

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

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the
5 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held January 8,
6 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 N. Motel Blvd., Las
7 Cruces, New Mexico.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
10 Larry Altamirano (LCPS) (departed 4:45)
11 Louis Grijalva (CLC Public Works) (arrived 4:10)
12 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
13 John Knopp (Town of Mesilla)
14 Harold Love (NMDOT)
15 Rene Molina (DAC Engineering)
16 Greg Walke (NMSU)
17 Willie Roman (CLC Transportation)
18 Luis Marmolejo (DAC)
19 Bill Childress (BLM)

20
21 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jack Valencia (SCRTD)
22 Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
23 John Gwynne (DA Flood Commission)

24
25 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO Staff)
26 Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
27 Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)

28
29 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

30
31 **1. CALL TO ORDER (4:05)**

32
33 Bartholomew: Let's see. It looks like it's about five minutes after four o'clock so I'll call
34 to order the, the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
35 Organization Technical Advisory Committee.

36
37 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

38
39 Bartholomew: The first item is the approval of the agenda. Is there any changes to
40 make Tom to the agenda?

41
42 Murphy: Staff has no changes.

43
44 Bartholomew: I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

45
46 Love: So moved, Harold Love.

1
2 Walke: Seconded, Greg Walke.
3
4 Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor please say "aye."
5
6 AGENDA APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.
7
8 Bartholomew: Opposed? I guess before we get too far in I should just have everybody
9 introduce themselves so their names and voices are on the record for the
10 meeting today. I'll start down at my, I'll start down there at my far right.
11
12 Knopp: Okay. John Knopp from Town of Mesilla.
13
14 Marmolejo: Luis Marmolejo, Dona Ana County Community Development Department.
15
16 Molina: Rene Molina, Dona Ana County Engineering.
17
18 Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.
19
20 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.
21
22 Bartholomew: Mike Bartholomew, City of Las Cruces Roadrunner Transit.
23
24 Walke: Greg Walke, New Mexico State University.
25
26 Childress: Bill Childress, Bureau of Land Management.
27
28 Altamirano: Larry Altamirano, Las Cruces Public Schools.
29
30 Bartholomew: And we've got one more walking in, too. We have Willie Roman from the
31 City of Las Cruces coming in as well.
32
33 **3. ELECTION OF OFFICER**
34
35 Bartholomew: So the first item of business is the election of officers so it's a, a Chair
36 and a Vice Chair, correct?
37
38 Wray: That's correct.
39
40 Bartholomew: That have to be selected. I think Jack Valencia was the Chair this past
41 year and I was the, the Vice Chair. I would entertain any motions for
42 somebody who would like to be the Chair for the next year for the TAC.
43
44 Herrera: I would like to nominate Mike Bartholomew for Chair.
45
46 Altamirano: Second.

1
2 Bartholomew: Okay, any other?
3
4 Altamirano: Larry Altamirano with the second.
5
6 Bartholomew: Any other nominations for Chair? It's an easy job so. Tom and his staff
7 make it pretty, pretty painless. I'll, I'll do it if, if that's okay. I guess I'll
8 close the nominations and all in favor of having me be Chair for another
9 year please say "aye."
10
11 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
12
13 Bartholomew: Opposed? Then I'll need a, a Vice Chair for those days that I won't be
14 here. Any nominations for that?
15
16 Herrera: I'd like to nominate Harold Love for Vice Chair.
17
18 Bartholomew: Okay. Any other nominations at this time?
19
20 Altamirano: Mr. Chair, I request that we close nominations.
21
22 Bartholomew: Okay nominations are closed. Is that okay Mr. Love for Vice Chair?
23
24 Love: That's fine.
25
26 Bartholomew: Okay. All in favor of having Harold Love as Vice Chair please say "aye."
27 Opposed?
28
29 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
30
31 Bartholomew: So I guess you've got your roster here for the, the next year.
32
33 Murphy: Thank you.
34
35 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
36
37 **3.1 November 6, 2014**
38
39 Bartholomew: The next item is the approval of the minutes of November 6, 2014. Any
40 ... hopefully everybody's had a chance to take a look at the minutes and
41 are there any changes, corrections needed on the minutes? Seeing none,
42 I'll take a motion to accept the minutes.
43
44 Herrera: So moved.
45
46 Bartholomew: Is there a second?

