



**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://mvmmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**AMENDED AGENDA**

The following is the Agenda for a special meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **August 13, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **Las Cruces Council Chambers**, 700 N. Main Street, 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. \*June 11, 2014 \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_  
6.1. Resolution 14-11: A Resolution Adopting the Mesilla Valley MPO Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan \_\_\_\_\_ **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 Doña Ana County, postponed from the June 2014 meeting \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_  
7.1. Transit Performance Measures \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**  
7.2. NMDOT updates \_\_\_\_\_ **NMDOT Staff**  
7.3. Advisory Committee Updates \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**

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

3  
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning  
5 Organization Policy Committee meeting which was held June 11, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at Dona Ana  
6 County Commission Chambers, 845 N. Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

7  
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**     Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)  
9   Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)  
10    Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)  
11    Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)  
12    Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla) via phone  
13    Councillor Nathan Small (CLC)  
14    Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)  
15    Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)

16  
17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:**     Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)  
18    Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)

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

24  
25 **OTHERS PRESENT:**     Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
26    Denise Weston, Bohannon-Huston  
27    Jennifer Hill, Bohannon-Huston

28  
29 **1.        CALL TO ORDER**

30  
31 Commissioner Garrett called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

32  
33 **2.        CONFLIC OF INTEREST INQUIRY-- No conflicts of interest**

34  
35 **3.        PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

36  
37 **4.        CONSENT AGENDA\***

38  
39 Mayor Barraza motioned to approve the consent agenda.

40  
41 Councilor Sorg seconded the motion.

42  
43 Garrett:        Any discussion about this? In that case would you please poll the Board?  
44    Those in favor say yes, those opposed, no. I think you're gonna poll the Board.

45  
46 Murphy:        Councilor Sorg?

1  
2 Sorg: Yes  
3  
4 Murphy: Councillor Small?  
5  
6 Small: Abstain.  
7  
8 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle?  
9  
10 Doolittle: Yes.  
11  
12 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza?  
13  
14 Pedroza: Yes.  
15  
16 Murphy: Mayor Barraza?  
17  
18 Barraza: Yes.  
19  
20 Murphy: Trustee Flores? (No response)  
21  
22 Garrett: Trustee are you on the phone? (No response) Okay, well she's not on the  
23 phone.  
24  
25 Murphy: And Commissioner Garrett?  
26  
27 Garrett: Yes.  
28  
29 Motion passes, vote 6-0 (1 Committee member abstained, 1 Committee member via  
30 telephone, no response to vote, 2 Committee members absent)  
31  
32 Garrett: And if I could let's go back and also get a quorum, if you'll call the roll and before  
33 we do that, I should say that Trustee Flores was planning on calling in and I  
34 would like to ask if there's any objection to her participating by phone.  
35  
36 No objections.  
37  
38 Small: And I would move, do you need a motion?  
39  
40 Garrett: We haven't had a quorum established yet. We'll proceed then there's no  
41 objections.  
42  
43 Murphy: Councillor Sorg?  
44  
45 Sorg: Yes, here.  
46

1 Murphy: Councillor Small?  
2  
3 Small: Here.  
4  
5 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle?  
6  
7 Doolittle: Here.  
8  
9 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza?  
10  
11 Pedroza: Here.  
12  
13 Murphy: Mayor Barraza?  
14  
15 Barraza: Here.  
16  
17 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett  
18  
19 Garrett: Here. Trustee Flores are you on the phone yet? (No response). Does  
20 somebody have a telephone?  
21  
22 Barraza: Mr. Chair, where is the phone? Where is she calling into?  
23  
24 Audio Staff: She was on the phone earlier and I don't know what happened. The phone  
25 says it's still connected.  
26  
27 Barraza: Is it this phone that's right there?  
28  
29 Audio Staff: No, no, it's through the intercom system. So I don't know what happened. I'm  
30 waiting for her to call back, but the indicator says she's still on the phone.  
31  
32 Garrett: Mayor do you....  
33  
34 Barraza: Mr. Chair?  
35  
36 Garrett: Yes.  
37  
38 Barraza: I just want to say, she participated also in Monday night's meeting via phone  
39 and we were having bad connections.  
40  
41 Garrett: Okay. That is what it is.  
42  
43 Barraza: She's in Mexico.  
44  
45 Garrett: We'll hope that she can, we can connect in with her. Thank you.  
46

1 Barraza: Mr. Chair, do we need Trustee Flores to participate to have a quorum?  
2  
3 Garrett: I don't believe so.  
4  
5 Murphy: We have all jurisdictions represented and we have at least five people here, we  
6 have six.  
7  
8 Barraza: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
9  
10 Murphy: That might be her.  
11  
12 Garrett: So we're good with the quorum.

13  
14 **5. \*APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

15  
16 **5.1 \*May 14, 2014 – minutes approved under the Consent Agenda vote.**  
17

18 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

19  
20 **6.1 Resolution 14-08: A Resolution Adopting the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Unified**  
21 **Planning Work Program (UPWP)**  
22

23 Garrett: We have three action items, and the first action item is Resolution 14-08: A  
24 Resolution Adopting the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program  
25 (UPWP). Mr. Murphy.  
26

27 Tom Murphy gave a presentation.  
28

29 Barraza: Mr. Chair, excuse me. I'm sorry. I don't have a copy of what you're talking and  
30 I don't think Councillor Pedroza does either.  
31

32 Garrett: This was separate from the packet that we normally get.  
33

34 Murphy: It was in the same email.  
35

36 Garrett: Oh. I, when I get this stuff, I don't look at the emails.  
37

38 Barraza: I'm in the same boat.  
39

40 Garrett: So any copies you've got would be appreciated.  
41

42 Barraza: I think more of the Board needs copies, Orlando.  
43

44 Garrett: I think what we're saying is we don't have a copy of the Unified Planning Work  
45 Program.  
46

1 Murphy: I do not have extra copies of the agenda. I can pass out the copy that I'm going  
2 off of and I have it on the screen here.  
3  
4 Sorg: On the screen is good enough for me.  
5  
6 Barraza: That will be fine. It's just that on the packet it says the draft copy was going to  
7 be provided at the meeting.  
8  
9 Murphy: Oh.  
10  
11 Barraza: On the agenda, on our packet.  
12  
13 Murphy: I included it in the email, so I kind of forgot what I wrote.  
14  
15 Barraza: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
16  
17 Murphy: So where I started was, we added the work product for the urban sustainability  
18 accelerator. I'll allow you to read that, give you a minute or so.  
19  
20 Garrett: Are we ready to move on? Ok.  
21  
22 Flores: What page are we on? Are we on 24 or 25 now?  
23  
24 Murphy: We went back to starting on 26.  
25  
26 Flores: Okay, 26 of the.....  
27  
28 Murphy: Of the UPWP. Now I'm gonna scroll up to page 24 to take a look at the Regional  
29 Leadership Consortium.  
30  
31 Flores: Okay.  
32  
33 Murphy: And for the rest of the Committee's knowledge, I did receive some comments  
34 from Trustee Flores via email. They are not incorporated into this but those  
35 were basic editing ones. I don't think they changed substantially, so I think  
36 staff's got the latitude to go ahead and make those changes prior to transmitting  
37 to the Department of Transportation.  
38  
39 Garrett: Mr. Murphy, question about this. Is this the end of, the bottom of this, what we  
40 see on screen is the end of this statement, right?  
41  
42 Murphy: Yes.  
43  
44 Garrett: This item? Because part of the discussion had to do with the fact that the  
45 consortium is intended to continue on and beyond the HUD grant, and so what  
46 we were looking for was an indication of continued participation. Now that

1 might be contingent on an item we have listed under the discussion in terms of  
2 our being involved with this, but to the extent that that's not indicating any  
3 participation, it seems to me to be an inadequate expression of our interest in  
4 that regional effort.  
5  
6 Murphy: Okay. Would it work if I added a third product on the chart and I'm trying to  
7 think of a good label for it, but  
8  
9 Garrett: You could say "continued participation with regional consortium in planning  
10 issues".  
11  
12 Murphy: Okay.  
13  
14 Garrett: Yeah, I think the idea of having that as a separate line because Viva Dona Ana  
15 is funded. That's the name that we've given to the HUD grant.  
16  
17 Murphy: The main purpose for the table with the X's in it is for the funded amounts for  
18 FHWA to see where, where staff is spending its PL time, so I can put "continue  
19 participation in regional planning efforts" and then I can just continue those  
20 boxes across the rest of fiscal 15 and then into fiscal 16.  
21  
22 Garrett: Would that be alright with everyone? Okay and I think that that's because HUD  
23 is part of this, or DOT is part of this overall HUD consortium at the federal level  
24 in terms of regional planning. That should be something that would be reflected  
25 I think.  
26  
27 Murphy: That makes sense, staff would participate in there but I see the benefit in  
28 labeling it and having it in the work program as a statement.  
29  
30 Garrett: Any other comments?  
31  
32 Barraza: Mr. Chair?  
33  
34 Garrett: Yes ma'am.  
35  
36 Barraza: Yes, I do have a question. I'm sorry I had to step out to take that phone call,  
37 but on the regional leadership consortium, and that's the area we're speaking  
38 about, am I correct?  
39  
40 Garrett: Yes.  
41  
42 Murphy: Yes.  
43  
44 Barraza: Okay and on the source of funds it's says "local funds for match and local non-  
45 matching funds". The local funds for match, is that in addition to what we

