Planning Area.
- D. The EPMPO will address all federal and state requirements for the Southern Doña Ana County portion of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County.
- CE. EPMPO and MVMPO agree that staffs of both MPOs will meet as needed to review progress of planning efforts, to discuss key findings from program activities, and to discuss

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.75"

the scope, plans and implementation of activities in coordination with New Mexico Department of Transportation.

- DF. This agreement will be reviewed when either agency identifies the need for a review and at a minimum, when the United States Census Bureau designates and updates urbanized area boundaries.

III. Specific Points of Understanding and Agreement

A. MPO Boundary

1. EPMPPO and MVMPO recognize that Berino is part of the El Paso Urbanized Area within Doña Ana County and that Berino is within the MVMPO Boundary.
2. Berino will be represented in the MVMPO's travel demand model. Current and forecast demographic data will be captured in traffic analysis zones.

B. Long Range Transportation Plans

1. ~~1.~~ The MVMPO accepts the responsibility for the long range planning and programming needs of the Berino within Doña Ana County.
2. ~~The EPMPPO retains the responsibility for the long range planning and programming needs of the Southern Doña Ana County portion within Doña Ana County.~~
2. The long range transportation plan will be developed consistent with 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450 and ~~MVMPO's~~ policies and practices of each MPO.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"

C. Transportation Improvement Program

1. ~~1.~~ The MVMPO accepts the responsibility for programming projects in the El Paso urbanized area within the ~~defined geographic area~~ Berino portion in accordance with 23 CFR 450 and assures that applicable funds are spent on projects and programs that improve the transportation system.
2. ~~The EPMPPO retains the responsibility for programming projects in the El Paso urbanized area within Southern Doña Ana County in accordance with 23 CFR 450 and assures that applicable funds are spent on projects and programs that improve the transportation system.~~
- 2.3. To help ensure continuity of federal and state funds, both EPMPPO and MVMPO ~~MPO~~ agree to abide by the methodology and process used to allocate funds to the respective MPOs.
34. The Transportation Improvement Program will be developed consistent with the MVMPO's policies and practices.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 1"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 1", Tab stops: Not at 1"

D. Unified Planning Work Program

1. The MVMPO accepts the responsibility for programming planning studies in the Berino portion within Doña Ana County.
2. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to abide by the methodology and process currently used to allocate federal transportation planning funds to the respective MPOs.
3. The Unified Planning Work Program will be developed consistent with 23 CFR 450 and MVMPO's policies and practices.

E. Other Planning Activities

1. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to work together to identify the need for studies and multi-modal projects that abut and/or crosses the EPMPO and MVMPO planning area boundary.
2. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to willingly address urban area boundary issues.
3. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to cooperatively develop and maintain a functional classification of public roads abutting the planning areas. This process will be completed using the Federal Functional Classification System guidelines.
4. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to exchange/share information of regional significance. Information will include, but not be limited, to studies, travel surveys, GIS data, and traffic data, and demographic information.
5. EPMPO and MVMPO agree to host a joint public meeting outlining current and future planning activities identified in the UPWPs, MTPs, and TIPs each year, or as deemed necessary. The format of this meeting may be, but not limited to, a joint meeting of the Policy Boards or their respective Executive Committee, an informational or open house meeting hosted by staff of both MPOs held in a location convenient to the residents of the area.
6. In addition to the joint public meeting outlined above: MVMPO staff shall present, at least yearly, a report on its planning activities in the area to the EPMPO Transportation Policy Board.
7. In addition to the joint public meeting outlined above: EPMPO staff shall present, at least yearly, a report on its planning activities in the area to the MVMPO Policy Committee.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 11, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

6.3 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Resolution 14-10 approving the proposed TIP Amendments

TIP Amendment Spreadsheet

Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planner

Email from Angie Guerrero, Doña Ana County

DISCUSSION:

On May 8, 2013, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00100	2014	NMDOT	I-25 Missouri Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction/Widening & Addition of Auxiliary Lane	Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8
G100030	2015 & 2016	Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs Roads	Unpaved Section of Both Roadways	Road Reconstruction – Pave unpaved sections	\$610,000 in FY2014 for design, \$5,950,000 in FY2015 for construction, \$3,220,000 in FY2016 for construction, \$828,000 County Contribution

LC00140	2017	US 70	Intersection with 17 th St.	New Traffic Signals and intersection improvements	New Project
LC00210	2014 & 2015	Goathill Rd	At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (east of Dona Ana Rd, north of Las Cruces)	Design and Install new lights and gates at crossing	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$220,000 in FY2015 for construction
LC00220	2014 & 2015	NM 226	At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (west of intersection with Berino Rd)	Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$290,000 in FY2015 for construction

This amendment will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 14-10

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2014-2019 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, preparation of a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.324) ; and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federally funded and regionally significant transportation-related projects within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee adopted the FY 2014-2019 TIP on May 8, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the NMDOT and Doña Ana County have requested amendments to the FY 2014-2019 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program to be approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I)

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's Fiscal Year 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

(II)

THAT the Mesilla Valley MPO's Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit "B", attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved

(III)

THAT staff is directed to take appropriate and legal actions to implement this Resolution.