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

Molina: Second.

Bartholomew: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes of November 6, 2014. All in favor please say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Bartholomew: Opposed?

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bartholomew: Next is the public comment period. Is there anybody wishing to comment? Don't see anybody at this point so I'll move on to the discussion items.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: Map Issues

Bartholomew: First one is 6.1, Metropolitan Planning, or Transportation Plan Update: Map Issues.

PRESENTATION BY TOM MURPHY.

Bartholomew: Okay.

Herrera: Mr. Chair can I ask a question first?

Bartholomew: Yes.

Herrera: I'm sure you said it Tom, but I just didn't hear, so the maps that are over there incorporated all of the changes that we suggested at the December meeting?

Murphy: We believe we've gotten ...

Herrera: Okay.

Murphy: All of your comments into that.

Bartholomew: Okay. So I'd like to move we recess for a few minutes.

Murphy: And, and for the, for the minutes, Louis Grijalva, City of Las Cruces has joined us.

1 Bartholomew: Thank you.

2
3 COMMITTEE TOOK 12 MINUTES TO OBSERVE MAPS BROUGHT BY MPO STAFF.

4
5 Bartholomew: If, if we can reconvene the meeting in the next minute or so that would be
6 wonderful.

7 Okay, it looks like we're all back here so I'll, I'll just start opening it
8 up for comments from the committee to Mr. Murphy on ... that they'd like
9 to get on the record here for what they've observed on the maps. I know,
10 Mr. Childress, you told me you had wanted to ...

11
12 Childress: Yes. The only remaining comment I have is that I still believe that for a
13 truck route none of the Dripping Springs or Sonoma Ranch should be
14 included in that delineation, especially the Dripping Springs. I'm a little
15 less concerned about Sonoma Ranch and maybe Sonoma Ranch where it
16 meets up with Lohman but as far as the truck route delineation for any
17 portion of Dripping Springs, I have a little bit of concern with that,
18 promoting traffic in that direction up towards Dripping Springs natural area
19 and the new national monument. And also if, if in fact the Dripping
20 Springs and Baylor route is paved we need to do what we can to reduce
21 and not inadvertently promote truck traffic using that route to Highway 70
22 and to I-25. That's it.

23
24 Bartholomew: Other comments?

25
26 Herrera: Mr. Chair, I already shared this with MPO staff over at the maps but I'd
27 just like you to take a look at the functional classification rules again and
28 some of those little weird collectors that are sticking out there so thank
29 you.

30
31 Roman: Mr. Chair? I would just like to comment on Mr. Childress' concern. As far
32 as the City's concerned, I believe there's still a quarry at that intersection
33 in operation so that's, that would be one reason we wouldn't want to take it
34 off the truck route, just one of the reasons because they have to have
35 access for their trucks to be able to you know access that location. But
36 the second reason is that they're both arterials and we would, we'd sort of
37 you know be contradicting ourselves if we have an arterial and then we
38 don't allow trucks to then access on arterial systems because the arterial
39 systems are there for that specific reason. I think the truck, the truck route
40 helps us to determine more than anything which local roads or collector,
41 residential collector type roads we, we need to limit as far as access
42 because there's maybe too much of a residential component on that,
43 directly on that road. So that's, that's the difficulty the City has in trying to
44 balance the two, you know allowing access and then balancing the arterial
45 factor.

46

1 Childress: I, I appreciate this. I, I think what I said specifically in the comment is I
2 understand that the, the route would be used for, for trucks, 16-wheelers
3 from time to time as service vehicles going to residents to do whatever
4 they need to do. To a lesser degree I, that probably does apply to the
5 quarry that's there as well, understanding that they use it for business
6 purposes and I view that use as a little different than somebody taking off
7 on Dripping Springs Road and trying to go all the way to 70 and by, and
8 converting it to a bypass, and maybe there's another way to resolve that
9 issue and, and to place some level of enforcement to prevent that from
10 happening down the road.