1 currently pay the MPO or funding through MPO? Would that be an additional  
2 amount for each community?  
3  
4 Murphy: The local match for funds is the local match that we have to pay the MPO  
5 budget. So my salary, Andrew's salary, Chowdhury's salary is part local match,  
6 part grant money. So.  
7  
8 Barraza: Okay.  
9  
10 Murphy: It pays, pays for both. I think the local non-matching funds just is really a  
11 statement that, you know, each of the participants and the Town participates,  
12 the County participates, the City and they're paying, they're paying staff and  
13 other expenses which are not being used to match my funding. So a good deal  
14 of Dona Ana County's planning is involved in this and those are local resources  
15 going towards this effort but they don't count towards the planning, the PL  
16 match of the MPO, but it is still part of the project.  
17  
18 Barraza: And this is all for Viva Dona Ana, correct?  
19  
20 Murphy: Yes. That's to show that, essentially, the short story is that this is, this particular  
21 item in our work program is larger than just the MPO staff.  
22  
23 Garrett: Very good. I mean are we ready to move on? Mr. Doolittle do you have  
24 something else?  
25  
26 Murphy: And then just  
27  
28 Garrett: Hang on just a second. Did you have another?  
29  
30 Doolittle: I just have a few small things. I just noticed as I was going through, under  
31 responsibilities, 4.1 for instance. Not 4.1, sorry 4.5 it shows MPO staff and then  
32 several periods. 4.6 staff is misspelled, I think 5.1 or 5.2 it also has staff with  
33 several periods, so there's just some formatting issues.  
34  
35 Murphy: Okay, we will go through those and take care of the formatting issues. And  
36 then to kind of to finish up on, we have two corridor plans on here, with not  
37 much in the schedule for them. We're currently in negotiation with the  
38 consultant on that one. We'll adjust the UPWP when, once we have contract  
39 in place. Since last month we also added the budget numbers for fiscal year  
40 2015 and this includes monies that are in this year's budget that I'm expecting  
41 to carry over. Most because of the corridor studies that makes it a big chunk.  
42 So we're looking at a total budget for FY 15 of \$662,000, and then in FY 15  
43 we'll go back to our normal apportionment that we get each year, which will  
44 come to a total of \$322,000. If we, if there are other opportunities for special  
45 studies that come up, we'll amend it into the two year UPWP at that time. I

1 think that concludes my presentation. I'll stand for any questions, and staff is  
2 looking for an approval on this. Thank you.  
3  
4 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Murphy, any questions or comments on my right, comments or  
5 questions on the left? Alright, I would like to entertain a motion to approve.  
6  
7 Small: Mr. Chair, it seems like there's perhaps additional input?  
8  
9 Murphy: I was just wondering if Trustee Flores was back with us, if she has a  
10  
11 Flores: I am, I'm back with you, I just didn't have any other comments to make, besides  
12 the ones that I had already sent to you.  
13  
14 Murphy: And I received those and incorporated those and I know that at least you were  
15 copied on that but I can forward those comments to the rest of the Board as  
16 well.  
17  
18 Garrett: I think that will be good, fine. Thank you for checking on that. And I would now  
19 entertain a motion to approve Resolution Number 14-08 adopting the FY2015-  
20 FY2016 Unified Planning Work Program.  
21  
22 Small: So moved.  
23  
24 Barraza: I second.  
25  
26 Garrett: The motion was made by Councillor Small and seconded by Mayor Barraza.  
27 Any further discussion, any public input? In that case, would you poll the  
28 Board? Those in favor say yes, those opposed say no.  
29  
30 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez?  
31  
32 Benavidez: I abstain because I just walked in five minutes ago.  
33  
34 Murphy: Councillor Sorg?  
35  
36 Sorg: Yes  
37  
38 Murphy: Councillor Small?  
39  
40 Small: Yes.  
41  
42 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle?  
43  
44 Doolittle: Yes.  
45  
46 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Pedroza: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza?

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores?

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: And Commissioner Garrett?

Garrett: Yes.

Motion Passes 7-0; (2 Committee members absent, 1 Committee Member abstained).

Garrett: And I would like to recognize that Commissioner Benavidez joined us. Thank you.

**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**

Garrett: We will now move on to Action Item 6.2, which is 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 and my understanding is that you are not actually looking for action this time, is that correct?

Murphy: No sir, Mr. Chair, I have not formally heard back from the director of El Paso MPO. I have heard via NMDOT that he is okay with it but I haven't heard. He is fine with the changes that we have proposed and, but I haven't heard that formally so. I want to go ahead and just kind of step through what we have, the changes since you saw this document last month. This will be on page, okay this did not get page numbered in the packets but it's the document Memorandum of Understanding. So we added, I added language about the planning and infrastructure initiatives in the El Paso Planning Boundary and that they're of concern to this Policy Committee. That's under Background Purpose Number A. Under General Points of Understanding and Agreement, we added that the MVMPO will address all federal and state requirements for the Berino portion of the El Paso Urbanized within Dona Ana County and that El Paso retains the authority for planning, program and reporting of transportation related activities for the portion that's within their, or in Dona Ana County but outside the MVMPO boundaries. Again on the, under Item 3, Specific Points of Understanding and Agreement, Long Range Transportation

1 Plans, El Paso retains the responsibility for Southern Dona Ana County. They  
2 retain it for programming and under the TIP sections. Then we have, we  
3 expanded upon the joint public meeting. We identified that the format of the  
4 meeting may be a joint meeting of the policy boards or their respective  
5 executive committees and informal or open house meeting hosted by staff of  
6 both MPOs held in a location convenient to the residents and then also, we  
7 added that each staff will on at least a yearly basis present reports on their  
8 activities within those areas to the other board.  
9

10 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Murphy, comments on this document, on my right, on my left?  
11 Trustee Flores?  
12

13 Flores: No, no comments.  
14

15 Garrett: Let me, I appreciate the overall direction that you took, which is consistent with  
16 the conversation that we had at our last meeting. The question that I have as  
17 much for the Policy Committee as anything else, is the degree to which we  
18 want to have our interests heard in a timely way. Maybe it was just the fact that  
19 we were looking in this meeting at the Unified Planning Work Program that I  
20 realized that the work that's done by the MPOs is on a very regimented  
21 schedule and that there's a cycle that all the stuff goes through in terms of the  
22 work plans, in terms of the long range transportation plans, and in terms of the  
23 project requests and things that go in and if we're not trying to align our input  
24 and they're providing us with information into their decision making, which the  
25 way that this is set up, they retain full authority over long range plans and  
26 putting together the transportation improvement program, we can really miss  
27 critical opportunities to have our concerns heard and so I think rather than  
28 simply saying it's gonna be once a year, I actually think I would probably leave  
29 the last part of the document intact, but another way, potentially, of addressing  
30 this is under section 3B and C, is to add language that makes it explicit that  
31 what our desires are in terms of review and of comment. If I could, just as a  
32 suggestion, under Long Range Transportation Plans, which again is section  
33 3B, subsection 2, right after that, if we might insert something like "The El Paso  
34 MPO will provide timely opportunity for the Mesilla Valley MPO to review long  
35 range transportation planning and program needs of southern Dona Ana  
36 County and will fully consider comments from the Mesilla Valley MPO in  
37 preparation of their long range transportation plans. I think that's sort of what  
38 we're hoping for, but this would be a more explicit way of saying make sure we  
39 know and we have the presentations on this, so we can do our action and get  
40 the information down to them for their action, any thoughts in terms of that  
41 proposal? Yes, Councillor Pedroza.  
42

43 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I think that goes along with my thinking as well, because  
44 whatever the historic reasons for having given El Paso MPO jurisdiction over  
45 certain parts of New Mexico, and I understand that that's happened in many,  
46 many different arenas. We are now possibly at the point where we are no

1 longer in diapers, and so yeah, we're not saying "hey you guys get out of New  
2 Mexico", not at all, but certainly make it clear that we would like our thoughts  
3 and comments considered and not simply say okay, we'll divide it up, this part  
4 of Berino is yours, the whole rest of it is ours, and we'll tell each other once in  
5 while or once a year. So I don't know if Commissioner Garrett will want to re-  
6 word or whether you already have the wording for what he proposed as a  
7 change, and if you do, well then has it already been made as a motion?  
8

9 Garrett: No. If I could, what I read is actually the language that I would propose to insert.  
10 I think that I would just add one other insertion, and that is under 3C, subsection  
11 2, "The El Paso MPO retains the responsibility for programming projects in the  
12 El Paso Urbanized area, within southern Dona Ana County, in accordance with  
13 36CFR450, and ensures that applicable funds are spent on projects and  
14 programs that improve that transportation system." And I would propose  
15 adding language based on full consideration of input from the Mesilla Valley  
16 MPO and part of what I've got in mind is that these are the really two big  
17 documents that drive projects and keep things moving, and if we're able to do  
18 our work in a timely way it means that this information would actually be  
19 available to the representatives from New Mexico who are on the El Paso MPO  
20 and it would perhaps carry a little more weight, so that Mr. Doolittle, Dr. Garcia,  
21 the people from Sunland Park that are on the, and is there somebody from  
22 Anthony as well?  
23

24 Wray: Yes.

25  
26 Garrett: And then we also have members, I think, from the legislature?  
27

28 Wray: We do, but the participation.

29  
30 Garrett: They don't go very often?  
31

32 Wray: Not at all.  
33

34 Garrett: But this, it seems to me that getting, if we're able to focus and provide  
35 meaningful input to those people, it might even give them a reason to go, and  
36 also to say, "look we're representing not just our small little areas, but also New  
37 Mexico and Southern New Mexico. So that's, I've been looking in this direction,  
38 so let me just this direction and I'll come back, any comments on this side  
39 relative to those suggestions? You can go on the record by turning on your  
40 mic.  
41

42 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chair. I approve, I like what you're doing here, so I'll go along  
43 with it, sure.  
44

45 Garrett: Anyone on, Mr. Doolittle?  
46

1 Doolittle: Mr. Chairman I do have a few comments. You mentioned the representation  
2 of the different entities that we have on the El Paso MPO. That's certainly an  
3 opportunity for southern Dona Ana County and those groups to voice their  
4 concerns or ideas and I hope that Tom and his staff are certainly coordinating  
5 with the El Paso MPO staff, but I don't know how much authority we have over  
6 the El Paso MPO, you know, and I hope that when there is open comment  
7 periods I hope that Tom is coming forward to us and then we can collectively  
8 submit those comments to the El Paso MPO, or I can take those comments to  
9 the MPO and share it, or even representatives. You know Dr. Garcia certainly  
10 has, is a representative of Dona Ana County, some responsibility and  
11 opportunities to voice concerns for Dona Ana County. I'm just a little bit  
12 concerned about what the language is gonna say and how it's gonna be read,  
13 over what authority we as Mesilla Valley MPO have over El Paso MPO.  
14

