



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **February 10, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers**, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](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 Mesilla Valley: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _____ **Chair**
Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ **Chair**
5. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
5.1. *January 13, 2016 _____ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
6.1. Removal of BPAC Member for Nonfeasance of Office _____ **MPO Staff**
6.2. Resolution 16-03: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
7.1. Committee Training _____ **MPO Staff**
7.2. Viva Doña Ana! Presentation _____ **DAC Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **POLICY COMMITTEE**

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held January 13, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in
6 Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las
7 Cruces, New Mexico.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
10 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
11 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
12 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
13 Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (departed 2:43)
14 Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
15 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
16 Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
17 Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
18 Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)

19
20 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
21 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
22 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)

23
24 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Wayne Savage, NMSU/Arrowhead Center
25 Wyatt Kartchner, Molzen Corbin
26 Charles Clements
27 Kristen Woods, Bohannon-Huston
28 Denise Weston, Bohannon-Huston
29 Melanie Bishop, Bohannon-Huston
30 Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

31
32 **1. CALL TO ORDER (1:05 p.m.)**

33
34 Flores: All right. It's five minutes after one so I'm going to call this meeting to
35 order and have a determination of quorum.

36
37 Murphy: Okay. Councilor Sorg.

38
39 Sorg: Here.

40
41 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

42
43 Doolittle: Here.

44
45 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

1 Bernal: Here.
2
3 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
4
5 Flores: Here.
6
7 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
8
9 Hancock: Here.
10
11 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
12
13 Eakman: Here.
14
15 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.
16
17 Pedroza: Here.
18
19 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
20
21 Garrett: Here.
22
23 Murphy: Mayor Barraza.
24
25 Barraza: Here.
26
27 Murphy: We're unanimous.
28
29 Flores: Yay. All right.

30
31 **2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

32
33 Flores: And so the first order of business is Election of Officers. So do you want
34 to talk about our tradition and what we might do, have a discussion on
35 that?
36
37 Murphy: Certainly.
38
39 Flores: Or should we have a motion?
40
41 Hancock: No I ...
42
43 Flores: Well go ahead.
44
45 Murphy: Okay, that's ...
46

1 Hancock: That's not the way we do it.
2
3 Murphy: Certainly Madam Chair. The ...
4
5 Hancock: He can tell us.
6
7 Murphy: MPO Bylaws require that we elect a, a Chair and a Vice-Chair on a annual
8 basis and do it the first calendar, first meeting of the calendar year and it's,
9 it's been, it's not a requirement but it's kind of been an informal tradition
10 amongst this Policy Committee that they rotate the Chair and the Vice-
11 Chair through the three jurisdictions. This, the last calendar year the
12 Town of Mesilla held the Chair and the City of Las Cruces held the Vice-
13 Chair so continuing that tradition would have the County be in the Chair
14 position and, or the City in the Chair position and the County in the Vice-
15 Chair position. But, and I, I need to you know put this out there that is no,
16 by no means a requirement. You are free to elect from your membership
17 whoever you choose to, to those two positions and we'll leave it, leave it at
18 that.
19
20 Flores: Okay. Do we have any discussion about this? Commissioner Hancock.
21
22 Hancock: Thank you Madam Chair. Is Trent a voting member and is he part of that
23 process?
24
25 Murphy: The, Mr. Doolittle was added a couple year, in 2013 when we amended
26 the Bylaws and the District 1 Engineer position was placed as a voting
27 member on the Policy Committee and I guess it's up to this Committee to
28 decide whether to put that position into the rotation or to elect Mr. Doolittle
29 in any capacity for, for those offices as I said it's, it's completely,
30 completely up to, to this body.
31
32 Flores: Okay.
33
34 Doolittle: Madam Chair.
35
36 Flores: Mr. Doolittle.
37
38 Doolittle: I'm sorry, if I could respond to that a little bit. I, I appreciate the, the
39 opportunity to sit in on that rotation but typically in the past with
40 discussions with executive staff because of conflicts with you know
41 budgets and our STIP and those types of things that we have control over,
42 the position has been both with this body and with the El Paso MPO that
43 we typically don't sit in as a Chair or Vice-Chair. We participate in the
44 committees but don't accept the nominations for any of those Chairs so I
45 got out of that one.
46

1 Hancock: I, I thought we should, Madam Chair I thought we should at least put him
2 on the spot.
3
4 Flores: Okay. Thank you.
5
6 Doolittle: You, you did and I got out of it.
7
8 Flores: Any other comments or nominations?
9
10 Garrett: Madam Chair.
11
12 Flores: Commissioner Garrett.
13
14 Garrett: Just, just to clarify if it's the normal rotation it would be, who would be in
15 the Chair slot?
16
17 Flores: Somebody from the City of Las Cruces.
18
19 Garrett: Some, somebody from the City. And then somebody from, Vice-Chair
20 would be someone from the County.
21
22 Flores: From County, right.
23
24 Garrett: Okay. I, personally not knowing exactly who's going to be interested or
25 available I think it really has helped us to just continue the, the cycle
26 unless somebody, the only exception I can think of is if someone in
27 particular has a burning interest to serve as the Chair and work through a
28 number of, of issues. And that could happen but I'm not sure if that's the
29 case today.
30
31 Flores: So I'll ask if anybody has a burning interest that they are, to pursue any
32 goals that they have for the MPO.
33
34 Eakman: Madam Chair. I think his point was do you have any burning passions
35 about, that you need to follow through on. Am I correct?
36
37 Garrett: Well that, I wasn't excluding her.
38
39 Flores: I think it was out there for anybody so.
40
41 Garrett: For anybody, yeah, yeah. Otherwise I would, I would feel that the default
42 should be to stay with the regular rotation.
43
44 Flores: I agree. So anybody, anybody have any nominations?
45
46 Hancock: Madam Chair. I would nominate Gil Sorg.

