



# 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://lcmpoweb.las-cruces.org>

## LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### AGENDA

The following is the AMENDED agenda for the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **March 7, 2013 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Blvd.**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the Las Cruces MPO website at <http://lcmpoweb.las-cruces.org>.

The Las Cruces 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 Las Cruces MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Las Cruces MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 528-3016 (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 Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 528-3016 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4.1. February 7, 2013 \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5.1 Discussion regarding Adjusting the Urbanized Area Boundary \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
  - 5.2 Transportation Asset Management Presentation \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING**

4 Following are the minutes from the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting  
5 held on Thursday, February 7, 2013 at 4:00 p.m. at Dona Ana County Government  
6 Bldg, Commission Chambers, Las Cruces, New Mexico.  
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)  
9 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
10 Harold Love (NMDOT)  
11 Greg Walke (NMSU)  
12 Larry Altamirano (LCPS)  
13 John Gwynne (DA Flood Commission)  
14 Debbie Lujan (Town of Mesilla)  
15 Bill Childress (BLM)  
16 Louis Grijalva (CLC Public Works)  
17 Jack Valencia (SCRDT)  
18 Henry K. Corneles (DAC Engineering)  
19

20 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jesus Morales (EBID)  
21 John Knopp (Town of Mesilla)  
22 Willie Roman (CLC Public Works)  
23 Luis Marmolejo (DAC)  
24

25 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)  
26 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)  
27

28 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Aaron Chavarria (NMDOT)  
29

30 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

31  
32 Meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Mike Bartholomew stated that the Committee needed  
33 to elect a temporary chair for this meeting. He asked for volunteers.  
34

35 Mike volunteered. All were in favor of Mike as temporary chair.  
36

37 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

38  
39 Bartholomew: All in favor or approving the agenda, please say 'aye'.  
40

41 All in favor.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

1 **3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

2  
3 Tom stated that the TAC has a chair and a vice chair. The chair runs the meetings and the  
4 vice chair steps in when the chair is unable to attend the meeting. The appointments last for  
5 one calendar year.

6 Mike asked for nominations for Chair.

7  
8 No nominations were made. Mike volunteered to be Chair.

9  
10 Jolene Herrera nominated Mike Bartholomew for Chair.

11 Bill Childress seconded the nomination.

12 Larry Altamirano made a request to close nominations.

13 All in favor of nomination. Mike Bartholomew is the new Chair.

14  
15 Mike asked for nominations for Vice-Chair.

16  
17 Larry Altamirano volunteered to be Vice-Chair.

18  
19 Harold Love formally nominated Larry Altamirano.

20 Henry Corneles seconded the motion.

21 Bill Childress motioned to close nominations.

22 All in favor of nomination. Larry Altamirano is the new Vice-Chair.

23  
24 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No public comment

25  
26 **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

27  
28 **5.1 November 1, 2012**

29  
30 Someone (didn't state name) stated they had a correction to the minutes. Willie Roman works  
31 for the CLC Transportation Department on page 1.

32  
33 Mike asked for a motion to accept the minutes as amended.

34  
35 Jolene Herrera moved to accept the minutes as amended.

36 John Gwynne seconded the motion.

37 All in favor, motion passes.

38  
39 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

40  
41 **6.1 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments**

42  
43 On May 11, 2011, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2012-2017 Transportation  
44 Improvement Program (TIP).

1 The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:  
2

| CN      | FY         | Agency                    | Project & Termini   | Scope   | Change   |
|---------|------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| W100032 | 2013, 2014 | Las Cruces MPO            | SRTS Coordinator  |   | Additional funding for FY 2013 & 2014                                  |
| TL00011 | 2014       | City of Las Cruces        | RoadRUNNER Transit  | 5 Dial-A-Ride vans  | Project funded in FY 2014  |
| W100080 | 2013       | CLC, Las Cruces MPO, LCPS | SRTS Infrastructure; Various LCPS elementary and middle schools | Bike racks, crosswalks, flashers, signage, sidewalk repairs, etc. | Project awarded \$500,000  |
| W100060 | 2013       | Las Cruces MPO, LCPS      | SRTS Champion Funding   |   | Project awarded \$25,000   |
| LC00070 | 2013       | NMDOT                     | US 70 – Morton Ln to Rio Grande Bridge                          | Pavement Preservation   | Project moved from FY 2014 to FY 2013, additional funding of \$600,000 |
| LC00080 | 2017       | NMDOT                     | US 70 – NASA Rd to Aguirre Springs Rd                           | Pavement Preservation   | Project moved from FY 2013 to FY 2017                                  |

3  
4 These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

5  
6 Tom stated asked for a recommendation to the Policy Committee for approval. Tom stated  
7 there are six projects that will be amended into the 2012-27 TIP.