15 Garrett: Can I answer that question, and then go to you, Councillor? The language I  
16 am proposing is that in this agreement that it would state that they have to  
17 agree to do this. The El Paso MPO will provide timely opportunity for the  
18 Mesilla Valley MPO to review long range transportation planning and  
19 programming needs of southern Dona Ana County and will consider comments  
20 from the Mesilla Valley MPO in preparation of their long range transportations  
21 plans. What I'm more interested in, than anything else, is being specific that in  
22 terms of coordination, that we want to make sure that we are having input on  
23 these two particular pieces of work that are done on an annual basis. They're  
24 simply agreeing to make sure we have the information in advance and agreeing  
25 to consider our input.  
26

27 Doolittle: I guess one question I have for Tom is, isn't' that, the coordination between the  
28 MPOs, is that part of y'all's responsibility as staff? I think that we are  
29 guaranteed opportunity to provide public comment by the process itself, so I'm,  
30 it may be worth putting that in the language, but I think that opportunity is there,  
31 and then Tom's staff should come to us and say here is the public comment  
32 period for these items. That process and that opportunity has to be given to us  
33 as a board.  
34

35 Garrett: But that's also for everybody, and I think what we're trying to do is use this  
36 agreement to have focused attention on this particular kind of relationship and;  
37 hopefully, we'll be able to see through the annual meeting and through the  
38 annual work, I don't think that right now there's a sense that the two MPOs  
39 need to be planning together, actually. I mean, you know the roads kind of run  
40 into each other at some point. I think what we're trying to do is to make that  
41 dialogue between these two MPOs more robust and consider more of the other  
42 kinds of things that we're interested in. I don't know that this, this doesn't have  
43 any particular consequences if this agreement is not followed. I mean it's, we're  
44 really trying to set up the intent of communication and that it's more and better  
45 and specific to us.  
46

1 Doolittle: I tend to agree, I just hope that we're not defining what Tom's staff should be  
2 doing as part of their normal duties in some sort of an agreement with the El  
3 Paso MPO. So I think once we get the language or once we get the draft  
4 finalized based on everybody's input, I think it would be worth us reviewing and  
5 maybe commenting on it, before we send it to the El Paso MPO. Because I,  
6 the way I understood your comment earlier, this is already sent, been sent to  
7 Michael at El Paso MPO for review, correct?  
8

9 Murphy: Yes. Yeah, Michael did the first draft and then these are the changes I proposed  
10 back upon our review of it.  
11

12 Doolittle: And now we're proposing some additional comments. So maybe what we  
13 could ask Tom to do is, is incorporate the comments that we have into a draft  
14 for us to review before we send it again to Michael and then add additional  
15 comments at the next meeting or I would just like to review the entire draft  
16 before you send it over to Michael.  
17

18 Garrett: And it sounds as though you also would like to have some input from the Mesilla  
19 Valley MPO staff about what they would envision, how they would envision the  
20 operation actually happening.  
21

22 Doolittle: And ultimately what Tom's staff's responsibility is to us. I mean if that is  
23 specifically one of Tom's staff responsibility to come to us with these open  
24 comment periods, that's Tom's responsibility, not the El Paso MPO's  
25 responsibility type of concern that I have and I don't know, I haven't reviewed  
26 the full responsibilities of Tom and his staff. I just worry a little bit if it's his  
27 responsibility to come to us with those notifications. Maybe we need to put that  
28 responsibility on Tom and not on an agreement between the El Paso MPO and  
29 this Policy Board. I think it's worth putting it in, maybe the language needs to  
30 be tweaked a little bit.  
31

32 Garrett: And I would simply say that I was anticipating with this language, that the El  
33 Paso MPO was accepting a responsibility for making sure we had the  
34 information in a timely way, and I'm assuming that that would come through  
35 staff. Not so much that our staff would be birddogging their staff. Councillor  
36 Pedroza you had a question, a comment?  
37

38 Pedroza: I did. I wonder sometimes at the meetings I learn new things that I think I should  
39 have been told before. For instance I didn't realize that Dr. Garcia was a  
40 member of the El Paso MPO. I never thought to ask him, but it's totally news  
41 to me.  
42

43 Garrett: We're talking here about Commissioner Garcia.  
44

45 Pedroza: I'm sorry.  
46

1 Garrett: I realized when I said that that there was a potential of misunderstanding.  
2  
3 Pedroza: Okay because I was very startled. I said wait a minute I should have known  
4 that, okay, thank you. Who else from New Mexico is on the El Paso MPO?  
5  
6 Doolittle: I don't know, Mayor Perea from Sunland Park. We have a representative from  
7 Anthony. Anthony is represented, two legislators.  
8  
9 Garrett: Didn't it used to be Representative Mary Helen Garcia?  
10  
11 Doolittle: Yes.  
12  
13 Garrett: So it will now be Representative Gomez.  
14  
15 Doolittle: Yes.  
16  
17 Garrett: That will be after, when they're sworn in.  
18  
19 Pedroza: Would it be possible to invite the New Mexico members of the El Paso MPO to  
20 meet with us informally or at a meeting just to exchange views, etc.? I think  
21 that would make me feel much more, as if in fact, there is some communication  
22 cooperation between the bodies. That's all. I would propose that or maybe  
23 make a motion that staff invite the New Mexico residents who are on the El  
24 Paso MPO to informally or formally meet with the Mesilla Valley MPO simply to  
25 get to know each other.  
26  
27 Garrett: Councillor, could I ask that the item on the table right now is a resolution relative  
28 to this MOA. We don't have an item that has to do with a motion to formalize  
29 a relationship with our, so we could add that to our August meeting.  
30  
31 Pedroza: That will be fine.  
32  
33 Garrett: If you....  
34  
35 Pedroza: Thank you, I'll withdraw the motion and bring it up in August.  
36  
37 Garrett: Okay, thank you. Councillor Small.  
38  
39 Small: Thank you Mr. Chair and thanks Mr. Murphy. It's interesting, so I guess I  
40 understand kind of, some of the background, which seems to be to maximize  
41 the seats at the planning table without over stepping authority. It seems that  
42 there is and I, from me, and obviously I'm new to this Board, which brings  
43 plusses and minuses, but it seems like with the state and locally, we do have a  
44 strong interest in maximizing as many seats at the table from a planning  
45 perspective. Easy for me to say since the planners are the ones. I guess, and  
46 I would be interested in hearing feedback if there is concern, not necessarily

1 with overstepping or usurping authority, but with how those seats at the table  
2 get apportioned. Whether there's more opportunity to review planning and  
3 more formalization or a formal process to review especially long range  
4 planning? Because it seems, again, just from the 30,000 foot perspective, what  
5 I see in the language that you proposed and the rationale behind it, is again, is  
6 to give southern New Mexico and Dona Ana County as much opportunity to be  
7 part of the planning from the El Paso MPO as I'm sure they probably have a  
8 strong interest in knowing kind of what's going on, on our side. I guess I, if  
9 there's consternation or if there's concern, not necessarily with the process but  
10 on the idea of having more involvement in that, then that would be interesting  
11 to hear and I don't have a, so yeah, I guess, and Chair if, if that kind of  
12 inaccurately puts meaning to where you were trying to go with some of your  
13 suggestions, then I apologize. But it seems to me that it really, again, just tries  
14 to give us more seats at the table, more formal opportunity for review, and  
15 formal buy-in from the El Paso MPO to include us and to include staff on,  
16 especially their long range planning.

17  
18 **Garrett:** If I could just respond briefly to that. I don't think it's about expanding the  
19 number of chairs, so to speak. It's about the timeliness and the effectiveness  
20 of the timeliness of input. What I'm really looking for here is something that's  
21 not general. That has to do with particular interest that we have in improving  
22 transportation in the southern part of the County and right now my  
23 understanding of our transportation planning for the Santa Teresa area, just as  
24 an example, that major improvements to roads there are within the purview of  
25 the El Paso MPO. Is that correct? And so that's something that the County,  
26 as a whole, is working on. It's something that benefits all of southern New  
27 Mexico and for that matter, arguably, New Mexico, and what I'm really  
28 interested in is minimizing the potential of our not providing timely information  
29 for decision making and that's really what this comes down to, is that there's a  
30 certain urgency that I'm feeling and I think when we get around the table and  
31 we talk about what's going on with, in particular truck traffic, and some of the  
32 other, the opportunities for further development in the south, we really don't  
33 want to miss a whole year cycle because we didn't know, it just didn't get our  
34 comments aligned in a proper way. I think if we do that and we're recognizing  
35 that we want to contribute in a meaningful way to what the El Paso MPO is  
36 charged with for the whole metropolitan area down there, I think that this is  
37 gonna work for everybody. But it's really just a matter of saying we want, we're  
38 going into their turf by asking for them to share information on planning and  
39 projects is really what it amounts to. We're just asking them to voluntarily time  
40 their distribution of information and consider our comments. That's my intent  
41 here.

42  
43 **Small:** Thank you, Chair. I appreciate the explanation and note kind of the urgency  
44 that you really focus on there. It makes good sense. The situation obviously  
45 needs as much coordination as possible and I think it's, you know, redundancy  
46 isn't a bad thing especially for elected officials. We could use all of it we can

1 get so I think, I guess I would look at it again being new, as does it seem to  
2 overstep bounds and by specifying; and as you point out, being specific on a  
3 couple of the points that it creates some redundancy and also creates a little  
4 bit of new ground but it's appropriate and something worthy for us to be  
5 supportive of. Thank you.  
6

7 Garrett: Thank you. Councillor Sorg, anything at this point? Commissioner Benavidez  
8 anything?  
9

10 Sorg: No.  
11

12 Benavidez: Yes, I'd like to say that the recommendation that Councillor Pedroza made  
13 regarding inviting the delegates, I guess, from New Mexico for the El Paso  
14 MPO, I think that's a wonderful idea because I've been serving on this Board  
15 for, this is my sixth year and I've never, we've never had the people from New  
16 Mexico here at this meeting and I think it would be good for them to, so they  
17 can coordinate with us as to what, what is important for the MPO and so I  
18 welcome that recommendation and I look forward to the motion that will be  
19 made in August. Thank you.  
20

21 Garrett: Thank you. Mr. Doolittle, do you have something else?  
22

23 Doolittle: I don't, but I think Jolene has some information that she would like to share,  
24 just dealing with both MPOs, if you wouldn't mind.  
25

26 Garrett: Great, certainly.  
27

28 Herrera: Good afternoon. One thing that I did want to say is that this agreement is gonna  
29 be between the two MPOs but FHWA will also be reviewing it, and I'm not sure  
30 if, I obviously haven't talked to them about the language that you're planning  
31 on including because that just came up today, but I'm not sure if some of that  
32 stuff is appropriate to put in the agreement because they're, like Trent already  
33 eluded to, there are open public comment periods. There's a process already  
34 set up, specifically for the long range plan. A lot of that is mandated by federal  
35 regulation, that kind of stuff. Specific to that planning document, basically what  
36 the El Paso MPO staff does, is they go to each one of the local governments  
37 on the New Mexico side, they have individual meetings with each one and talk  
38 about needs, future needs. That process happened two years ago for the plan  
39 that was just kind of adopted and approved this year and it won't be happening  
40 again for another four years. But I think that's the kind of stuff that maybe better  
41 communication from the staff to the board would be appropriate because it's  
42 already happening. The chance for comments is there. They come individually  
43 and asked for everybody's input and then they have, once they kind of write up  
44 the documents, they send that out as draft to the communities that they've had  
45 input from. Then they have additional public comment periods on top of that.  
46 So there are a lot of chances for people to comment.