11
12 Murphy: Mr. Chair?

13
14 Bartholomew: Mr. Murphy.

15
16 Murphy: Mr. Childress, I, I would think that probably the, the solution in that is we
17 use this and then we can also ask, ask the County to come up with a
18 method that they sign Dripping Springs east of Sonoma Ranch as, as no,
19 no through trucks and I think you know we can use this map for that
20 purpose and, "Look, you know it's allowable up to here; past here it's not
21 allowed." And then that, that would say, you know that, that way you,
22 you've drawn a line in the sand saying, "Okay, we're not prohibiting it but
23 we're prohibiting it here because of, you know all of, you know all the uses
24 that you had mentioned that we don't want to have Baylor Canyon turned
25 into a bypass.

26
27 Childress: I appreciate that. I, I can understand that perspective and if that's the way
28 you need to move forward then that's acceptable from my perspective.

29
30 Bartholomew: Okay. Other comments?

31
32 Roman: Mr. Chair, Mr. Childress, I think it might benefit us if maybe some County
33 Engineering can explain to use how that, that bypass is going to be
34 designed because if the, if the vertical curves and horizontal curves aren't,
35 aren't designed to accommodate a truck they're not going to prefer to use
36 that route and that, that'll be a, the design itself will, you know will, will
37 work to prohibit them using that.

38
39 Molina: So that, the roadway, Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon, those
40 improvements are not intended to be a bypass. That's clear as day.
41 There's been no intention of referring to it as a bypass. The roadway's
42 designed as a minor local roadway with geometrics that aren't conducive
43 to that of a collector or arterial. With respect to the map, believe the map
44 went to ...

45
46 Murphy: Sonoma.

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

Molina: Sonoma Ranch and that was it so with respect to additional signage, we could take a look at that. I'm not too certain there will be a warrant to place the signage but we can certainly take a look at that at a later date.

Childress: I appreciate it. Yeah, when the first generation of map that we reviewed last month did actually have a portion of Baylor Canyon Road delineated as a truck route as well and that's no longer on the map and I think that's a good move. And I guess as long as we can, you know cut it off at Sonoma Ranch Road going around to 70 that, you know that, I understand the rationale behind leaving it because you have a customer that's using heavy trucks to move sand and gravel and if that, you need that truck route delineation for that, I understand that.

Bartholomew: Other comments on that? I, I would, I would comment as I was talking with you earlier Tom, that we perhaps get with Jamie Rickman about Mesquite. I'm not opposed to it being sustained as a truck route, I'm just relaying the information that I know that there's a lot of, of residents in the area that seem to be concerned or not a lot but some residents that seem to be concerned that it was a truck route. Regard, regarding the transit one, I, I was really, I like that, that it was included, you included the two alternate locations we were looking at for the side transfer area because going into the Mesilla Valley Mall as we do now really is a time-killer, to get in and get out of the mall and I think looking at either of the locations there behind Petco or at the combination of the City-owned/BLM-owned land near Paseo de Onate and Lohman might be good areas to look for an alternative for a transfer area.

Under the transit-oriented development policies area in there it, it, you kind of mentioned land use but it might be good to maybe specify like when the corridors are developed for transit-oriented development to make sure that there's space to develop proper bus amenities, pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, in addition to the street in those transit-oriented development corridors.

Another comment I had, I remember that there was some stuff done in December when we were drawing on maps that I didn't know if it's reflected on them, any of those I may have missed it, but about perhaps having Triviz eventually go underneath University Avenue into the university. I don't know which map in particular that would best, best go on or that idea.

Murphy: Mr., Mr. Chair, yeah that's, that project's actually been kind of discussed. I, I'm, it's not on any of the maps. And I need to figure out which map it goes on best so, but that's, that is a project that I think I, I know the DOT has studied it. I think they have some design on it already, already drawn. We just have to figure out which map to put that on and we will get it on one of them.

