



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **August 7, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico**. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org).

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 Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. June 5, 2014 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 5.2. Transportation Alternative Program Process Discussion _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 5.3. Truck Routes Discussion _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

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 June 5, 2014 at
6 4:00 p.m. at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 N. Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New
7 Mexico.

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

22
23 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
24 Jesus Morales (EBID)

25
26 **STAFF PRESENT:** Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO staff)
27 Orlando Fierro (MPO staff)
28 Tom Murphy (MPO staff)

29
30 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Denise Westin, Bohannon-Huston
31 Jennifer Hill, Bohannon-Huston
32 Anna Lauren de la Mora
33 Paul Pompeo, Southwest Engineering
34 Dara Parker, Senator Heinrich's Office

35
36 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

37
38 Meeting called to order at 4:01 p.m.

39
40 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

41
42 Valencia: I would like to call the meeting to order and look at Item number 2,
43 Approval of the Agenda. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the
44 agenda? If so the Chair will entertain a motion for approval.

45
46 Walke: So moved.

1
2 Bartholomew: Second
3
4 Valencia: It's been moved and seconded, any amendments to the agenda? If not,
5 all those in favor signify by saying aye.
6
7 All in favor.
8
9 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
10
11 **3.1 May 1, 2014**
12
13 Valencia: We have a sign-in sheet for the members that have, of the TAC that are
14 here, so we do have a quorum? I want to state that and anyone who
15 makes comments with regard, from the TAC that we introduce ourselves
16 for minute purposes so that the minute taker will have the ability to
17 differentiate who is speaking. That brings us to Item 3, Approval of
18 Minutes, May 1, 2014. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the
19 minutes?
20
21 Walke: I have a couple of really tiny corrections. On page 4, line 32-33, it say's
22 "one of the things it will have is by next months, next year...". I don't
23 remember which it is, I think they meant by next month, we'll be looking at
24 adopting the updated Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Do you know,
25 Tom, whether that was next month or next year?
26
27 Murphy: We will be updating the MTP next year.
28
29 Walke: Next year.
30
31 Murphy: We've started some public outreach activities sooner but the plan itself will
32 be updated next year, so we'll change that to next year.
33
34 Walke: So that should probably say "next year" and then at the top of Page 9, the
35 third line, Missouri was the top "ranked" project, not "tanked".
36
37 Valencia: Well, it hasn't tanked yet but there's still an opportunity.
38
39 Walke: That's all I had.
40
41 Valencia: Any other corrections to the minutes, if not the Chair will entertain a
42 motion to approve the minutes as amended.
43
44 Walke: So moved.
45
46 Bartholomew: Second.

1
 2 Valencia: Moved and seconded, any other comments, questions or amendments? If
 3 not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.
 4

5 All in favor.
 6

7 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**
 8

9 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

10 **5.1 Transportation Improvement Program 2014-2019 Amendment**
 11

12
 13 Valencia: Under 5.1 Transportation Improvement Program 2014-2019 Amendment,
 14 Mr. Murphy.
 15

16 On May 8, 2013, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2014-2019 Transportation
 17 Improvement Program (TIP).
 18

19 The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:
 20

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00100	2014	NMDOT	I-25 Missouri Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction/Widening & Addition of Auxiliary Lane	Change BOP from MP 1.5 to MP 0.8
G100030	2015 & 2016	Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs Roads	Unpaved Section of Both Roadways	Road Reconstruction – Pave unpaved sections	\$610,000 in FY2014 for design, \$5,950,000 in FY2015 for construction, \$3,220,000 in FY2016 for construction, \$828,000 County Contribution
LC00140	2017	US 70	Intersection with 17 th St.	New Traffic Signals and intersection improvements	New Project

LC00210	2014 & 2015	Goathill Rd	At BNSF RR Crossing #019679L (east of Dona Ana Rd, north of Las Cruces)	Design and Install new lights and gates at crossing	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$220,000 in FY2015 for construction
LC00220	2014 & 2015	NM 226	At BNSF RR Crossing #019744P (west of intersection with Berino Rd)	Design and construct new crossing surface, lights, and gates	\$30,000 in FY2014 for design, \$290,000 in FY2015 for construction

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

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

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Staff is requesting a recommendation of approval on Item 5.1. These are amendments to 2014-2019 TIP. On the particular, particular amendments are outlined starting on page 18 of your packet. Briefly, we'll quickly run through them, Missouri Bridge, change in terminus; addition of Baylor Canyon Road paving project through the federal lands and the County; a new traffic signal on US 70 and 17th Street by the Department of Transportation; and then two railroad safety crossings by the rail bureau on Goathill Road and NM 226. If you have any more detailed questions on any of those items I'll try to answer, but essentially those are the amendments that we're requesting a recommendation to the Policy Committee on.