8  
9 Tom gave a brief presentation.

10  
11 **Unknown: (did not state name)** – The Safe Routes to School is a great program but I  
12 would just like the, I know you have a new staff member that is running this and  
13 maybe I could just meet with her or something and encourage her to maybe  
14 reach out to more of the schools in the County rather than just seems to be like  
15 mostly Mesilla and City schools but there are some schools in the County that  
16 could probably benefit from this also and I know that some of them may not be  
17 real forthcoming about giving information but maybe we could just help them a  
18 little bit especially the ones in the colonias and places where they could walk to  
19 school, just an observation.

20  
21 Murphy: I will ask her to give you a call.

22  
23 Mike asked for a motion to recommend these amendments to the Policy Committee.

24 Harold Love motioned to recommend to the Policy Committee.

25 Greg Walke seconded the motion.

26 All in favor, motion passes.

27

1  
2 **6.2 New Mexico Highway Safety Improvement Program: FY13 Safety Project**  
3 **Application**  
4

5 The New Mexico Highway Safety Improvement Program (NM HSIP) is now formally issuing an  
6 announcement requesting proposals for engineering type stand-alone transportation safety  
7 improvement projects for consideration for funding in the appropriate forthcoming Federal FY  
8 2013, FY2014 and FY2015 program years of the current NM State Transportation  
9 Improvement Program (STIP). All received safety project applications are in competition with  
10 each other at the state-wide level. Safety funds are eligible for funding the costs of studies,  
11 right-of-way acquisition, project development costs (such as environmental clearance), project  
12 design, project construction and non-construction program operation.  
13

14 HSIP regulations require that justification for all HSIP funded safety projects must be data  
15 driven and evidence-based regarding forecasted safety improvements. The most successful  
16 proposed engineering type safety projects that will receive funding approval will likely be  
17 prioritized based on: crash data showing fatal, incapacitating, or visible injury crash history, or  
18 crash data showing evidence of crash history of a particular type that can be corrected by the  
19 proposed safety project, or a traffic conflicts study (engineering safety study) with results  
20 showing a traffic hazard with the proposed safety project generating countermeasures to  
21 reduce the identified traffic hazard. Evidence submitted based on published studies should  
22 cite the table number, figure number, or page number of the study. Examples of such  
23 published studies include: NMDOT's annual New Mexico Transparency Reports (Five Percent  
24 Most Severe Safety needs) from FY2006 through FY2012; Mid-Region COG's 2011 Annual  
25 Crash and Safety Report for the Albuquerque Metropolitan Planning Area; Las Cruces MPO's  
26 Road Safety Assessment: El Paseo Road Corridor, October 26-27, 2010, by Vanasse Hangen  
27 Brustlin, Inc.; Santa Fe MPO's Cerrillos Road/Alta Vista Street/Luisa Street/Cordova Road,  
28 Pedestrian Road Safety Assessment, Santa Fe, New Mexico, May 11 – 12, 2009 by Vanasse  
29 Hangen Brustlin, Inc., and all road safety audit reports conducted by the NMDOT HSIP.  
30

31 *Submittals from cities, counties, tribal governments, and other local agencies must be sent first*  
32 *to their respective Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) or Regional Planning*  
33 *Organization (RPO) for review, processing, and approval and then have the MPO or RPO*  
34 *submit the safety project applications to the NMDOT General Office. All city streets, county*  
35 *roads, and tribal roads are eligible.*  
36

37 Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation. Projects are due by February and they are to be a  
38 statistically driven project that addresses engineering solutions to safety conditions within a  
39 jurisdiction. Tom stated that one application was received from the City of Las Cruces to do  
40 improvements that were recommended by a road safety assessment conducted by FHWA on  
41 El Paseo Road back in 2010. The City wants to amend the application to add some more  
42 information.  
43