1
2 Bartholomew: Okay. And my other comment was that, and I understand you were
3 telling me while we were on recess there that there, there will be a
4 separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities map that you're going to be
5 presenting to the BPAC, correct?
6
7 Murphy: Yes. Currently the MPO, the current Transport 2040 has a trail system
8 map and has an on-street bicycle map but I also want to add a third one to
9 the mix and that being a pedestrian priority plan map, and we want to vet
10 those through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.
11
12 Bartholomew: And by the, you're going to be doing that this month with the, that
13 committee so perhaps by February we might see, hear about what
14 comments they would have on that, that particular map?
15
16 Murphy: Yes. We should have, we should have all of them ready to go you know
17 when we come back in, in February and then of course we will always put
18 our maps onto the website so that you can review them at any time.
19
20 Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you.
21
22 Herrera: Mr. Chair, I have one other comment/question. When you bring the
23 Bicycle Pedestrian Committee the existing maps and are looking for
24 updates, can we somehow get an overlay of what the truck route map is
25 with that because I don't think we necessarily want to be putting truck
26 routs on roads that we deem as Tier 1 for bike facilities?
27
28 Murphy: I think we can, we can do the overlay, yeah.
29
30 Herrera: Okay. Thank you.
31
32 Childress: One additional comment, I did make some comments on proposed
33 recommendations on bicycle Pedestrian so I will provide those as to, as
34 well today for consideration with the idea we'd have pedestrian and
35 bicycle on Dripping, Baylor, and Arroyo roads as well. Both go in
36 proximity to the new monument to provide I think enhanced recreational
37 opportunities for the community.
38
39 Bartholomew: Are there other comments? So just to clarify Tom then in February we'll
40 be making some kind of a recommendation then on these to the Policy
41 Committee?
42
43 Murphy: That's correct. I hope to have, I hope to have everything compiled, put
44 together so that we have a, a complete MTP for you to, you know
45 recommend for us ultimately to go out to the public.
46

1 Bartholomew: Okay. And you'll probably have that on the website for us to review
2 before the next meeting too?

3
4 Murphy: Yes. Probably not much, probably not more than a week before but yeah.

5
6 Bartholomew: Okay.

7
8 Murphy: We're getting, we're getting down to the, we're getting down to the, the do
9 or die time so it'll, it'll be there in some form.

10
11 Bartholomew: I don't see any other comments out there so it looks like we're ready to
12 move on to the next item.

13
14 **6.2 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: Loop Road Presentation**

15
16 Bartholomew: Which is 6.2: Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: Loop Road
17 Presentation.

18
19 Murphy: So Michael McAdams is going to give a presentation for MPO staff on
20 some of the, some Loop Road issues and bypass issues. Some of, some
21 of you raised some of the comments last month when we were looking at
22 the maps as far as construction of bypasses. We also got some, some
23 public comment concerning, concerning the issue when we went out, we
24 went out with our public input last or in the fall, and then the Policy
25 Committee also has a concern, so Michael has put together a, a, a brief
26 presentation to kind of brief, brief you on the issues and then get your
27 feedback and I'll turn that over to Michael now.

28
29 **PRESENTATION BY MICHAEL MCADAMS.**

30
31 Bartholomew: Are there any questions from the Committee at this point in time? Kind of
32 you talking about all the, all that's involved with bypasses and everything
33 and you have to plan, is that, is, what's the status of all that planning and
34 everything right now in, in this MPO?

35
36 McAdams: I mean, this is all preliminary right now. This might, all in the planning
37 stages ...

38
39 Bartholomew: Right.

40
41 McAdams: Nothing has been done, it's, nothing's set in stone.

42
43 Bartholomew: Right, but you mentioned like starting now rather than 50 years from now
44 so I was just ...