Valencia: Any member of the Committee have any comments regarding, if not, then I take it you need a motion to approve the TIP amendment. The Chair will look for a motion.

Gwynne: So moved.

Altamirano: Second

Valencia: It's been moved and seconded, is there any further discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All in favor.

5.2 FY 2015 - FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program Adoption

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

1 accomplishing the tasks. The UPWP must be in compliance with the Metropolitan
2 Transportation Plan.

3
4 Valencia: That brings us to Item 5.2, FY 2015-2016 UPW, Mr. Murphy.

5
6 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again we are asking a recommendation of approval
7 to the Policy Committee. This is for the Federal Fiscal Year 2015 and
8 Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Unified Planning Work Program for the MPO.
9 We had it here last month as a discussion item. As you were walking in, I
10 apologize that we didn't get it into your hands sooner, but we handed out
11 to you the updated document from May's meeting. We did have it on our
12 website for, to allow for public comment, for 30 days. Just to highlight the
13 changes, since I stood before you last, if you direct your attention to page
14 9 of your packet and I'll go down through the table of contents and where
15 the changes have been made. We added, added a line, the Task 1.8 to
16 account for state and federal coordination. Our work with, our typical work
17 interacting with FHWA/FTA and NMDOT, as well as more active
18 participation in the Statewide Long Range Plan update which is ongoing.
19 We added under Item 4.6, an item that somehow we missed, our
20 coordination with the Regional Transit District, that we'll provide planning
21 support as needed to the RTD, as well as attendance of the Board
22 meetings for the RTD. Finally, Item 5.6, we've added the 2014-2015
23 Urban Sustainability Accelerator. The City of Las Cruces applied for and
24 is gonna be receiving some technical assistance through the Urban
25 Sustainability Accelerator program, which is run through the, through
26 Portland State University. The particular focus of this process would be
27 trying to implement complete streets onto El Paseo Road in conjunction
28 with the road safety audit that was conducted a few years back, as well as
29 the City's area blue print which they worked on last year and was
30 approved through City Council. So this is a grant aiming to further work
31 on El Paseo in order to make it a more complete street and that's in
32 conformance with the MPO's Transportation Plan. Also the big items in
33 Appendix A, we have the budgetary information figured out, starting, which
34 is on page 29. That handles the major changes since this Committee saw
35 this last. I'll stand for any questions.

36
37 Valencia: Any member of the Committee have questions for Mr. Murphy?

38
39 Walke: In Section 5.6, under responsibilities it lists a NMSU Civil Engineering
40 Department and the College of Engineering. Do you know what the
41 difference in those two are?

42
43 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Walke, the difference being in them, is the City's been
44 working with several individuals, not only with the MPO of the City and
45 NMSU. Two of the individuals from NMSU, one identified themselves as
46 being in the Civil Engineering Department, and the other one identified

1 themselves as the College of Engineering. I presume they are more of the
2 Dean's level office.

3
4 Walke: Alright, thanks.

5
6 Valencia: Additional questions, any member of the public here to speak on this
7 item?

8
9 Herrera: Mr. Chair.

10
11 Valencia: Jolene.

12
13 Herrera: I have a question. Tom, on the budget, on page 29, I'm just looking at
14 your program total there, that \$609,000, does that include the funding that
15 you want to rollover from 2014?

16
17 Murphy: Yes that will include the anticipated rollover from, particularly from the
18 special projects, the corridor studies, the Short Range Transit Plan that we
19 don't anticipate completing by October 1.

20
21 Herrera: Okay, thank you.

22
23 Valencia: Any other questions by any member of the Committee and/or the public?
24 If not, the Chair will entertain a motion.

25
26 Herrera: Move to approve.

27
28 Valencia: It's been moved, is there a second.

29
30 Bartholomew: Second

31
32 Valencia: Any additional discussion, questions for amendments? If not, all those in
33 favor signify by saying aye.

34
35 All in favor.

36
37 **5.3 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan**

38
39 Mesilla Valley MPO's Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan (TASM Plan)
40 represents one of the management plans recommended by the MPO's current Metropolitan
41 Transportation Plan (MTP). It is designed as the first step in implementation of coordinated
42 asset management for transportation infrastructure under the jurisdiction of the following
43 agencies: New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), New Mexico State
44 University (NMSU), Doña Ana County, City of Las Cruces and Town of Mesilla.

45

1 The overall purpose of this Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan is to
2 develop strategies, projects and tasks for implementation of a management approach to
3 regionalized decision making related to transportation system improvement, maintenance
4 and replacement. This plan has been developed under the framework of MAP-21, Moving
5 Ahead of Progress in the 21st Century Act. MAP-21 is a performance-based program;
6 therefore, a broader purpose of this Plan is to develop a data collection and prioritization
7 process that can be used to evaluate the performance of the transportation planning efforts
8 as they align with the criteria used in MAP-21.