1  
2 Garrett: Do you have a follow-up on that?  
3  
4 Doolittle: Actually I just have a question or a comment. The New Mexico participation in  
5 the El Paso MPO is minimal. So the idea of getting the representatives from  
6 the El Paso MPO to have discussions with us as a board who deals with  
7 southern Dona Ana County, I think is an excellent idea. I don't think there's  
8 fault or blame on anybody that sits on that committee, because typically if you  
9 sit in those meetings, it's a lot of TXDOT, El Paso, because they own the bulk  
10 of the money, but very little, Mayor Perea has done an excellent job  
11 representing Sunland Park. He's doing a really good job. So I think it's  
12 important that although they go and they meet with these entities, I haven't  
13 been involved with those specific meetings, I will tell you that short of the DOT  
14 and even Jolene through some of her presentations, the New Mexico side is  
15 not represented or participative in the Policy Board. Now the TAC and BPAC  
16 and those other committees that Jolene and Harold participate in, I think the  
17 involvement is much greater. So although those meetings are taking place, I'm  
18 just wondering how that information is being relayed, and are their needs or the  
19 needs of this Body that ultimately tie in to those, how that interaction is taking  
20 place. So I think getting them in here, speaking with us as a group is important.  
21  
22 Garrett: Thank you. Councillor?  
23  
24 Small: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Ms. Herrera, and thanks Mr. Doolittle. It  
25 certainly seems very good and relevant to have folks appear in person to have  
26 that dialog. Explaining kind of the intricacies, which again I think I'm in unique  
27 position, not to understand, just having come on to the Board, although having  
28 served for a while, I think my own and perhaps inaction or unfamiliarity with a  
29 lot of this, even though it has such deep importance with some of the economic  
30 future, just as one example, for the County, is a good example why I see so  
31 much good in what the Chair has proposed, the idea behind it at least, which  
32 is to deepen and formalize that integration. I think Mr. Doolittle said it well, in  
33 that there's no ascribing fault or blame. This is and again I'm a perfect textbook  
34 case because I've just come on, the more redundancy and chances that can  
35 be built into getting this information in front of folks and opportunity for comment  
36 because I think you laid out well Ms. Herrera, the process by which federal folks  
37 go to each of the entities, but I mean, gosh, even a year ago in some ways can  
38 seem like a long time and some of these very rapidly changing parts of our  
39 county, of where transportation of course is at the forefront, so again that idea  
40 that the Chair has kind of helped lead to a really good and positive discussion,  
41 is, it really makes a lot of very good sense to me knowing just how fast that  
42 things are changing and knowing perhaps the structures that are in place now  
43 are bi-annual or whatever time period but they're certainly not a time period  
44 that's responsive enough either to changes that are happening on the ground  
45 or even potentially monies that become available for transportation  
46 improvement. It certainly helped broaden my focus and if whether we strike

1 the right language now or at the next meeting, I tend to agree with the Chair  
2 that the more specific, again, within appropriate boundaries, and the better,  
3 because it creates those really good structures and but thanks very much for  
4 (inaudible) it out too.  
5  
6 Herrera: And Mr. Chair if I could just clarify.  
7  
8 Garrett: Thank you, certainly.  
9  
10 Herrera: ...one point, so the long range plans, you know they're four year documents  
11 but that doesn't mean that we can't amend them if we need to. So I mean there  
12 is opportunity to do that. It's not just, you know, like it's done, we're not looking  
13 at it for four years. Everybody knows with the growth that's happening that we  
14 probably will have to amend it, probably soon, so.  
15  
16 Sorg: Mr. Chair.  
17  
18 Garrett: Yes, Councillor Sorg.  
19  
20 Sorg: Thank you. I would add to my, to what's been commented on already and this  
21 is something I think we need to do is to have more of that communication with  
22 EPMO, MPO, and so yeah, I would agree. Whatever we can put in here, keep  
23 the communication going so that we know what's going on and they know what  
24 we thinking of and so on and so forth.  
25  
26 Pedroza: Mr. Chair.  
27  
28 Garrett: Thank you. Yes, Councillor Pedroza.  
29  
30 Pedroza: Thank you. Jolene, can I ask, I'm not sure I understood one part of what you  
31 were saying. Are you saying that some of the difficulties that we are having  
32 come because of the federal regulations?  
33  
34 Herrera: No. I don't think I would say that. I would say that, honestly, it's a lack of  
35 communication between what's happening at the staff level and what is getting  
36 filtered up to the board members. It's really where the....  
37  
38 Pedroza: Okay. So we don't need to look into the future and say what we need to do is  
39 get our federal delegation down here and tell them what needs to be fixed.  
40  
41 Herrera: No, no, I don't think it's  
42  
43 Pedroza: Thank you, I was worried about that.  
44  
45 Herrera: No.  
46

1 Garrett: I would. Thank you for everybody for this discussion. There's an important  
2 point that's been made here that has to do with the fact that the review process  
3 is already structured and what I, in addition to the urgency, the other thing that  
4 I'm seeing in terms of trying to move forward with implementation of some of  
5 the things that we're talking about with Viva Dona Ana is that we are constantly  
6 running into fragmentation. For, for the MPO in El Paso to have conversations  
7 with Sunland Park, separate from Anthony, and Anthony separate from  
8 Sunland Park, and those presumably separate from Santa Teresa, because  
9 Santa Teresa is not incorporated, or Chaparral, it, it continues to perpetuate  
10 the sense of seeing only one tiny part of the elephant and if they're gonna be  
11 working at larger systems and trying to figure out how to overcome the, the  
12 inherent fragmentation that comes because of all these different jurisdictions  
13 then we're gonna have to face this at some point kind of head on. The Camino  
14 Real Consortium and the MPOs participation in that is part of that effort of being  
15 able to deal with systems and not with just a bridge or a street that's within a  
16 particular jurisdiction. I want to suggest that, that one important addition that  
17 might be made to this document then is in the purpose, the background and  
18 purpose statement, and that would be to say that because of the fragmentation  
19 of jurisdictions in southern New Mexico that are part of the El Paso MPO, the  
20 Metropolitan area, that what we are interested in improving the communication  
21 that is part of the normal and expected public review and comment process  
22 and that we put that up front so that it's clear that that's what this is about and  
23 then really what we're trying to do is to say that the MPO is in a unique position  
24 to understand more about the systems as a whole. Not to overstep Sunland  
25 Park and Anthony but we see the systems in a different and a larger way and  
26 hopefully we're trying to get them involved and one of those entities is involved  
27 in the regional planning. But I think that's really what we're trying to deal with  
28 here is how do we make sure that the best information is available for  
29 consideration and it's so if we could incorporate a new purpose statement  
30 there, that really has to do with improving communication through the comment  
31 process and overcoming problems with fragmentation, the language I had  
32 proposed was, do you want me to read that again or does everybody got it  
33 memorized? No, okay, alright. So under 3B, under subsection 2 I'm proposing  
34 that we add something like, "The El Paso MPO will provide timely opportunity  
35 for the Mesilla Valley MPO to review long range transportation planning and  
36 program needs of southern Dona Ana County", and may we add "as part of its  
37 public comment process", "and will fully consider comments from the Mesilla  
38 Valley MPO in preparation of their long range transportation plan." That might  
39 be important simply because for one thing we're outside the boundary, in terms  
40 of, but an important outside component. Then under C, 3C, after an appendix  
41 to the existing language for 2, we'd simply add, "Based on full consideration of  
42 input from the Mesilla Valley MPO as part of the review process." So we're  
43 basically flagging it that we would like for them to acknowledge us as part of  
44 that internal, that review and comment process. Is it okay with the, the Policy  
45 Committee that that be incorporated into the draft for further consideration?  
46 Trustee Flores, did you have a comment?

1  
2 Flores: No, I just said yes.  
3  
4 Garrett: Oh, okay. Mr. Doolittle:  
5  
6 Doolittle: Mr. Chairman I do have, I guess one additional comment is I think that can go  
7 either way. I think the El Paso MPO probably needs to have, well they  
8 obviously have the opportunity to provide comment but I think there needs to  
9 be some language, both MPOs have a responsibility to each other, to provide  
10 the opportunity and to provide comment.  
11  
12 Garrett: Okay.  
13  
14 Doolittle: So maybe we can word it very similar to what we did some of the other places,  
15 where you mentioned both MPOs. If we're gonna include that language, it  
16 needs to go both ways.  
17  
18 Murphy: Yeah, I think, that was gonna be my suggestion, was that we include some  
19 reciprocity in it, that it goes both ways. I think the, your suggestion to add into  
20 the background and purpose is excellent and it speaks to it, and then I see no  
21 problem with adding the language as proposed. It's stuff that both MPOs, both  
22 MPO staff already do as a matter of following the process but I think this is just  
23 kind of highlighting it as really important to all the individuals involved in the  
24 planning process, so I think it would be, it would be a fine addition into this  
25 document.  
26  
27 Garrett: Very good. So then we would be, so the idea of reciprocity can be built into  
28 this as well, any objection to that? Okay. I mean, quite honestly I think that  
29 we have more to win or gain from that simply because of our interest in southern  
30 Dona Ana County but I think that that's both the gracious and appropriate thing  
31 to do. This also might help FHWA understand why we're trying to do this.  
32 We're trying to make the system work better. So okay, very good, any further  
33 comments on this item? Then we will, we do not need to table this or anything,  
34 I think we just carried it over or do you want to have it tabled until the August  
35 meeting?  
36  
37 Murphy: Yeah, I think if we had a motion to table it to the August meeting and I'll get that  
38 date here real quickly.  
39  
40 Barraza: Mr. Chair.  
41  
42 Garrett: Yes.  
43  
44 Barraza: If you table the item, it goes away, but if you postpone it, is it better?  
45  
46 Garrett: Yes, I'm gonna suggest we do the postponement.