DONE and APPROVED this 11th day of June, 2014.

APPROVED:

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Garrett	
Vice Chair Bernal	
Councillor Pedroza	
Councillor Small	
Councillor Sorg	
Commissioner Hancock	
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez	
Mayor Barraza	
Trustee Flores	
Mr. Doolittle	

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

CN	FY	Route	Termini	Scope	Funds listed on TIP	Project total	Change
LC00100	2014	I-25	Missouri Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction/Widening & Addition of Auxiliary Lane	\$13,800,000	\$13,800,000	Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8
G100030	2015 & 2016	Baylor Canyon & Dripping Springs Roads	Unpaved section of both roadways	Roadway Reconstruction- Pave unpaved sections	\$610,000	\$9,780,000	\$610K in FY2014 for design, \$5,950,000 in FY2015 for const, \$3,220,000 in FY2016 for const, \$828,000 County contribution
LC00140	2017	US 70	At intersection with 17th St.	New traffic signal and intersection improvements	\$0	\$750,000	New project
LC00210	2014 & 2015	Goathill Rd	At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (East of Dona Ana Road, North of LC)	Design & Install new lights and gates at crossing	\$0	\$250,000	\$30K in FY2014 for design, \$220K in FY2015 for construction
LC00220	2014 & 2015	NM 226	At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (West of int with Berino Rd)	Deisgn and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates	\$0	\$320,000	\$30K in FY2014 for design, \$290K in FY2015 for construction

Qn	I símsr'Á W'ús a j ba 5hÇ W'ús a j I símsr'Á lÇÁÇ j l
{sC	i s' r' s' l' r' Á a Á a
Q	! r' r' s' Ö i ' n' Á
{j L' s' r' Ç	Qt ! s' r' s' C
! ÇÁ s' C	Ç a j Qt ! s' r' s' C s' l

Daar ñn-! r' r' s' Ö

/ Á Foj s' r' s' ÁQt ! s' r' s' CÄ Á Á' G- Ç s' j t ! / Ç / Á r t / s' s' G- l o a j
r' Á s' r' s' Ç s' Á Á' r' C s' ÁÇÁ s' r' l' r' s' Á l' s' CÄ LÁ r' j s' C

LÁ r' s' i j s' l' Ç- Ç o j Ç a z' l' r' s' Qt ! s' r' s' CÄ Á r' r' C s' l' o l' Ç j l' G- j r' l' G- C s' / s' CÄ Ç s' r' n' Á r' l
s' r' s' C s' ba 5hÇ W'Á j r' s' Á Á' l' C r' s' s' l' s' r' C s' l' Ç a z' w' l' n' a l l' l' Ç s' F Ö l' s' Ö a n' l' l' Ç a j
Ç a j o j a z' C s' l' s' r' s' C Á r' s' l' C s' a e a t h L a j r' Á n' s' l' Á r' l' Á Ç a j o s' z a r' Ö Á r' j Ç l' C s' F Á r' s' Á s' r' s' r'
l' G- C s' Qt

t s' r' s' C s' l' l' Ç a j Á s' Á F i j j s' l' G- l

Ç l' Á l' l' l'

Jolene Herrera
 Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
 NMDOT South Region Design
 750 N Solano Dr
 Las Cruces, NM 88001
 O: (575) 525-7358
 C: (575) 202-4698

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Subject: TIP Amendments
Attachments: FY2014 TIP Amendment 4.xls

Good morning Andrew,

Can you please include a TIP Amendment as an action item on the upcoming BPAC, TAC, and PC meetings? You can include this email and the attached spreadsheet as backup documentation.

I am requesting this out of cycle TIP Amendment to add the construction funds to the Central Federal Lands project. The NMDOT Rail Bureau also just released the list of RR crossings they will be working on in FY2014 and FY2015; 2 of these projects are in the MVMPO boundaries and cannot move forward until they are amended into the TIP.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N Solano Dr
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O: (575) 525-7358
C: (575) 202-4698

From: Angie Guerrero <angieg@donaanacounty.org>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 10:25 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Robert Armijo; Tom Murphy
Subject: RE: Dripping Springs Rd

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Yes, I apologize for not getting this information to you yesterday. The non-federal match at this time is coming from capital outlay funds.