9
10 Bohannon Huston, Inc. is currently preparing this Plan for Mesilla Valley MPO.

11
12 Valencia: Next is Item 6, Discussion Items, no I apologize, is Item 5.3 the
13 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan and I know we have
14 some guests here that are going to present after your intro, I'm sure, Mr.
15 Murphy.

16
17 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. We have Denise and Jennifer here again. You've
18 seen them a lot throughout the past year. I think they've done a lot of
19 great work for us. What we're asking for this afternoon is for a
20 recommendation from the TAC to the Policy Committee on the adoption of
21 this document, which we hope will help guide us in our planning efforts
22 moving forward. With that I'm gonna go ahead and turn it over to Denise
23 so she can walk through her presentation.

24
25 Valencia: I guess my first point of clarification on the title as I see it, it says Las
26 Cruces MPO.

27
28 Westin: I was just gonna apologize for that.

29
30 Valencia: Well, you can do it twice.

31
32 Westin: Old habits die hard. Just grabbed an old presentation and grabbed the
33 wrong front screen, so good afternoon Chair and Committee members
34 and again I apologize for that. We are here, and we appreciate the
35 opportunity to be here one more time to be bringing you the final edits to
36 the Mesilla Valley MPO Transportation Asset and Safety Management
37 Plan, known as the TASM Plan. So we, I'm not gonna go through the
38 whole asset management process again, we've all been through that.
39 We've been a great team on this. We have actually, really appreciated
40 your support on this process and what I'm gonna do this afternoon is just
41 sort of respond to the comments that I heard at the last meeting, and the
42 comments we've received in the emails since then. So a quick overview,
43 we edited the EBID maps, we enhanced the signage section, included
44 some transit criteria, developed a section on drainage infrastructure, and
45 then did some outreach and created an entire section and a
46 recommendation on an asset management leadership committee. So the

1 EBID, I made you a copy of the sections we changed. I didn't recreate the
2 entire document in this draft form because I figure you have the one from
3 last time. If you have any comments today I'm still willing to integrate
4 them in quickly before we make a final version, hopefully, upon your
5 approval, for the Police Committee next week and then at that time I will
6 make sure that I bring enough hard copies of the final version for Tom, for
7 all of you to have after that time. So I just created paper versions of the
8 actual sections that we made the edits to, so that you feel comfortable
9 being able to review those and give your approval on those particular
10 sections. So we worked closely with Chowdhury and Orlando and made
11 sure that we had the correct reference and the correct, you know,
12 reference to the EBID trails and we removed those and referenced them in
13 a way that felt more comfortable to both of those agencies. Then we had
14 one comment on the signage and Mr. Gwynne, if we did not respond to
15 this as you had requested please clarify for me, but I felt that your concern
16 was really about making sure that that reference to signage was
17 comprehensive, and that. So what I did was I went back in and I made a
18 clarification that the signage is an asset, that is, both can be regulatory,
19 directional, informational and that in fact it does require a considerate cost
20 and does need to be considered under the asset management process,
21 but that each agency individually can determine how best to incorporate
22 which signs they want to include. So does the Town of Mesilla want to
23 include all of their way finding signs or do they just want to include their
24 regulatory signs? I mean, I think under the federal guidelines, under
25 MAP21, that you'd have to include sort of your regulatory signs, but it
26 would be an individual decision at an agency level on whether you wanted
27 to include informational signs or way finding signs, but does that address
28 your comment?

29
30 Gwynne: Yes, very good thank you.

31
32 Westin: And then, Mr. Bartholomew was really great and gave us all of these sort
33 of really specific decision making questions and criteria he uses to
34 determine where transit sites are located. I know they're tiny on our
35 screen, they're not really for you to read, as much as for you to see that he
36 has an integral list of criteria that he uses on a daily basis to make that
37 decision. I put that in the plan. I think that's really important. Those are
38 the, that's the level of effort that each individual agency might want to go
39 to at, for each asset, as it's appropriate. So at the end of the day the great
40 words of wisdom, the sites with the fewest constraints are usually, you
41 know, built first, or they get the improvements done most quickly. So,
42 does that address your comment?

43
44 Bartholomew: Uh huh.