44 Grijalva: Mr. Chairman, yes, I would like to make a motion so we could amend the existing  
45 application. We wanted to add; there was another report that had come out that  
46 Jolene kind of pointed out to us that we wanted to include the New Mexico

1 Transparency Report as some of the background information and also to amend  
2 the cost estimate, so I do have some copies of the pages that we would want to  
3 replace from the existing packet.  
4

5 Bartholomew: Mr. Grijalva, is there anything in particular that you wanted to point out in the  
6 packet as the part being amended.  
7

8 Grijalva: Mr. Chairman, it's just basically what I said. We just wanted to include that  
9 transparency report as part of the background information for that El Paseo  
10 corridor and then increase the cost estimate by approximately \$10,000.  
11

12 Bartholomew: What's the procedure here, Tom? Do we need to vote on the amendment first  
13 or can we just vote as amended?  
14

15 Murphy: I think we can, the way we've worked here in the past, this Committee can  
16 recommend approval to the amended report.  
17

18 Bartholomew: If there are no questions, are there any recommendations for approval of the  
19 amended report?  
20

21 Love: So moved.  
22

23 Herrera: Second.  
24

25 Bartholomew: So moved and seconded; any further discussion?  
26

27 Gwynne: Louis, can you just tell me real briefly does this impact any of the work that's  
28 been previously done on El Paseo just recently?  
29

30 Grijalva: Mr. Chairman, no, this will be all new improvements that we would do. Part of  
31 that safety corridor study was installation of access control medians, so this  
32 would in addition to the ones that we've already previously installed.  
33

34 Valencia: Mr. Chairman, Tom, with regard to the \$335,000 I guess the cost in there, does  
35 the City of Las Cruces have the match monies or participatory monies budgeted  
36 for completion of this project?  
37

38 Herrera: Mr. Chair, Tom, I can answer that question. On safety projects through the DOT  
39 there is no local match, it's a State match.  
40

41 Bartholomew: Any other questions? I'll call for the vote then to recommend this application as  
42 amended to the Policy Committee. All in favor please say 'aye'.  
43

44 All in favor, none opposed, motion passes.  
45  
46

1 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

2  
3 **7.1 Transportation Improvement Program Administration Modifications**

4  
5 On May 11, 2011, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2012-2017 Transportation  
6 Improvement Program (TIP).

7  
8 The following administrative modification(s) to the TIP have been processed:

| CN      | FY        | Agency             | Project & Termini  | Scope  | Change  |
|---------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| TL00010 | 2013-2016 | City of Las Cruces | RoadRUNNER Transit | Transit Operations                               | Funding update based on FY 2013 appropriations      |
| TL00013 | 2013-2016 | City of Las Cruces | RoadRUNNER Transit | Support Equipment and Facilities                 | Funding update based on FY 2013 appropriations      |
| 1100830 | 2014      | NMDOT              | I-10; MP 141-143   | Reconstruction of bridges @ University and Union | Termini changed from MP 141.82-142.11 to MP 141-143 |

9  
10 These administrative modifications will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

11  
12 (Didn't state name): Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, mile marker 141 is located, mile marker  
13 it says mile post 141 to 143, where is the approximate location of it?

14  
15 Herrera: Mr. Chair, that mile post is on I-10 right by the University interchange. Tom, I  
16 wanted to ask a question I guess, you have in this table showing the  
17 administrative adjustment for the mile posts but on the table that I sent to you the  
18 NMDOT matrix that was included with the amendments this project was actually  
19 supposed to be moved to 2015 as well and I don't see that that change was  
20 made.

21  
22 Murphy: What was the project number on the control number?

23  
24 Herrera: 1100830 – on the TIP report it is still showing the funding in 2014.

25  
26 Murphy: Okay, we'll go ahead and we'll make that change because it is a modification it  
27 doesn't.....

28  
29 Bartholomew: Any other questions on these modifications, if not I'll move to the second  
30 discussion item.

31  
32 **7.2 Discussion of Adjusting the UZA Boundary with El Paso**

1 After each Census MPOs may adjust their Urbanized Area based on projected conditions. The  
2 deadline for submitting an adjustment is June 2014. MPO staff will discuss with the committee  
3 the potential for amending our UZA.