1  
2 Murphy: Postpone it to August 13.  
3  
4 Garrett: Right, can I, yeah, go ahead.  
5  
6 Small: Move to postpone to August 13<sup>th</sup>.  
7  
8 Doolittle: Second.  
9  
10 Garrett: Okay and that was made by Councillor Small and seconded by Mr. Doolittle  
11 and that applies to Resolution 14-09. Any further discussion on this item, any  
12 comments from the public?  
13  
14 Doolittle: Mr. Chair.  
15  
16 Garrett: Yes.  
17  
18 Doolittle: I do have one suggestion, once we get the final draft put together, can we look  
19 at it before it's submitted to El Paso MP?  
20  
21 Garrett: Certainly.  
22  
23 Murphy: Yes.  
24  
25 Doolittle: Thank you.  
26  
27 Garrett: So we won't see that until August. Okay. Alright could you poll the Board?  
28 Those in favor say yes, those opposed no.  
29  
30 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez?  
31  
32 Benavidez: Yes.  
33  
34 Murphy: Councillor Sorg?  
35  
36 Sorg: Yes  
37  
38 Murphy: Councillor Small?  
39  
40 Small: Yes.  
41  
42 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle?  
43  
44 Doolittle: Yes.  
45  
46 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza?

1  
2 Pedroza: Yes.  
3  
4 Murphy: Mayor Barraza?  
5  
6 Barraza: Yes.  
7  
8 Murphy: Trustee Flores?  
9  
10 Flores: Yes.  
11  
12 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett?  
13  
14 Garrett: Yes. Yes. Thank you.  
15  
16 Motion Passes 8-0; (2 Committee members absent).  
17  
18 **6.3 Resolution 14-10: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation**  
19 **Improvement Program (TIP)**  
20  
21 Garrett: So we're now moving on to Action Item 6-3, 6.3, it's Resolution 14-10, a  
22 Resolution amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program.  
23  
24 Sorg: Move to approve.  
25  
26 Garrett: That's been moved to approve the Resolution, could I have, that's resolution  
27 14-10 that was made by Councillor Sorg, could I have a second?  
28  
29 Barraza: I will second.  
30  
31 Garrett: And that was seconded by Mayor Barraza. Would you proceed with the  
32 presentation?  
33  
34 Andrew Wray gave his presentation on the TIP report.  
35  
36 Garrett: Any questions about the proposed amendments to the TIP? No. I just had one  
37 that's not so much about it being on the list but my understanding is that the  
38 Baylor Canyon/Dripping Springs roads were going to have a scoping, public  
39 scoping session as part of the project. There's been public concern about  
40 paving all those roads and I've been asking this from the very beginning of the  
41 time that the County was involved and you know, requesting the money and I  
42 was assured that every time, that, yes, we're gonna have that. We're getting  
43 very close to moving forward with this and so I'm just curious.  
44  
45 Wray: Mr. Chair, I don't know anything about, I have the contact information of the  
46 person that I was told is the responsible party. He has not responded to any

1 email that I've sent to him so I, I have no information beyond what is given in  
2 the packet as far as where the project is or anything like that.  
3  
4 Garrett: Let me just say that I'm concerned about approving a project that, where I've  
5 been assured that there was going to be a public scope and component, and  
6 an opportunity for public to comment on this, and I simply can't seem to get a  
7 commitment on this and every time we're deferring it further and further into the  
8 process of moving ahead and designing it and building it. What are the  
9 implications of holding off on that?  
10  
11 Wray: I would have to defer to Ms. Herrera for a detailed, but I imagine that it might  
12 stymie the project to some extent but I'll defer to her for any further comment.  
13  
14 Herrera: Well, it would result in a partial approval of the TIP, a partial approval of the  
15 STIP and obviously I haven't had a chance to talk to Central Federal Lands but  
16 it could result in loss of the funding ultimately if they have to award those  
17 amounts in a certain fiscal year and they're not able to because of the process.  
18 That's a big could. Of course I can't say yes or no either way.  
19  
20 Garrett: Can, I'd like to, I'd like to keep things moving, but I really have been  
21 continuously looking for was a commitment that we would have a scoping  
22 discussion and that based on the public input we would know what the actual  
23 scope of the project was gonna be in terms of what was gonna be paved and  
24 what was not gonna be paved and this talks about paving unpaved sections  
25 and I've had people come to me and say we do not want it to be paved. So  
26 again it's sort of the, I'm constantly faced with if you raise the question, you're  
27 gonna kill the whole project, and all I've been asking for is a public meeting  
28 where there is an opportunity for anyone who has a concern about this specific  
29 project to come forward and express their concerns. It might be three people.  
30 I don't know. I'm just, you know, the bureaucracy of this process right now is  
31 just overwhelming any kind of meaningful public input into the discussion.  
32  
33 Herrera: Right and unfortunately, Mr. Chair, because this one is a Central Federal  
34 Lands, which is a division of FHWA, the DOT doesn't even have any, I guess,  
35 more say so than you do, or anybody from the public at this point, and I can tell  
36 you that I personally have taken a couple of phone calls with concerns from the  
37 public about this project in particular. We've all kind of been asking the same  
38 question because I've heard the same thing that you have. We've been  
39 assured that there's gonna be scoping meetings, and this, I'm at the same point  
40 that Andrew is at this point.  
41  
42 Small: Mr. Chair.  
43  
44 Garrett: Thank you. Yes Councillor.  
45

1 Small: Thank you very much Mr. Chair, and thanks to staff for the presentation. I  
2 guess, a couple of quick questions, one, a real concern about the fiscal year  
3 funding, but theoretically we could, with appropriate open meetings act  
4 notification, arrange a special meeting to accept funding prior to the end of the  
5 fiscal year which would, I guess, close at the end of this month, right, In June?  
6 So would there be a, there be time to schedule? So that's one option I guess,  
7 to put it out there as a point for discussion. Option or discussion point two,  
8 building on Ms. Herrera's feedback regarding the jurisdiction and really, I  
9 guess, in some ways the responsibility for the public process, not really  
10 following with DOT right now, or with the County, is it the Central Federal Lands,  
11 is that through the local Bureau of Land Management? I mean, who, how would  
12 we translate to who has responsibility for that public, for shepherding the public  
13 input, prior to the projects acceptance and then after the project is, moves  
14 forward in whatever capacity?  
15  
16 Herrera: So Central Federal Lands is its own, kind of, it's like a sub agency of the Federal  
17 Highways.  
18  
19 Small: Okay.  
20  
21 Herrera: So although they do have a relationship with the BLM, they're not under the  
22 BLM.  
23  
24 Small: Understood.  
25  
26 Herrera: One thing, that actually Denise just brought up to me and is kind of an  
27 assurance, is the NEPA process itself.  
28  
29 Small: Right.  
30  
31 Herrera: So if you're expending federal money, you are required by federal law to have  
32 public meetings and those kinds of things.  
33  
34 Small: Sure.  
35  
36 Herrera: So although that's not somebody from Central Federal Lands saying yes, we're  
37 gonna have a meeting on this day that is at least some assurance.  
38  
39 Small: Sure. Thank you, and that, that is being mildly familiar, there is that strong  
40 component and there's often more public input, although it's built in, in a unique  
41 way. One missing piece, and again for me just kind of coming into things, is  
42 that kind of comfort about who would be leading the process from their end and  
43 so is this, do we surmise that it will be somebody from the local BLM office or  
44 do we think that it, somebody from, as you've said, Central Federal Lands,  
45 wherever their, and I presume that they don't have anybody either in Las  
46 Cruces or in El Paso.

1  
2 Herrera: No, they don't. My guess is that while they're gonna be the project managers,  
3 but my guess is that would probably have to contract some parts of the project  
4 out.  
5  
6 Small: Sure. Sure. Sure.  
7  
8 Herrera: A lot of those projects go to local firms to help with public involvement.  
9  
10 Small: Sure.  
11  
12 Herrera: Those kinds of things.  
13  
14 Small: Sure.  
15  
16 Herrera: Of course, I haven't heard their plans.  
17  
18 Small: Sure.  
19  
20 Herrera: So I'm just kind of making a guess.  
21  
22 Small: Sure. But kind of following it out and I guess, Mr. Chair, the key component  
23 because of the NEPA process, I guess it, it presupposes the project if the  
24 funding is accepted and I understand that there could be consternation that  
25 there hasn't been public outreach before the funding is accepted. But I would  
26 feel comfort that there is a, a robust public engagement process that has to be  
27 part of federal dollars being expended. The missing component there then is,  
28 is really searching and hoping from the, from the staff perspective, that there's  
29 ability to deliver who will be that contact and, you know, even, even if it's a  
30 consultant, who is gonna be ultimately managing that consultant. It doesn't  
31 seem to be too extensive of a request, even just to have kind of more of a  
32 connection to who that will be or what group that will be beyond this kind of and  
33 cause that's where maybe some of the discomfort could come from is that  
34 there, we know the entities we deal with here locally, this is a totally new one  
35 who, it sounds like up until this point, we have not been able to kind of pin down  
36 and so if there's a way, how would you propose, or would you think there's a  
37 way to find that person or contact?  
38  
39 Herrera: Actually Councillor, yes, I do have a contact, a point of contact who I've been  
40 told is the project manager. I have sent that to Andrew previously to send to  
41 the BPAC, so I can send it again and make sure that this, this whole Committee  
42 receives his contact information. I guess at this point, the more people that  
43 contact him, probably the better, so.  
44  
45 Small: There we go. Sure.  
46