The following is the breakdown of the funds for the Baylor Canyon/Dripping Springs project:

13-1836 \$250,000 for Baylor Canyon.
13-1838 \$100,000 for Dripping Springs
14-2054 \$828,000 for the whole project

This is a total of \$1,178,000 going towards the required 14.6% non-federal match. I don't have the total project amount but I can get it to you on Tuesday when I am back at the office. If you need it sooner I can probably call and get it to you today if you have a deadline.

Let me know.
Angie

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: [Andrew Wray](#)
Sent: 5/23/2014 10:12 AM
To: [Angie Guerrero](#)
Cc: [Robert Armijo](#); [Tom Murphy](#)
Subject: RE: Dripping Springs Rd

Ms. Guerrero,

I just wanted to follow up with you regarding the financial information for the County's portion of the Dripping Springs project.

Thanks.

From: Robert Armijo [<mailto:robertar@donaanacounty.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:59 AM
To: Angie Guerrero
Cc: Andrew Wray
Subject: RE: Dripping Springs Rd

Angie,

Please coordinate with Andrew and get him the information he needs.

Thanks,
Robert

From: Andrew Wray [<mailto:awray@las-cruces.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:37 AM
To: Robert Armijo
Cc: Tom Murphy; Albert Casillas
Subject: Dripping Springs Rd
Importance: High

Hi Robert,

At the BPAC meeting last night, it was brought to the attention of staff that there is a Doña Ana County portion to the Dripping Springs paving project lead by Central Federal Lands.

We need to have the information for the county portion of the project as soon as possible for us to include in our TIP. What we specifically need is the financial information regarding this project.

Thanks.

Andrew Wray
Transportation Planner
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
P.O. Box 20000
Las Cruces, NM 88004
(575) 528-3070

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 11, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Camino Real Consortium/Regional Leadership Consortium Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

At the May 2014 meeting, the Policy Committee requested there be a discussion item at the June meeting regarding the future participation of the Mesilla Valley MPO in the Camino Real Consortium/Regional Leadership Consortium after the depletion of the grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 11, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM:

7.2 Committee Briefing, State Policies and Procedures Manual

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

This will be a briefing on the State Policies and Procedures Manual.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 11, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

7.3 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Draft of the Transportation and Safety Management Plan

DISCUSSION:

In June 2010 the MPO adopted the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) – Transport 2040. Among the implementation strategies outlined in Transport 2040 is the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan (TASM Plan). It is designed as the first step in implementation of coordinated asset management of regional transportation infrastructure.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF June 5, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

8.0 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications

ACTION REQUESTED:

None, this item is for informational purposes only.

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

TIP Amendment Report

Email from Michael Bartholomew, RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator

DISCUSSION:

On May 8, 2013, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The following administrative modifications have been performed:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
TL00010	2014-2019	RoadRUNNER Transit	RoadRUNNER Transit Operations	Operating Assistance	Increase in apportionment to \$1,554,775
TL00013	2014-2019	RoadRUNNER Transit	RoadRUNNER Transit Operations	Capital Projects	Increase in apportionment to \$365,660

This amendment will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

From: Michael Bartholomew
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 9:13 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Tom Murphy; Lisa Murphy
Subject: STIP question
Attachments: NMDOT Transit_STIP official.pdf; NMDOT Transit_STIP Transit.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Andrew – I have a question on the STIP.

When I request the adjustment for the Section 5307 funding, I looked at only the official STIP on the NMDOT website. This only shows the one 5307 project TL00010.

However there is also the Transit STIP on the NMDOT website which shows two 5307 projects – one for operating and one for Capital – TL00010 (operating) and TL00013 (capital). Is TL00013 actually in the STIP too since it shows in the tTransit STIP, or is it not since it is not in the official Official STIP?

If TL00013 is officially in the STIP, I need to request a slightly different adjustment based I what I need to request in the grant:

TL00010 would be \$1,554,775 FTA, \$1,554,775 local, \$3,109,550 total (this is for operating projects)
TL00013 would be \$365,660 FTA, \$76,521 local, \$442,181 total (this is for capital projects)
These combined projects reflect the \$1,920,435 Section 5307 apportionment.

If all of the FY14 Section 5307 apportionment needs to go under only TL00010, it would need to show:
\$1,920,435 FTA, \$1,631,296 local, \$3,551,731

What is the best way to reflect this funding in the STIP?

Also just FYI, the link from the MPO website to the NMDOT STIP (under documents) seems to be a bad link.

Mike Bartholomew, CCTM
RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator
City of Las Cruces, NM

Phone: (575) 541-2500
Fax: (575) 541-2733

It is the mission of RoadRUNNER Transit to provide safe, dependable and convenient transportation services to the citizens of Las Cruces.