45

1 Westin: Good and then Harold absolutely gave us the comment to include
2 drainage infrastructure and it wasn't one of our original assets. It didn't
3 come through the scope, it wasn't identified in isolation, it does sort of, you
4 know, it is considered under curb and gutter, it is considered in broad
5 costs on road ways, but what I did was I built an entire section on drainage
6 infrastructure so that we could really identify the value of it as an asset in
7 its own right, and so that we can address the costs and the risks impacts
8 from it, but given the fact that they are so, you know, there's such a
9 variation of drainage infrastructure that can be either be a standalone
10 project or another component of another asset. I didn't go through in this
11 TASM plan and evaluate the costs, the lifecycle, the lifecycle costs, or the
12 risks for each drainage type, but I did recommend at agency level that you
13 do that under your asset management plan implementation and that,
14 associated with that you would have to develop your own inventory and
15 inspection process for each of those drainage infrastructure types. I think
16 the most unique thing about the drainage infrastructure is that sometimes
17 they're done as part of a transportation project and sometimes they're
18 done separately on their own. So that is, that is actually you know, a way
19 for on a regional basis, where you can sort of corral that together and
20 really make that connection of getting those drainage projects done in
21 association with your transportation projects. Not only do you make the
22 implementation more effective, you can consider additional funding
23 sources for those drainage projects, and I think all of that really helps you
24 build sort of an asset management approach to drainage infrastructures
25 that's slightly unique, compared to the other assets which are a little bit
26 more black and white. Jennifer handed out a copy of that chapter, so if
27 you have any concerns about it over the next day or so you have 24
28 hours. Don't hesitate if it doesn't, if it doesn't feel right to you, you just let
29 me know and we'll add some wording or we'll expand it a little bit and
30 make sure that it's addressing that drainage infrastructure as an asset.
31 And then I think the biggest piece that we added was the recommendation
32 to create this asset management leadership team and it was a request of
33 the Committee to do a little bit more research on this and we did, and we
34 went ahead and did a peer review with the Ohio Department of
35 Transportation, who has one of the most successful asset management
36 leadership teams in the nation, and they were really gracious, actually,
37 and spent quite a bit of time on the phone with us chatting about how they
38 developed it and how well it works. No big surprise, they have the same
39 sort of group of stakeholders that we've identified here. They have
40 FHWA and the Department of Transportation Districts involved, the
41 Council of Governments Regional Planning. They have it broken down
42 into three levels, you can see there, where the Asset Management
43 Leadership Team is everybody, they have a smaller executive level
44 component of that, which is the decision, which you know really does the
45 hard work, they meet on a monthly basis, and they make, they make the
46 recommendations, and then a very small group of the IT Council, which

1 actually makes the final decisions on that. So how they got this started is
2 they invited all the stakeholder agencies they could think of to the group,
3 to the first kick-off meeting. So there were hundreds, you know, like a lot
4 of people at this meeting, but then just sort of to give everybody the
5 information and the education on what asset management is. But then
6 they were really clear with these agencies that they had to pick two
7 representatives, that's, they got two representatives, two slots, because
8 they wanted to make sure that they brought consistency and commitment,
9 and accountability at the agency level for this Asset Management
10 Leadership Team. So at the end of the day, they have about that 35
11 member executive level component that meets on a monthly basis and
12 gets things done. So some of the work that they did, they did at the
13 beginning as a leadership team, has already been done here in the TASM
14 plan. You know, we, as a group here, developed goals, we have the
15 stakeholder lists completed, we've evaluated your data gaps, the assets
16 that you're gonna want to cover, so you have a really good start with this
17 TASM plan and you're ready to move right on into collecting that adequate
18 data, creating those consistent parameters so you can make those
19 prioritization decisions and the best news of all, is there wasn't really any
20 extra funding allocated to this process. They really just went to the
21 agencies and requested the time commitment from the staff members and
22 the leadership to be on that to be a part of that leadership team. So I'm
23 not saying it's free but it is a measure of a time commitment at the agency
24 level. So the primary tasks and the greatest benefits from developing a
25 management leadership team is to really engage in that regional
26 prioritization process, as you know, which is the greatest benefit from
27 doing asset management at a regional level. The other interesting thing
28 that the Ohio DOT did was to create sort of an objective evaluation of the
29 needs so that you wouldn't be pitting agencies against agencies and
30 assets against assets, is that they actually did a survey, sort of an
31 anonymous survey on asset, on the needs assessment for each asset and
32 that way the data came back to make the comparison and it wasn't
33 necessarily provided by somebody's strong political drive on which assets
34 needed to rise to the top. So they found that to be a very productive way.
35 They literally just used Survey Monkey and they worked with the university
36 and they found some good connections with the university, and they
37 collected the data to help them prioritize their needs. Then, obviously, to
38 have the ability to have a leadership team that can maintain that regional
39 coordination, can bring validity to those decisions and really keep the
40 asset management data updated and establish a, you know, a local and a
41 regional spot to keep the data. I know that question came up last time and
42 Tom graciously offered that the MPO would be happy to do that but I won't
43 commit him to that. But something like that, so that it's all in one location
44 and there's not confusion about where that data is being collected. So
45 those are the edits that we did. We're pretty excited to be able to finalize
46 the plan for you and but we're happy, like I said, we're happy to take any

1 comments on those edits, anything else we can do to make this plan work
2 for you, we're happy to hear about that tonight.
3