45

1 McAdams: Yeah, I mean I guess when we've talked about it before it's, it's maybe 50
2 years in the future but I think it's, if there's ever going to be action there
3 should be sort of a plan saying, "This is where it does happen," but this
4 Committee and the Policy Committee has, has the right to say, "We want
5 to delineate the bypass," or they could say, "We would like it studied
6 further or to continue in the plan because we believe it's, it'd be necessary
7 in the future".
8

9 Bartholomew: Okay.

10
11 Herrera: Mr. Chair, can I maybe add a little bit more information to that answer? So
12 I think that some of the proposed bypass routes have been studied in a
13 little bit of detail. I know for example the West Mesa or High Mesa Road
14 was, we started studying it and then the Policy Board of the, this MPO
15 decided not to approve the, the next phase of that so I think that there has
16 been some planning going on. I'm not sure about the other, the other
17 lines on that map but I know that that for one has been looked at at least
18 in some detail.
19

20 Bartholomew: I do you recall that one.

21
22 Murphy: I, I can, I can give a little bit more. As such the, not only the state did a
23 Phase A report on the High Mesa and West Mesa, it also factored into the
24 City-sponsored Jackrabbit Interchange Study at the convergence of US-70
25 and I-10. Back in the '90s the County had done some preliminary
26 environmental documents on the, on the Weisner alignment connecting
27 from US-70 down to I-10 near the Mesquite interchange. That is the
28 documentation that I'm, that I'm aware of. We just kind of in, yeah in, in
29 talking with your agencies and kind of polling what, what your plans are
30 none of, none of the agencies and part of the MPO or, or a partner in the
31 DOT, can I sense that anybody's, anybody's looking to move forward with
32 any of these facilities save the DOT had considered the, the West Mesa
33 aspect. However when we go out to public we're, we're getting two
34 reactions; one is you know, "We're not a real city until we build a loop
35 road. We need to, we need to build, we need to build one yesterday.
36 Why haven't you, why haven't you done that yet?" so, so we, it continually
37 comes up in the public forum. At this time in our public forum is we've
38 also got the, the polar opposite comment that said you know, "If, if there's
39 not an immediate need for it, you don't see the need for it in the 20-year
40 horizon, why is it even on your map?" So that, that was a fair enough
41 question so we thought that ... and then, and then a, a couple of you had
42 made some, some comments on the maps last month about, about getting
43 a loop road system constructed and so we thought, "Okay we really need
44 to dive into this, into this issue deeply kind of, kind of get some firm
45 answers for it." So we had Michael, you know kind of give this, and he's
46 going to give the same presentation, maybe a little modified it to Policy

1 Committee next week so that we get, get some firm direction from our
2 Technical Committee and our, our Policy Committee on whether or not to
3 include this in our planning, you know in our planning maps. From the
4 looks of things and from what I'm understanding your projects to be, you
5 know the County, the County's main number one concern is, remains they
6 have many miles of unpaved roads out there is that's their first foremost
7 need. City of Las Cruces, they're, they're implementing their pavement
8 management system. They want to get their pavement quality up to, up to
9 the quality that their citizenry expects. They're also looking at ITS
10 solutions in order to better manage the, manage the existing
11 transportation system. So all, and then the, and then NMDOT has been
12 and my, I, it sounds like you guys will continue to be in maintenance mode
13 here for the foreseeable future due to the uncertainty of funding at the
14 federal level and, you know maintaining what we have is you know the
15 number one listing in the federal regulations so I was looking at, you know
16 essentially having our, our MTP come out with; that we're not going to do
17 any capacity expansion projects, that we're going to concentrate on
18 maintenance, that we're going to you know take care of what we got. But
19 the, but the loop road and calls for new interchanges kind of fly in the face
20 of that so I think we need to, we need to have the discussion out here.
21 We need to have the discussion very publicly and, and, and settle it one
22 way or the other if that's the, if that's the route that we're going to, to go
23 with this MTP.

24
25 Bartholomew: Okay. Thank you, Tom. Any other comments or questions of Tom?

26
27 Herrera: Mr. Chair, another comment. I think that's a good route to go, to say that
28 we're pretty much in maintenance mode, that it's fine to study these and if
29 we want to put them in long-range plans that's okay, but so far none of the
30 local governments and, you know the DOT did that Phase A but we're not
31 looking at spending \$60 or \$70 million to build loop roads right now. We
32 just can't afford it, so.

33
34 Bartholomew: Other comments, agreement, disagreement? Sounds like there, people
35 nodding heads in agreement pretty much.