1 Herrera: So I'd be happy to do that today.  
2  
3 Small: Thank you very much, Thanks, Andrew, as well.  
4  
5 Sorg: Mr. Chairman.  
6  
7 Garrett: Yes Councillor Sorg.  
8  
9 Sorg: I just happened to go, oh, okay, never mind, I just saw it.  
10  
11 Garrett: Okay. If I could just follow up on this one, we've got \$610,000.00 for designs  
12 that is programmed for FY14, that's within the next three and a half months  
13 right?  
14  
15 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, Tom did make a very good point, that without  
16 approving this project, it may not be able to have the public involvement  
17 process because they may be relying on these funds in order to do, to do that.  
18  
19 Garrett: Well, I'd appreciate it, if you, number one, we need to find out what the schedule  
20 is for this and in particular, when the NEPA process is gonna be, you know,  
21 and it's been, I don't think I've ever heard of a NEPA process and design for a  
22 road being done in three and a half months. So you know, I don't know if they're  
23 just talking about obligating the money this year, or what, but if this is supposed  
24 to be \$610,000.00 in FY14 monies, we need to have that information if you  
25 could send that out to us as soon as possible that would be appreciated.  
26  
27 Wray: Yes Mr. Chair.  
28  
29 Garrett: Thank you, any further comments about any other items here? I'm delighted  
30 to see the two railroad crossings. That's good. Commissioner Benavidez, I  
31 don't know where Goat Hill Road is, but I do know where Berino Road is.  
32 Alright, any further discussion, any further discussion from the public?  
33  
34 Pedroza: Mr. Chair.  
35  
36 Garrett: Yes.  
37  
38 Pedroza: Just for clarification, are you then saying that you're comfortable with approving  
39 the entire, what is it, the Resolution 14-.....  
40  
41 Garrett: 14-10.  
42  
43 Pedroza: Yes, 14-10, without any or without knowing when or who will conduct public  
44 hearings?  
45

1 Garrett: Yes. I'm not very comfortable with it but at this point I don't see any very good  
2 alternatives and we can certainly make a fuss if this is not adequately handled,  
3 once the project gets moving. So,  
4  
5 Pedroza: Okay, thank you.  
6  
7 Garrett: Yeah.  
8  
9 Barraza: Mr. Chair.  
10  
11 Garrett: Yes Mayor.  
12  
13 Barraza: I just, just to piggyback off of what Councillor Pedroza just said and I think that  
14 this is only for the design isn't it? The 610, that's the crucial thing that we don't  
15 want to lose the funding for that and hopefully in the phase of the construction  
16 that those public hearings will be held prior to any construction.  
17  
18 Garrett: Actually, I think we need, I'm hoping that the NEPA process is done before and  
19 we're looking at alternatives and so that what gets built is something that has  
20 gone through the NEPA process and is the, you know, where it comes to  
21 adverse impacts, there's been litigation proceed, measures identified and so  
22 forth.  
23  
24 Barraza: Thank you.  
25  
26 Garrett: Thank you. This is just, I think, a good example of a project that's come  
27 together from a number of different points and there's nobody who's really  
28 owning it and, but I know that there's some people who are very, very, very,  
29 very concerned about it so, and others who think, hey, we just need a paved  
30 road out there. So, okay, any further discussion? In that case we have a  
31 motion on the floor, would you please poll the Committee, and those in favor  
32 say yes, those opposed no.  
33  
34 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez?  
35  
36 Benavidez: Yes.  
37  
38 Wray: Councillor Sorg?  
39  
40 Sorg: Yes  
41  
42 Wray: Councillor Small?  
43  
44 Small: Yes.  
45  
46 Wray: Mr. Doolittle?

1  
2 Doolittle: Yes.  
3  
4 Wray: Councillor Pedroza?  
5  
6 Pedroza: Yes.  
7  
8 Wray: Mayor Barraza?  
9  
10 Barraza: Yes.  
11  
12 Wray: Trustee Flores?  
13  
14 Flores: Yes.  
15  
16 Wray: Mr. Chair?  
17  
18 Garrett: Yes. Thank you.  
19  
20 Motion Passes 8-0; (2 Committee members absent).  
21

## 22 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 23 **7.1 MPO Participation in Regional Leadership Consortium**

24  
25  
26 Garrett: Now we're on to discussion items, 7.1 is MPO Participation in the Regional  
27 Leadership Consortium.  
28  
29 Murphy: Mr. Chair, the members of Committee, staff does not have any presentation on  
30 this one. I believe it was gonna be a Committee led discussion, although I think  
31 our discussion was, through the UPWP kind of answered what was going to  
32 happen, at least from the MPO staff standpoint.  
33  
34 Garrett: Thank you. We did briefly talk about this at our last meeting. There is work  
35 that's being done by the Regional Leadership Committee as part of the Camino  
36 Real Consortium. It's actually the Camino Real Consortium, the Regional  
37 Leadership Committee. The HUD grant expires in the next nine months, a year,  
38 something like that and from the beginning we've talked about the idea that this  
39 effort needed to continue in terms of trying to work in a way that broke down  
40 the silos that often isolate our work. The Regional Leadership Committee is  
41 exploring both short and long term structures for continued regional planning  
42 and I think that the question here for us, was simply whether it was the sense  
43 of the Board that this is a worthwhile effort, and that as we have the discussions  
44 as the RLC, that the assumption can be made that contingent on a, issues that  
45 may have to do with funding or with authorities or any other kinds of things like  
46 that, that the principle idea of being able to work together on regional planning

1 is something that we would like to see the MPO continuing and I think that's the  
2 extent of where we need to go at this point and in order to authorize the  
3 representative of the MPO to participate fully in the discussions in an informed  
4 way. So, Trustee Flores do you have questions or observations, comments?  
5 Let me just go to you first.  
6

7 Flores: No, (inaudible).  
8

9 Garrett: How do you feel about our continued participation?  
10

11 Flores: I think it's a good idea.  
12

13 Garrett: Okay. That's really all I'm looking for today, any further comments on my right?  
14 Okay, on the left? Okay. That's good. I, there doesn't seem to be any big  
15 controversy about this, it's simply that it's a good idea to check with everybody  
16 before we go stepping off and moving forward, so thank you for that continued  
17 support.  
18

## 19 **7.2 Committee briefing: NMDOT Policies and Procedures Manual** 20

21 Garrett: The next has to do with NMDOT Policies and Procedures.  
22

23 Tom Murphy gave a presentation on the NMDOT Policies and Procedures  
24

25 Garrett: Very good, comments, questions? Now are you anticipating that we would be  
26 going back over this in more detail in August or .....?  
27

28 Murphy: We could, August, September. It's one of those things when we set our  
29 meeting calendar, when Jolene and I were talking in January or so, we decided,  
30 okay, June we're going to do a presentation on this and we didn't, they didn't  
31 get it back from FHWA in order to really dive into it.  
32

33 Garrett: I understand. So.....  
34

35 Murphy: But I thought I'd give you, I thought I'd still give an overview.  
36

37 Garrett: This is kind of an overview and so we'll be going into more detail at some future  
38 time. Just out of curiosity, do you happen to know how well this interfaces with  
39 the Texas version of policies and procedures manual?  
40

41 Herrera: Mr. Chair, actually most states don't have something like this. This was  
42 something that our FHWA division office really, kind of wanted us to do just  
43 more to formalize processes and responsibilities, that kind of stuff, because we  
44 were having some issues in the state, not with this MPO so much but with some  
45 other ones, just really not knowing what their responsibilities were and so this  
46 kind of just formalized it. It's actually pretty neat because the Planning Division

1 at NMDOT was given several awards for this document by FHWA. I don't think  
2 that Texas has one and if they do, it's probably not as good as ours.

3  
4 Garrett: Well, the reason I raise that is that, assuming we're ahead, that just in terms of  
5 the whole issue of coordination of review, which was part of what we were  
6 talking about earlier, this might be another indication of where things could fall  
7 between the crack, if you have either a formal system and another system that's  
8 not in sync with it and it's not clear who's got the responsibility, that is how we  
9 could, potentially, miss opportunities for input and vice versa, as we said, very  
10 good. So we would want to share this with the El Paso MPO, right? Okay, got  
11 it, now we are ready for NMDT.

### 12 13 **7.3 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan**

14  
15 Garrett: And now we are ready for NMDOT updates. No, no, we got one more, one  
16 more, sorry, Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan. I am not  
17 intending to jump over that.

18  
19 Doolittle: Our updates are just so exciting, you couldn't wait.

20  
21 Garrett: Yeah, we live for that part of the meeting, alright.

22  
23 Tom Murphy introduced Denise Weston from Bohannon Huston, who gave the TASM Plan  
24 presentation.

25  
26 Garrett: Very good, thank you, questions or comments?

27  
28 Small: Thank you Chair and thank you. A comprehensive presentation and so very  
29 much appreciated it, and also the connection to kind of go through and then  
30 follow-up with any feedback. Thank you very much.

31  
32 Weston: Absolutely.

33  
34 Garrett: Just a couple questions. When you talk about regional, what do you mean by  
35 regional in our context?

36  
37 Weston: Right now, the regional component is really the MPO boundary. This is a  
38 Mesilla Valley MPO boundary plan. So if there were any expansion beyond  
39 that, that would be at Tom's discretion but we have worked closely with Jolene  
40 and made it really clear that the region needs to align with the statewide asset  
41 management initiatives that are underway and so we would want to make sure  
42 that the ability to align, the flexibility to, sort of, you know, connect ion, at the  
43 external components of the MPO boundary were available.

44  
45 Garrett: Okay. So, this again, do we know if El Paso has a similar process for this kind  
46 of thing?