4 Valencia: Any questions from our Committee? I do have one, in the data collection
5 and all of that, is there a monetary amount that is provided to the assets
6 and if so, is there a depreciation or replacement kind of value to the, in
7 totality of what, what you discovered in your inventory?
8

9 Westin: Absolutely, I mean we gave some samples in the plan itself on sort of cost
10 to certain assets and that is the, one of the most beneficial questions you
11 can ask, is when is it most valuable to replace that asset and when you
12 know, cause it's a lot more valuable or it's a lot more beneficial financially
13 to get in earlier, do maintenance, keep things updated than it is to wait 'til
14 the end and have to replace the entire asset. So we gave some samples
15 in the TASM plan that would actually, that are real estimates on cost,
16 based on engineering data. But certainly the agencies would have to get
17 in and look at their historic expenditures and really enhance that
18 component when they're actually implementing asset management. Does
19 that answer your question? So for like drainage infrastructure I didn't go in
20 and give cost, I didn't give approximate cost for that just because of the
21 various, you know, wide range of potential drainage infrastructure
22 required. But when they're implementing the asset management plan they
23 would have to really take some time to
24

25 Valencia: There's a tradeoff between doing a new project or utilizing that same
26 source of funding for maintenance. Greater longevity out of the use of
27 the...
28

29 Westin: Totally. Right and historically those decisions had been made in isolation,
30 in separate silos right? You have your maintenance decisions made over
31 here, and your capital improvement projects made over here. But one of
32 the goals of asset management is to marry that decision making process,
33 for the better use of public funds and the better level of service provided to
34 your residents.
35

36 Valencia: In the business world they utilize depreciation and that for tax advantage
37 and things of that nature. In the private, in the public sector, it's for
38 replacement.
39

40 Westin: Right. I don't think you're gonna get any tax cuts.
41

42 Valencia: Any other comments?
43

44 Herrera: Mr. Chair.
45

46 Valencia: Jolene.

1
2 Herrera: I just have a question, I guess it's more general, how do you see the asset
3 management leadership team working within the MPO? Because I think
4 you did a really good job. I just read through it briefly, outlining what Ohio
5 DOT did, but on a smaller scale within this MPO, do you kind of see the
6 Policy Committee being like the executive.
7
8 Westin: I think you can set it up anyway you want and I think that's a really good
9 point, that you may only need two components of that triangle, right.
10 Because you're not gonna get more than 30 people on your larger piece of
11 your stakeholders. So yeah, I do think and absolutely if you want to
12 double up and have your Policy Committee be your decision making
13 group, then you're not asking extra efforts from people, you know, and you
14 could really keep this TAC as your sort of asset management leadership
15 team if you felt comfortable and you felt like it was comprehensive
16 enough, you could do it at that that level. But that's really your decision or
17 you might find benefit from grabbing, maybe an additional staff member
18 for each of these agencies so that you have the extra leg work that you
19 need, somebody else who's really able to spend the time and the effort,
20 doing the data collection and understanding what's going on at the, you
21 know, at the staff level, combined with your TAC representative and then
22 together that's your committee and then you go to the Policy Committee to
23 get your decisions made.
24
25 Herrera: Thanks and I guess, if I could extend the question over to Tom, how, have
26 you thought about how, kind of the implementation of this plan will go?
27
28 Murphy: I think what Denise alluded to; I think it would really start with this
29 Committee. This Committee historically has been who we've relied on for
30 the expertise. I don't really see, you know, expertise lying in different
31 areas, maybe supplemented by additional members of your agencies but I
32 think informally this Committee has historically been that and I think
33 formalizing it and just making it move forward into a usable work product.
34
35 Herrera: Thanks. The reason that I'm kind of asking this question is because, as
36 you both know, the State is also working on an asset management plan
37 and I think you guys are ahead of the game in that and it's just some ideas
38 to think about how you're gonna about implementing it, so maybe we can
39 see how that's gonna work on a smaller scale and try to scale it up. So
40 let's not recreate the wheel right?
41
42 Westin: Right and as we have mentioned several times, whatever you do at this
43 level really does need to align directly and coordinate with whatever is
44 being done at the state level to make sure that you are in federal
45 compliance, if nothing else.
46

1 Valencia: Any additional comments or discussion? Mr. Murphy you want approval
2 of this, I assume. The staff recommendation?
3
4 Murphy: Yes, we're asking for recommendation to the Policy Committee.
5
6 Valencia: The Chair will entertain a motion for 5.3, the Transportation Asset and
7 Safety Management Plan.
8
9 Altamirano: So moved.
10
11 Gwynne: Second.
12
13 Valencia: It's moved and seconded, any further discussion amendments? If not, all
14 those in favor signify by saying aye.
15
16 All Approved.
17
18 Valencia: Thank you Denise.
19
20 Westin: Thank you and I do want to thank you. It's actually been a very enjoyable
21 project, so we appreciate the opportunity.
22