4 Tom stated that it should not have read like that on the agenda. It is adjusting the UZA  
5 boundary for the MPO.

6 Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

7 Bartholomew: Tom, could you bring up the east mesa one again. You were talking about  
8 adding in those areas north of Highway 70 like where Onate is or just south  
9 you said to Mesa Grande or how would it, if you could circle it with a cursor  
10 what area.

11 Murphy: The cursor seems to be disappearing on me. I'm not really seeing it so it's hard  
12 for me to point. In this area south of US 70 is Onate High School and this is  
13 proposed Mesa Grande has it running down, this is Sonoma Ranch coming  
14 down through here, as you can see based on the population density of the  
15 tracts the urbanized area is extended to the east of Sonoma Ranch and  
16 somewhat to the east of Calle Abuelo over here, some of this in this aerial  
17 photograph was done in 2011. You can see there have been some lots that  
18 have been scraped for residential development and are probably have houses  
19 today. The guidance says the traffic generators need to be included in the  
20 UZA. The high school is certainly a significant traffic generator for our area so  
21 this would be the area that I would propose squaring off to put into the  
22 urbanized area.

23

24 Bartholomew: Yeah, I think that would be a good area too and I noticed like Rinconada where  
25 Wal-Mart is getting built, that's outside of it right now.

26

27 Murphy: Yes, that would be a traffic generator as well.

28

29 Corneles: Mr. Chair, question for Tom, what is the significance of including these areas? Is  
30 that going to affect funding? Will we be able to do projects in those areas  
31 easier?

32

33 Murphy: It could affect the funding. It affects the classification, how we report our data to  
34 the Highway Performance Monitoring System, their HPMS. In the last several  
35 years we've not seen a lot of federal funding go through towards local roadways  
36 so I don't see it affecting us from a funding standpoint, but it does affect us from  
37 a highway data reporting. It would increase the number of urbanized miles that  
38 we report and these miles essentially are urban miles.

39

40 Corneles: Okay, thank you, so we're not talking about the MPO borders; we're just talking  
41 about the urbanized area borders?

42

43 Murphy: That's correct.

44

45 Corneles: Okay, thank you.



1  
2 Herrera: Mr. Chair, if I could add a comment to that, it actually could affect funding  
3 especially now with the Transportation Alternatives Program coming down  
4 because the way that that is broken out in the law, so much money goes to urban  
5 clusters, so money goes to rural areas, that kind of thing so I guess what you  
6 have in your urbanized area affects where some of that money can be spent  
7 whether it's rural versus urban but we're still kind of working on the details for  
8 that so just something to keep in mind.  
9  
10 Bartholomew: I think it could affect us a little bit too because when we do our NTD reporting,  
11 National Transit Database reporting every year we have to allocate out any  
12 service that is outside of the UZA because that affects whether funding is  
13 allocated to 5311 or 5307. Right now we've got some routes that skirt the edge  
14 of that like Highway 70 but there is really nothing there at Highway 70, well there  
15 are stops there now, there is development in that area that you pointed out up  
16 there.  
17  
18 Murphy: And if I'm not mistaken is the DACC campus outside the urbanized boundary?  
19  
20 Bartholomew: It's off of Sonoma Ranch, I can tell, it might be in the white area there. It looks  
21 like it's in the .....  
22  
23 Someone is speaking without using the microphone – comments inaudible.  
24  
25 Bartholomew: It is just out, isn't it?  
26  
27 Murphy: That's it I believe.  
28  
29 Bartholomew: So your proposal would be to include that in the UZA.  
30  
31 Murphy: Yes.  
32  
33 Bartholomew: Are there any other questions for Mr. Murphy on this?  
34  
35 **Didn't state name:** Mr. Chair, Tom, in a nutshell could you explain how the process works?  
36  
37 Murphy: I'm still not entirely sure of the process. I believe at some point we need to work  
38 through the Committee system for MPO, agree upon what the, 1) if we want to do  
39 an adjust to UZA, we're not required to do it but if we do, once we agree upon  
40 one we do submit it to the FHWA for their review and I don't know if it goes  
41 through your department, it probably goes through your department. Jolene is  
42 indicating that it certainly does.  
43  
44 Herrera: Yeah, it does, it would go from what I understand and we've just kind of recently  
45 been talking about this at the planning division because the mid-region MPO has  
46 a lot of boundary stuff going on, so we're kind of working through the process as