1  
2 Weston: I actually don't know the answer to that but I can find that answer out and make  
3 it available  
4  
5 Garrett: Okay and then we would be talking about the, when we go outside the MPOs,  
6 there's another body that looks at those areas that are outside and I'm  
7 assuming that at some point we need to have asset and safety management  
8 plans that basically cover the system regardless of the jurisdictions that are  
9 within that, correct?  
10  
11 Murphy: Mr. Chair, if I may, I know we've talked a little bit about this, about this in the  
12 past, with the MPO being the data keeper, I think we would take in what we get  
13 reported on. While we would derive our, our performance measures and TIP  
14 prioritization process from within the MPO boundaries, if the County staff would  
15 report on conditions on all their roadways we would incorporate that into the  
16 GIS. We already have GIS on a county-wide basis so it would be no extra cost  
17 for us to be the, to be maintaining that data and to transmit it back to the County  
18 at times that the BOCC needs to make any kind of CIP budgets or stuff. So,  
19 you know, as far as MAP21 and that, we need to keep it within the MPO  
20 boundaries but there's no reason that we could not house all the data that the  
21 County is willing to report to us.  
22  
23 Garrett: Yeah, I think part of what I'm interested in here is, I guess, consistency of data  
24 management and of, at some point, seamless coordination in terms of the  
25 components of the systems that we're talking about regardless of jurisdiction  
26 because sometimes we're gonna have other jurisdictions that are gonna need  
27 to get involved. In terms of the actual scope of the types of features that you're  
28 looking at, these are all federal, this is all the federal, or is this, how far down  
29 does this go? Does this go to local roads?  
30  
31 Weston: You can make that decision, actually. So what Tom is talking about with the  
32 compliance component, you would have to apply the level of service  
33 performance measures and the decision making criteria on those federal  
34 features but the plan itself and the process.....  
35  
36 Garrett: could apply it to everything.  
37  
38 Weston: You as an agency could apply that at any level. Some of the assets we looked  
39 at, curb and gutter, those are not federally mandated assets. So we've already  
40 built a process around assets that are really to help you as a community and  
41 help the MPO comply with federal guidelines. So in order to sort of enhance  
42 the response to the last question, you, as Dona Ana County wants to take this  
43 individually and apply it beyond the MPO boundaries, there is no reason you  
44 can't do that and then Tom just slices off what he needs. So you can apply it  
45 county-wide when you develop your level of service and your performance

1 measures and your pieces of the asset management. There's nothing that  
2 would make that less effective or even more complicated for you.  
3  
4 Garrett: Okay and we could even change some of the performance criteria.  
5  
6 Weston: Absolutely.  
7  
8 Garrett: We were just earlier talking about agricultural corridors where you want to make  
9 sure that you've got shoulders, not so much curbs, so those big pieces of  
10 equipment can move over and safely.....  
11  
12 Weston: You can make those as elaborate as you feel comfortable and it could, you can  
13 even have performance measures outside the MPO boundary but within the  
14 county and different performance measures within the county and also inside  
15 the MPO boundary as well. You know, you just need to clear but absolutely as  
16 a way for you, the County, to manage your assets and to be able to measure,  
17 right, measure how you spend your money.  
18  
19 Garrett: Right.  
20  
21 Weston: Absolutely.  
22  
23 Garrett: Now the City of Las Cruces, have they been using something like this?  
24  
25 Weston: For pavement.  
26  
27 Garrett: For pavement.  
28  
29 Weston: So I didn't go into that with too much detail but we use that pretty extensively  
30 as sort of a foundation to understand, so they have a pretty sophisticated asset  
31 management inventory and documentation process for their pavement  
32 condition.  
33  
34 Garrett: That's consistent with this system that you're talking about.  
35  
36 Weston: Absolutely and it's in here and actually in the appendix is the mini version of  
37 their pavement study because it's a good, it's a good template.  
38  
39 Garrett: Has there been any discussion by the various jurisdictions in terms of making  
40 sure that all the things because I know there's discussion about this kind of stuff  
41 but are we working toward the idea of having a completely integrated system  
42 for Dona Ana County and the various jurisdictions within it?  
43  
44 Murphy: We've been talking with the members of the TAC as far as implementing this.  
45 I think what we want to do from the MPO standpoint, we want to become, we  
46 want to become that data house, the store house for the data and then we can,

1 then be able to provide that information where and when it's needed. I think  
2 the first step is that we get this, we get this adopted. We've identified where  
3 there are gaps. It's gonna be in our next steps of things, work with each  
4 individual agency, if we can help close those data gaps. It's certainly, if they  
5 get direction from above them that this is important, and that you need to  
6 cooperate with the MPO staff in providing that information so that we can  
7 regionalize our decisions.

8  
9 Garrett: Very good.

10  
11 Small: Mr. Chair.

12  
13 Garrett: Yes, Councillor Small.

14  
15 Small: Thank you. Just to add, we do have the pavement management system that's  
16 gone through a thorough inventory of all the city roads. I would point out  
17 though, in a presentation we saw, the consequence of failure kind of metric,  
18 and that's the metric that has to be applied. Because data, knowing how to fix  
19 things and the trajectory and generally doing more work frequently at a lower  
20 level of cost and not letting it get too low prevents those big costs. But the City  
21 is actually having a work session, I think either not next Monday, but the  
22 Monday after, because we're only now applying the prioritization. The  
23 standard, the kind of the standardization based on the data. So I think what  
24 this presentation does nicely is both really focus on the data but also give us  
25 ways to think about how to consistently use that data. That's very important.  
26 We can gain a false sense of security that every single road has been mapped  
27 with sonar or whatever it is and you know what's there but until you use that in  
28 a consistent systematized way, all it is just good data. It has, you have to go  
29 that next step. Thank you.

30  
31 Garrett: Very good.

32  
33 Sorg: Mr. Chair.

34  
35 Garrett: Yes, Councillor Sorg.

36  
37 Sorg: Just to add (inaudible) what Councillor Small is saying, for the benefit of those  
38 who aren't in the city government, the City has been behind on maintenance of  
39 city streets, pretty severely, and it's gonna take a lot of extra money to catch  
40 up as you pointed out but I also wanted to point out that the work session is not  
41 gonna be next one, it will be in July.

42  
43 Garrett: Okay.

44  
45 Weston: Thank you.

46

1 Garrett: Thank you. That was great. While we're getting that pulled together, I'm just  
2 gonna suggest that sharing this particular kind of idea, this approach with  
3 regional leadership committee, is important, because this could be a specific  
4 tool that we being to push for. I mean, we've talked about the data portal and  
5 beginning to integrate some of that GIS stuff. I think that this is important in  
6 terms of potentially addressing road, street. So, and that could be a huge step  
7 forward for everybody but we have to decide, we have to figure out how we're  
8 gonna get gaps addressed, smaller communities that might not have funding.  
9 I mean how we're gonna deal with unincorporated areas and so forth.  
10  
11 Pedroza: Mr. Chair.  
12  
13 Garrett: Yes.  
14  
15 Pedroza: I have a question for Denise please. Do you have in here some estimate of  
16 what it would cost to gather the data? I understand that you have, you have  
17 identified what data we need to gather. Do you have any estimate of what the  
18 cost is, where certain parts of that data are nonexistent.  
19  
20 Weston: We don't have a cost associated with that because we did recommend ways to  
21 do it and cost effective ways. So I think that it will be important at the agency  
22 level to think about that. In many cases, like in the City, we recommended  
23 actually tearing onto the pavement collection process because once that truck  
24 is out there it can grab the curb and gutter information for you, signage  
25 information for you, and so the incremental cost is small. If you're looking at  
26 the Town of Mesilla, we actually recommended perhaps some of your service  
27 area efforts, we could build for you, some type of either electronic or paper  
28 based inventory systems, so when your workers are already out there doing  
29 stuff, they're in the field every day. You could build into that a process where  
30 they collect the data. So we didn't associate a cost, but we did try to  
31 recommend cost effective ways for each individual community to think about  
32 doing that and I would be happy to also brain storm with you other ways to do  
33 that.  
34  
35 Pedroza: And is that all included in our little?  
36  
37 Weston: It is.  
38  
39 Pedroza: Thank you.  
40  
41 Weston: It is, but don't, but particularly the smaller communities, to respond to what you  
42 said, we tried to be really clear that it's, everyone can do it at whatever effort,  
43 level of effort they can afford to do and what they need. The City needs a more  
44 complex system. The Town of Mesilla, we can do it in an excel database and  
45 it can cost you nothing and that data can get transferred to Tom's group. Okay?  
46

1 Pedroza: Thank you.

2

3 **7.4 NMDOT Updates**

4

5 Garrett: Very good, now are we ready for the NMDOT updates, waiting with bated  
6 breath.

7

8

9 Doolittle: Yeah, you made me wait to give you all of our exciting news, just a quick project  
10 update, as usual. We did have our pre-construction conference yesterday for  
11 the New Mexico 28 chip seal and that's the one that we're gonna start at mile  
12 marker zero and chip seal that entire road, all the way through the Town of  
13 Mesilla. That work should start next week and will be finished by the end of the  
14 month. That's this year's fiscal money so we need to get that work completed  
15 by the end of the month. We did have a couple of public meetings.

16

17 Barraza: Trent, can I ask you a question about that one?

18

19 Doolittle: Yes.

20

21 Barraza: It's only going to Union, am I correct or is it gonna go through Highway 28, into  
22 Mesilla?

23

24 Doolittle: It's actually going into Mesilla, all the way to the City limits, just south of Avenida  
25 de Mesilla, correct.

26

27 Herrera: The ending mile post that Leo gave me was 27, which is, I think, actually around  
28 that cotton gin thing.

29

30 Barraza: Oh, that's right on the outskirts of .....

31

32 Doolittle: So it is at the south end.

33

34 Herrera: Yeah, it ends before I think you actually get into the town but that was for some  
35 very specific reasons with the curb and gutter and things like that.

36

37 Garrett: That's Union, right?

38

39 Doolittle: Yes. Originally we were gonna try to go the whole way, but we have, we have  
40 a very set funding limit on that project so that may be as far as he was able to  
41 go based on the funding that we were given.

42

43 Barraza: Okay, it was my understanding that you all were going to do Highway 28  
44 because it was in dire need of paving or whatever it is that you all do. Thank  
45 you.