23 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

24 **6.1 Arroyo Road/Nation Monument Impact Discussion**

25
26
27 In light of the recent creation of the Organ Mountains National Monument, concern has
28 been expressed regarding potential impacts to the MPO Thoroughfare network. This item is
29 intended to discuss potential impacts to Arroyo Road, the closest MPO thoroughfare to the
30 national monument.
31

32 Valencia: Going to the next item, Item 6.1 Discussion Item, Arroyo Road National
33 Monument Impact discussion. Mr. Murphy.
34

35 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. As many of you are
36 aware since we last met, there was announcement of the new national
37 monument designation for the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National
38 Park. We looked at it and we were also specifically requested by the City
39 that we evaluate its impact on the existing MPO plans. Happy to say
40 there's only one, even close impact and that's, you'll see on the screen,
41 we got a snap shot out of the proposed or the functional classification
42 proposed Thoroughfare Plan, which shows that proposed Arroyo Road is
43 a proposed principal arterial that crosses the pre-existing BLM recreation
44 area and the monument boundaries are close to within that area. So the
45 question being was where does this proposed right-of-way cross over the
46 monument proper and what impacts would that have to our planning

1 process. As you can see from the zoomed out version of the
2 Thoroughfare Plan, is that Arroyo Road does, has been planned to be a
3 very important connection for the region, connecting the Dona Interchange
4 to I-25 in the West, eastward up the East Mesa, ultimately ending as a
5 principal arterial at Weisner Road, which is proposed to be a major north
6 south for the region in connectivity to the US 70 points further east. Also
7 with the major development known as Metro Verde, immediately east of
8 the proposed monument area, this facility could provide traffic relief to US
9 70, which is, we know is right now one of our most heavily traveled
10 thoroughfares. So, working with the staff from Senator Heinrich's office
11 and from Mr. Childress at the BLM, we've gotten some more information
12 about how those boundaries line up and this one, I appreciate this photo
13 of Mr. Childress'. The Arroyo Road, it connects into the Desert Wind
14 alignment as it ultimately goes onto the Dona Ana Interchange. With this
15 monument boundary, you see that the dirt road of Desert Wind Way is
16 outside the monument boundary and then it would connect here. You can
17 see the golf course in the upper right hand corner of that picture and then
18 here's a zoomed out view. We have that, so essentially we're here today
19 to discuss whether we want to move forward with doing any kind of
20 amendments to the Thoroughfare Plan or do we feel that the, or feel that
21 it's adequate as is. I think I'd like to open it up for discussion.
22

23 Valencia: What is the timeframe for the expected build out of Arroyo Road? I mean I
24 know there have been many discussions over the years of the so called
25 "loop" system in Las Cruces that is a component of it, also from Santa
26 Teresa up to the airport, is the discussion of the West Mesa Road, and
27 that. What are the estimates of that really becoming a roadway?
28

29 Murphy: As with most of the proposed thoroughfares on our system plan, it's
30 mostly been a matter of the function of how development proceeds.
31 Development builds our thoroughfare system and then turns its over to the
32 respective governments for maintenance. This particular section of Arroyo
33 Road goes through federal land that we now know absolutely will not be
34 disposed of, so it will continue to cross public lands. There's really no
35 funding source lined up for that section of Arroyo Road now, and then I
36 guess if I can kind of just reference the TIP amendment that you voted on
37 earlier this meeting, the paving of Baylor Canyon Road, that's something
38 that the federal lands recently, recently was able to, or came up with the
39 funding to pave that roadway even though it's been a widely used
40 roadway within our region for, I would say decades. So the short answer
41 is there's nothing programmed for it, so I cannot give a timeframe and I'll
42 defer to Mr. Childress if he knows more than I do.
43

44 Childress: As far as the buildup of the road, I haven't heard any, there's no
45 indications that there's movement in the direction, we haven't received a
46 right-of-way. But I would like to reaffirm the position that the road is