36 37 **6.3 Transportation Improvement Program Update**

38
39 Bartholomew: If there's no other comments then I guess we're going to move on to the
40 final discussion item: Transportation Improvement Program Update.

41
42 Wray: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is less of a discussion item and more just a
43 brief update on the TIP and TAP projects that we received last month. We
44 only received two that were submitted to us. One was from the Town of
45 Mesilla for road improvements in the area of Zia Middle School. As the
46 Committee is no doubt aware, that's been a problem area for several

1 years and the Town of Mesilla is seeking funding to implement some
2 remedies for that area. The other application that we received was from
3 the School District. They're looking to put flashers and other safety
4 features around several crossings throughout the area. And those were
5 the two projects that, or applications that we received and staff is going to
6 be convening very soon to start work on putting those through the TIP
7 process. We anticipate probably having them before this Committee in
8 March, I would say. Probably in March for this Committee's review.
9

10 Bartholomew: Thank you Andrew. Any questions.

11
12 Herrera: Mr. Chair, Andrew I have a couple of questions more about the, the
13 application submitted by the Public School District. What source of
14 funding are they looking for on that?
15

16 Wray: I have to defer to Mr. Murphy on that as I have not actually seen the
17 document.
18

19 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, they're looking for, to be funded under the, the
20 TAP program is the funding source referenced.
21

22 Herrera: Okay. And that's what I figured but we need to keep in mind that the
23 deadline for submittal of TAP applications to the statewide coordinator is
24 February first. And this, since it's a statewide competition the MPO
25 doesn't need to take action, we just need to make sure that that
26 application is submitted with a signed resolution and everything else by
27 February first.
28

29 Murphy: You know I thought it was February 15th but I think, I think we're going to,
30 we're going to do the same hustle either way.
31

32 Herrera: Okay. Thanks.
33

34 Murphy: So we'll get it in.
35

36 Bartholomew: Any other questions or comments? Thank you, Andrew.
37

38 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS** 39

40 Bartholomew: Any comments from the Committee at this point in time?
41

42 Knopp: All right. One thing that we usually do on an annual basis is approve the
43 calendar. I don't think we did this time. And as we do that for the,
44 typically the first Thursdays of the month other than today, I would suggest
45 that we change September's from the third to the tenth, just so that it's
46 after Labor Day and there's a lot of vacations and things like that going on.

1 And also we don't meet in July and it already said the locations, you know
2 July wasn't included in either so it kind of acknowledges that.

3
4 Bartholomew: Okay. Tom is, is this usually an action item that's brought to the, to the
5 group? The calendar?

6
7 Murphy: We have in the past taken it, taken through here for recommendation of
8 the Policy Committee and it, it's apparent that we've neglected to get your,
9 get your feedback on it because we, you know I wanted, I think mainly
10 because we were not changing anything on there. I think the solution, the
11 solution would be that, that's, could be at the discretion of the, of the Chair
12 or the discretion of the MPO officer when it comes to September. We can
13 cancel the meeting that's set for September 3rd and just call a special one
14 for September 10th. That way we don't have to amend the, we, we don't
15 have to amend the official calendar and take it through Policy Committee
16 because it is a, it is a, a power that's vested in either, either you or myself.

17
18 Bartholomew: I, I would be agreeable to doing that as the Chair at the time it comes if
19 we do have a September meeting, I'll leave it to the Committee if we'd like
20 to, to do it any, anything more formal than that. Okay? I guess we'll just
21 do it informally, then that way when the time comes just remind me.

22
23 Murphy: Okay, if you remind me to remind you.

24
25 Bartholomew: Okay. John will remind us. Any staff comments at this time?

26
27 Murphy: No staff comments.

28
29 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

30
31 Bartholomew: Okay. And I haven't seen any public walk in yet so I'll pass over that.

32
33 **9. ADJOURNMENT (5:00)**

34
35 Bartholomew: I'll take a motion for adjournment then.

36
37 Love: So moved.

38
39 Herrera: Second.

40
41 Bartholomew: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor? Thank you.

42
43 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

44
45 
46 Chairperson