46

1 Doolittle: The next project that I'd like to discuss, just real quickly, Avenida de Mesilla,  
2 we do have the westbound off-ramp open. The westbound on-ramp is currently  
3 closed. I haven't really heard any complaints about that. I think our detour is  
4 set up well enough with plenty of signing. It certainly is an inconvenience but I  
5 think we've done a good job with the contractor, trying to make sure everybody  
6 knows how to get in and out from that intersection. We continue to do some  
7 sub-grade work, some base course in the area. We're actually getting ready  
8 to pave here, pretty quick. As soon as we get the paving down, then we can  
9 start getting that roadway open. Actually I drove through yesterday morning.  
10 They're working on the concrete paving on the westbound on ramp. So as  
11 soon as we can get the concrete paving done we can actually get the ramp  
12 open as well. A little bit of work on the bridge, so again, once we get that main  
13 line finished we can get those ramps open back up and then start focusing on  
14 some of the other smaller aspects of that project that won't affect traffic.  
15  
16 Barraza: Do you have a completion date for that or month?  
17  
18 Doolittle: I don't. I can get it for you but he did not send that as part of his update, but I'll  
19 get you a completion date.  
20  
21 Barraza: Thank you.  
22  
23 Doolittle: Our North Main project, that's another one that we have some extensive work  
24 going on in the median. We have it choked down to one lane each direction.  
25 I've driven through it three times now, there is quite a bit traffic, but it seems to  
26 be flowing pretty well. We're monitoring the signal timing at Three Crosse, and  
27 at Spruce and Picacho just to make sure that we don't have traffic backing up  
28 but for the most part it seems to be working pretty well. I think those that can  
29 avoid it, are avoiding it. We've had a few issues with some business owners  
30 and access but we've been pretty proactive trying to install additional signing  
31 as those things come up, but honestly I haven't heard anything except positive  
32 comments so that's always a good thing on a project, that is the big.  
33  
34 Garrett: Any comments about that? Okay.  
35  
36 Sorg: One little brief thing, I think I believe I saw our City PIO put out a notice and  
37 they used the word months and months for the length of the project instead of  
38 a specific time, so I remember reading it and I think I got it right.  
39  
40 Doolittle: Councilor Sorg if you'll give me, I'll go through my updates and if you'll give me  
41 just a quick second for my computer to pull up that file, I can give you the  
42 number working days for that project.  
43  
44 Garrett: Well, it might actually be helpful though for the PIO.  
45

1 Doolittle: So if you'll give me, I'll have that by the time I get finished with my report. I  
2 think I mentioned this last month, but we did recently finish two projects, we  
3 finished the pavement preservation project, over the pass at Organ and we are  
4 completely finished with the cable median barrier project on US 70. We have  
5 started our concrete wall barrier project on US 70 from I-25 to Rinconada  
6 interchange. We started tearing out the median so that we can start installing  
7 the concrete barrier project on that one. We're working on conduit for new  
8 lighting. Mesquite and Vado interchange, we'll continue to have the monthly  
9 meetings to keep the public updated on that one. We've removed the bridge  
10 over the I-10 eastbound lanes where we've switched traffic. We started driving  
11 piles for the abutments at the bridges. We've done a little bit of work outside  
12 of traffic at the Vado roundabouts. We have made a commitment to the public  
13 to not impact traffic at both Vado and Mesquite at the same time. I think there  
14 was some miscommunication, initially, that we weren't doing work at both at  
15 the same time. We just need to clarify that we are not going to impact traffic at  
16 both. We're actually expediting, by allowing them to work outside of the  
17 roadway prism at Vado. So hopefully that will help us make some time up that  
18 we had some issues with at the beginning. That's really all of the big projects  
19 that we have in the Dona Ana County area.  
20

21 Garrett: Any questions?  
22

23 Sorg: Yes.  
24

25 Garrett: Yes, Councillor Sorg.  
26

27 Sorg: Just to satisfy my curiosity, with these bridges that you just mentioned and the  
28 Missouri bridge coming up, are there any other bridges in the MPO that need  
29 to be replaced now that haven't been replaced in the last 15 years?  
30

31 Doolittle: The bridge on US 70 just east of Three Crosses.  
32

33 Sorg: Oh, of course, of course. I almost forgot that one.  
34

35 Doolittle: Unless you want us to leave that one out.  
36

37 Sorg: No, we'll leave that in. We'll definitely... Is that the only one though?  
38

39 Herrera: There's some upcoming projects in 2015. They're not for bridge replacements,  
40 but they are for bridge rehab and we'll be doing the ramp E bridges by  
41 University and then the one over Union Avenue.  
42

43 Sorg: Okay.  
44

45 Herrera: So we'll be doing those. Other than Missouri, I think we should be done with  
46 bridges in the Las Cruces area for a while.

1  
2 Sorg: Yes, I'm looking forward to that day.  
3  
4 Doolittle: I'm sorry, Jolene, I was looking at information for Councillor Sorg. Did you  
5 mention ramp E?  
6  
7 Herrera: Yes.  
8  
9 Doolittle: Okay, sorry. Thank you.  
10  
11 Sorg: The letter "e" you said?  
12  
13 Herrera: Yes.  
14  
15 Sorg: Okay, I didn't know they were lettered.  
16  
17 Herrera: I think...  
18  
19 Doolittle: I think that's internal lingo probably.  
20  
21 Herrera: Yeah, that's just what we call it but it's the ones over there on I-10 by the  
22 University.  
23  
24 Garrett: Okay.  
25  
26 Doolittle: Just for Councillor Sorg's information, that North Main project is scheduled for  
27 360 calendar days. We began counting contract time earlier this month. So  
28 the expectation is, contract time, is a year from last month. But we've only been  
29 started a little over six weeks and Sandoval Construction has actually said  
30 they're already about two weeks ahead of schedule. So as long as weather,  
31 we all need rain, but on projects like this rain is our worst enemy. So as long  
32 as the weather continues to cooperate with us, they're making excellent  
33 progress on that project.  
34  
35 Garrett: Very good. Thank you.  
36  
37 **7.5 Advisory Committee Updates - None**  
38  
39 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS – None**  
40  
41 **9. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**  
42  
43 **10. ADJOURNMENT**  
44  
45 Garrett: In that case, without objection, we have completed the items on our agenda,  
46 and we are adjourned.

1  
2 Meeting adjourned at 3:26 p.m.  
3  
4  
5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 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 ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 13, 2014

### **AGENDA ITEM:**

6.1 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.

Bohannon-Huston Staff initially presented on the TASM Plan at the June meeting of the Policy Committee.

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**RESOLUTION NO. 14-11**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE MESILLA VALLEY MPO  
TRANSPORTATION ASSET AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

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

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces area as designated by the Governor of New Mexico in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134(b); and

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federal and/or state funded transportation related projects within the MPO's Urbanized Area; and

**WHEREAS**, two of the national goals established by Congress in Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) are Safety and Infrastructure Condition; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee adopted the 2010 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, known as Transport 2040 on June 9, 2010; and

**WHEREAS**, the creation of Management Plans was listed in Chapter 4 of Transport 2040 as a goal for Mesilla Valley MPO staff; and

**WHEREAS**, the creation of a transportation asset plan and a safety management plan were specifically called for in Transport 2040; and

**WHEREAS**, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval at its June 5, 2014 meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution adopting the Transportation and Safety Management Plan (TASM Plan) 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 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby adopted.

(II)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 7th day of August , 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

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 ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 13, 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.

This item was postponed from the June 11, 2014 meeting of the Policy Committee. For reasons that will be discussed in the presentation, MPO Staff will ask the item be postponed again.

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**RESOLUTION NO. 14-09**

**A RESOLUTION APPROVING A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT  
WITH THE EL PASO MPO ON PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES IN  
CERTAIN AREAS OF DONA ANA COUNTY.**

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

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces urbanized area as designated by the Governor of New Mexico in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134(b); and

**WHEREAS**, the El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the New Mexico portion of the El Paso urbanized area as designated by the Governor of New Mexico and the Governor of Texas in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134(b); and

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization and the El Paso Metropolitan Organization are responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federal and/or state funded transportation related projects within their respective MPO's Urbanized Areas; and

**WHEREAS**, due to the proximity, economic and social ties of the two urbanized areas, The US Office of Management and Budget has designated the two Metropolitan Statistical Areas as a Combined Statistical Area ; and

**WHEREAS**, combined efforts such as Viva Dona Ana have shown the benefits of greater regional collaboration; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution approving a Memorandum of Agreement with the El Paso MPO be approved.

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

**(I)**

**THAT** the Memorandum of Agreement between the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization and the El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization shown in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby adopted.

**(II)**

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

**DONE** and **APPROVED** this 13th day of August, 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:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney

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.
- 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.
- 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 EP UZA within Doña Ana County, New Mexico.

II. General Points of Understanding and Agreement

- 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 the Mesilla Valley MPO. The geographic area of responsibility 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.
- C. 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.
- E. 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 the scope, plans and implementation of activities in coordination with New Mexico Department of Transportation.

- F. 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. EPMPO 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. The MVMPO accepts the responsibility for the long range planning and programming needs of the Berino within Doña Ana County.
- 2. The EPMPO retains the responsibility for the long range planning and programming needs of the Southern Doña Ana County portion within Doña Ana County.
- 3. The MVMPO will provide timely opportunity for the EPMPO to review long range transportation planning and program needs of the Berino area and will fully consider comments from the EPMPO in preparation of their long range transportation plans.
- 4. The EPMPO will provide timely opportunity for the MVMPO to review long range transportation planning and program needs of the southern Dona Ana County area and will fully consider comments from the MVMPO in preparation of their long range transportation plans.
- 5. The long range transportation plan will be developed consistent with 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450 and policies and practices of each MPO.

#### C. Transportation Improvement Program

- 1. The MVMPO accepts the responsibility for programming projects in the El Paso urbanized area within the 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 EPMPO 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.
- 3. To help ensure continuity of federal and state funds, both EPMPO and MVMPO agree to abide by the methodology and process used to allocate funds to the respective MPOs.

4. The Transportation Improvement Program will be developed consistent with the MVMPO's policies and practices.

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.

DRAFT

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 August 7, 2014**

**AGENDA ITEM:**

7.1 Transit Performance Measures, Committee Briefing

**SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

None

**DISCUSSION:**

This will be a briefing by MPO Staff on Transit Performance Measures.