1 outside of the recent monument that was established through
2 proclamation and even if it wasn't there's language in the proclamation
3 that allows us upgrade or improve existing rights-of-ways. This is
4 probably viewed as a revised statute, 2477 route; the counties and cities
5 are allowed to improve prior to FLPMA, which was established in 1976.
6 So those are claims and we view those as valid claims until they're
7 adjudicated or we receive a FLPMA title 5 right-of-way applications, which
8 we're able to approve it through that process. So the road is, the edge of
9 the road on its north side, we view that as the boundary for the new
10 national monument. So the road can be improved to the south or it can
11 even be improved in the edge of the nation monument because of the
12 language in the proclamation.
13
14 Valencia: That was gonna be my next question, is there anything prohibiting the
15 buildup? So that answers that. Any other questions?
16
17 Marmolejo: Where is it, more or less, is it that area in green above, in the Goathill
18 area, or where about are you talking about?
19
20 Murphy: If you can see the arrow, this is the Goathill itself. Currently Desert Wind
21 exists as an unpaved roadway serving some single family residential uses
22 and then it continues eastward. This appears to be the current trail head
23 parking lot for the BLM recreational area and it gets a little narrower as
24 you proceed eastward but it's still discernable, and it heads in towards the
25 Metro Verde and then you see the new golf course there on the upper
26 right hand side of that.
27
28 Valencia: You satisfied Luis? Any other questions? I guess my comment, as far as
29 moving forward on this, it's obvious that it isn't imminent, and it's not an
30 emergency, so I mean we have time to, you know, take it at another
31 meeting for further discussion. Is that what you're looking for?
32
33 Murphy: Mr. Chair, this was placed on the agenda at the request of the City.
34 They're currently working on a special assessment district for building of
35 roads in Metro Verde and I think that there was some concern that the
36 roadway would have to dead end at the monument boundaries and would
37 not be improved further, but viewing the information that I've learned since
38 we've placed this on the agenda today and I would view this as really a
39 non-issue and that it could be.....
40
41 Valencia: We've just been briefed and we have no objection of it moving forward on
42 the City level.
43
44 Murphy: We're not asking for any action, it's a discussion item, but if anybody
45 thought that it merited a closer look, we could continue to study that and
46 bring it back to further, to future meetings. But as of this point, if staff were

1 to give a recommendation, I think we would recommend that the
2 Thoroughfare Plan remain unchanged in this regard.
3
4 Gwynne: Mr. Childress I have a question. I believe BLM has, what, three to five
5 years to put together the operation and maintenance plan for the
6 monument. Would this be included as part of that plan because it's right
7 on the boundary?
8
9 Childress: Yes, we'll probably take about five years, we'll take about five years to
10 develop a land use management plan, which will make decisions on
11 designating routes that exist within the monument boundaries. We'll have
12 to sort of think about this a little bit in terms of where the road exists and
13 whether or not the road would need to be expanded into the boundary of
14 the monument versus on its edge. If it's on the edge we wouldn't, it
15 wouldn't depend on that land use planning process to make that decision.
16 But also, in saying that, I think that any plans to move forward with an
17 application, what we call a Title 5 right-of-way application from the City or
18 whomever, we could still move forward with processing that request. Very
19 similar to what we're doing on the Baylor Canyon and Dripping Springs,
20 we've got the FLAP funding to pave those two small segments of each of
21 those roads and our plans are to move forward even though they're in the
22 middle of the national monument. All the other routes out there that BLM
23 is responsible for, roads, trails, all of those remain open and of use until
24 we go through the land use planning process as well.
25
26 Gwynne: Thank you very much.
27
28 Valencia: What is the pleasure of the Committee? Mr. Murphy?
29
30 Murphy: I don't know if there are any members of the public that would like to
31 speak to this.
32
33 Valencia: We'll open it up for public discussion right now on Item 6.1. Do we have
34 members from the public that would care to make comment specifically on
35 this item? With none being seen, or I see some movement in the
36 audience. Just state your name for the record.
37
38 Parker: I'm Dara Parker, I'm with Senator Heinrich's office. I just wanted to,
39 actually before the Committee, thank Tom for his work with, it was then
40 Senator Bingaman's office, and working through that area and making
41 sure that we had the information from your Thoroughfare Plan to make
42 sure that everything was compatible as well and so I'm glad things are still
43 shaking out the way it was intended. But I did just want to thank everyone
44 for their work on that.
45

1 Valencia: Thank you. Do we have any other member of the public that cares to
2 make comment on this item? Seeing none, Mr. Murphy.

3
4 Murphy: That concludes my presentation, and unless there is any compelling need,
5 I don't think that we'll look at this again unless it's requested separately.

6
7 Valencia: Thank you. Well I think the Committee concurs with you, so we'll allow it
8 to maintain its path.

9
10 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

11
12 Valencia: We'll go ahead and close discussion on that, we'll move to Item 7,
13 Committee and Staff Comments. Any member of the Committee have any
14 announcement, comments, or anything with regard to the area that your
15 represent? I have one. The Regional Transit District is rolling out South
16 Valley service on Monday, on South Main Street, Highway 28, Chaparral,
17 and Sunland Park area. I want to thank the DOT, Mr. Loven, Jolene for
18 your efforts in assisting us with our signage, and we're looking forward to
19 providing public transit service in this region. Our schedules can be seen
20 on scrtd.org starting next Monday, and they can call 855-RTDBUSS.

21
22 Herrera: Mr. Chair?

23
24 Valencia: Yes, Ms. Herrera.