1 well, but from my understanding once it goes through the MPO it will go to the  
2 planning division for review. Whatever boundaries (inaudible) you have will be  
3 packaged with the mid-region MPO boundaries and that will be submitted to  
4 FHWA from us as once package.  
5

6 Murphy: And we'll work with the mid-region on timing it but right now this is an introductory  
7 look for this Committee.  
8

9 Corneles: Mr. Chair, Tom, what is the downside?  
10

11 Murphy: I'm not aware of any downside. Like I said we don't have to do it. The downside  
12 may be that, like I said my doubting of it affecting any funding at least from a road  
13 standpoint, it would be the time spent on it without any results or any positive  
14 results out of it but I think for sakes of cleaner reporting I think that is something  
15 that we ought to do.  
16

17 Corneles: It was a just a question to see because what I foresee is that there is going to be  
18 balance of where the funding goes. Will more go to the urbanized area and less  
19 to the rural areas that way, that's the question I guess.  
20

21 Murphy: I would have to look into that. Jolene said they are still working out the formulas.  
22 I thought that it was based on the non-adjusted areas. I wasn't sure of that, see I  
23 don't know if the adjusted areas would affect that and that's one of the reasons to  
24 take it here is to get those questions answered but unfortunately I don't have the  
25 answer today.  
26

27 Herrera: And unfortunately I don't have that answer either. That wasn't something I don't  
28 think had even been brought up, so thank you, that gives us something else to  
29 look at and as far as my understanding on how the TAP language is written in the  
30 law, it's kind of written to not give more funding to the urban areas. They really  
31 want to concentrate on putting funding in rural areas as well, so I think they are  
32 trying to balance that out so from that standpoint there is not really a downside to  
33 doing this.  
34

35 Bartholomew: Any other questions? And you will be bringing this back several times you said  
36 over the next months.  
37

38 Murphy: That is correct  
39

40 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**  
41

42 Harold Love introduced the new technical support engineer, Aaron Chavarria, who will also  
43 give us a quick synopsis of what is going on with the projects in the area.  
44  
45  
46

- 1 Aaron Chavarria gave an update on projects in the area.  
2  
3
  - 4 • Motel Boulevard, Exit 139/I-10, should be wrapped by the end of the month;
  - 5 • I-10/I-25 interchange – was scheduled for 373 calendar day, looks like it will be finished  
6 around 224 calendar days which is around mid-April;
  - 7 • US 70 post and cable job just started on Saturday, February 2. It is scheduled to go on  
8 until around July.
  - 9 • Picacho Avenue from the river east to Main Street, pavement preservation project and it  
10 is scheduled to go on for about four months, construction should start around February  
11 25.

12 Tom announced that Andrew Wray is the new MPO planner. Andrew was the successful  
13 applicant to replace Andy Hume.

14 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No public comments

15  
16  
17 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

18  
19 John Gwynne motioned to adjourn.

20  
21 Jolene Herrera seconded the motion.

22  
23 Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.  
24  
25

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 Chair  
29



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

**LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF March 7, 2013**

**AGENDA ITEM:**

5.1 Adjusted UZA

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Committee Discussion

**SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

Maps to shown at meeting

**DISCUSSION:**

Last month the TAC began the discussion of adjusting the UZA for the Las Cruces Urbanized Area. While the adjusted UZA is due to FHWA in June 2014, the NMDOT is undergoing a Functional Classification update and has requested that the MPO complete its adjustment by May 2013.

Proposals for adjusting the Las Cruces UZA include:

- Adding Onate High School and other land abutting US 70 from Sonoma Ranch to Porter
- Using proposed Mesa Grande alignment to proposed Lohman extension to square off UZA boundary south of US 70
- Using Desert Wind/ Arroyo Rd. from I25 to Sonoma Ranch extension to square off boundary north of US 70.
- Include the Las Cruces International Airport and the West Mesa Industrial Park.



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

**LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF March 7, 2013**

**AGENDA ITEM:**

5.2 Transportation Asset Management Presentation

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Committee Discussion

**SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

TBD

**DISCUSSION:**

The Las Cruces MPO has retained Bohanan-Huston Inc. to develop the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan. Denise Weston, Senior Planner from BH Inc. will present the schedule, process, and goals for the development. She will also solicit input from committee members on the direction for the plan development.