25
26 Herrera: I guess I'll follow up your comment about NM28, specifically. We had a
27 couple of public meetings over the last two weeks about that roadway.
28 We're gonna be starting a chip seal project on it, on June 16, and the
29 reason that I wanted to bring it up for you specifically and then for Mr.
30 Altamirano, is because we're gonna have a pilot car operation.

31
32 Valencia: A what car?

33
34 Herrera: A pilot car operation, we'll have lane drops, so it'll be one lane in each
35 direction, with a pilot car to lead traffic through, so expect, probably, 20-30
36 minute delays, in four mile section.

37
38 Valencia: And beginning on June...

39
40 Herrera: June 16.

41
42 Valencia: And how long is that gonna run?

43
44 Herrera: So far the project manager has said that we should only be out there
45 about 13 or 14 days on the road. So it's gonna go really quick, but just be
46 aware that for a couple of weeks we're gonna have that going on and the

1 schedule right now is from 7:00 a.m. until about 5:00 p.m. They might go
2 longer to finish up on time.
3
4 Valencia: Can you provide me your contractor information so that I can have our
5 people to have a clearer understanding as how these detours or delays
6 would impact our service, so we that we can get a rider notice out to the
7 affected parties?
8
9 Herrera: Sure.
10
11 Valencia: Thank you.
12
13 Herrera: Oh, I guess I should clarify that we're chip sealing the entire section of
14 roadway and we're starting at the Texas state line and working our way
15 into town.
16
17 Valencia: That's only heart attack number 57 this week for me so.
18
19 Herrera: Well. I thought you should know now instead of encountering it out on the
20 road.
21
22 Valencia: Which I totally appreciate.
23
24 Altamirano: Mr. Chair?
25
26 Valencia: Mr. Altamirano.
27
28 Altamirano: I have a question for Jolene. So then the starting date, June 16 and then
29 for possibly, let's say twenty days, which would put us into the end of July
30 and stuff, in looking at pilot car situation, where that is determined by the
31 amount of vehicles that going one way or the other, if we have to turn
32 around, you're not blocking off any of the access roads to it, correct? I
33 mean, you're not gonna close off any roads?
34
35 Herrera: Not that I'm aware of, no. That wasn't discussed at the public meetings
36 and I'm pretty sure the project manager would have brought it up
37 specifically. I don't think we're gonna have any side streets closed at all,
38 it's just gonna be leading people slowly through the construction.
39
40 Altamirano: So we can get in and out still without any particular problem? Okay, thank
41 you.
42
43 Herrera: I can get you information on the contractor as well. Bridget Spedalieri, you
44 both know her, she's coordinating.
45

1 Altamirano: Right, I missed it, I was out of town. They had the public hearing, but.
2 Thank you.
3
4 Valencia: Any other members of the Committee have any comments?
5
6 Knopp: Just a reminder, we don't meet in July, right?
7
8 Murphy: That's correct.
9
10 Valencia: Mr. Murphy, any, you or your staff have comments?
11
12 Murphy: Mr. Knopp got my only one.
13
14 Valencia: Then I'll close committee and staff comments, unless I see another hand.
15
16 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**
17
18 Valencia: With that we'll go to public comments, a second time during the course of
19 the meeting that we allow any member of the general public to make
20 comment. Does any member of the general public care to speak on any
21 issue that was not on today's agenda? If not, we'll close public comment.
22 And that brings us to adjournment.
23
24 **9. ADJOURNMENT**
25
26 Valencia: The Chair will take a motion to adjourn.
27
28 Walke: Mr. Chair I do have a question. In my packet there was another agenda
29 item which was part of the TIP program modifications. Was that included
30 in our vote on the TIP modifications?
31
32 Valencia: Under 5.1?
33
34 Walke: It's called agenda Item 7.0, and it has to do with an increase in
35 apportionment in Roadrunner Transit.
36
37 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mr. Walke, I apologize that I didn't make that clear, that I didn't
38 explain that under staff comments. These are TIP administrative
39 modifications that the agencies are allowed to process without approval
40 from the Board. They happen rather frequently and we've been providing
41 them in your packets as informational items.
42
43 Walke: So this is just for information?
44

1 Murphy: Right, yeah, and we didn't think that it rose to the level of discussion
2 unless there's a specific question but we wanted you to have the
3 information.
4
5 Walke: Thank you.
6
7 Valencia: No other comments, Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.
8
9 Mike Bartholomew motioned to adjourn.
10
11 Greg Walke seconds the motion.
12
13 All approved.
14
15 Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
16
17
18 _____
19 Chair



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 7, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

NMDOT Staff will discuss the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 7, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 Transportation Alternative Program Process Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

NMDOT Staff will discuss the changes in the Transportation Alternative Program Process.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 7, 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

5.3 Truck Routes Discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

This item is to discuss truck routes through the Mesilla Valley MPO related to the update to Transport 2040.