1
2 Flores: Okay. Do I hear a second?
3
4 Eakman: I would second.
5
6 Barraza: Madam Chair. I second.
7
8 Flores: Okay. I, I heard two seconds from Mr. ...
9
10 Eakman: Eakman.
11
12 Flores: Eakman and from Mayor Barraza. So we'll just take the second from Mr.
13 Eakman. Any more comments? Should we take a vote on that then?
14
15 Murphy: You want to close the floor for nominations and with ...
16
17 Flores: Any more nominations? Okay. Seeing none we'll close the floor and take
18 a vote.
19
20 Murphy: Okay. Mayor Barraza.
21
22 Barraza: Yes.
23
24 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
25
26 Garrett: Yes.
27
28 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.
29
30 Pedroza: Yes.
31
32 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
33
34 Eakman: Yes.
35
36 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
37
38 Hancock: Yes.
39
40 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
41
42 Flores: Yes.
43
44 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
45
46 Benavidez: Yes.

1
2 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.
3
4 Bernal: Yes.
5
6 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
7
8 Doolittle: Yes.
9
10 Murphy: Councilor Sorg.
11
12 Sorg: It doesn't matter. Yes.
13
14 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
15
16 Flores: Now from here does he take over for the nominations for Vice-President?
17
18 Murphy: Let's go ahead and ...
19
20 Flores: Finish off and ...
21
22 Murphy: Nominate the Vice-Chair and then turn over.
23
24 Flores: And then I'm not, and then I'm done. Okay. All right. Do I hear any
25 nominations for Vice-President, or Vice-Chair, sorry.
26
27 Sorg: Shall I nominate? Commissioner Hancock.
28
29 Flores: Okay. And I saw a second from Mayor Barraza and Olga Pedroza was
30 also hand in her hand but I, I'm going to take Mayor Barraza on that one.
31 So any other nominations? Olga were you trying to nominate anybody
32 else or ...
33
34 Garrett: I just have a question.
35
36 Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.
37
38 Garrett: Does Chair Hancock feel that he has the time to serve as the ...
39
40 Hancock: No.
41
42 Garrett: As the Vice-Chair. I'd be willing to do this but I, I need to allow a, a sort of
43 a caveat. I've taken on the responsibility to represent the County in two
44 insurance pools for the State which will mean that based on the schedule
45 of those meetings which are mostly in Santa Fe that I will probably have to
46 miss three meetings. Now as long as Councilor Sorg is here you, you

1 don't need me for backup but I'm, I'm really interested in what's being
2 done with this body and with the understanding that I have those three
3 that I probably am not going to be able to get to, I'd be happy to serve in
4 that capacity as long as you would take sort of a, a wounded duck you
5 know for ...
6
7 Flores: You know actually I had a question about that is if the Chair doesn't show
8 up and the Vice-Chair doesn't show up does, could the Vice-Chair send a
9 proxy? Is that fine with the Bylaws? What do the Bylaws actually say to
10 that? Could, you know ...
11
12 Murphy: Madam Chair, yeah Members of the ...
13
14 Flores: What would happen in that case?
15
16 Murphy: Members of the Committee. The, the Bylaws call for any one of you can
17 have a, another, another elected member of your, of your government
18 serve as a, as an alternate or proxy for you at any one meeting. If there
19 were a meeting where the, both the Chair and the Vice-Chair were absent
20 the, then the, the, the members that did convene would elect a ...
21
22 Garrett: Exactly.
23
24 Murphy: Temporary Chair ...
25
26 Garrett: Right.
27
28 Murphy: For that meeting.
29
30 Garrett: Yeah.
31
32 Hancock: Madam Chair. I, I would then be able to do a, like a second Vice-
33 President.
34
35 Flores: All right.
36
37 Garrett: So you could be the backup.
38
39 Flores: Okay.
40
41 Garrett: So I, I'd be willing if someone wanted to note, nominate me I would be
42 willing to accept that.
43
44 Flores: Okay.
45
46 Hancock: I nominate.

1
2 Flores: Do I hear a nomination?
3
4 Hancock: Nomination for Commissioner Garrett.
5
6 Flores: Okay. Do ...
7
8 Barraza: Okay, so do we need, I'm sorry. Madam Chair.
9
10 Flores: Do we need a vote on the first one?
11
12 Barraza: Do we need to rescind the first motion?
13
14 Sorg: No. It dies from a lack of second.
15
16 Hancock: No, I ...
17
18 Barraza: There was a second.
19
20 Flores: There was a second and ...
21
22 Barraza: There was a second.
23
24 Sorg: Oh, there was.
25
26 Hancock: But ...
27
28 Sorg: I'm sorry.
29
30 Hancock: But, but ...
31
32 Murphy: I think it was, the nomination was refused.
33
34 Hancock: Right.
35
36 Flores: Okay.
37
38 Barraza: Okay.
39
40 Flores: So the nomination being refused, do I hear a second on the nomination?
41
42 Benavidez: Second.
43
44 Flores: Okay. So Commissioner Benavidez seconded the motion to nominate
45 Commissioner Garrett for Vice-Chair. So any more nominations or
46 comments? Seeing none, I'd like to, let's take a vote.

1
2 Murphy: Okay. I guess closing the floor and taking the vote. Mayor Barraza.
3
4 Barraza: Yes.
5
6 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
7
8 Garrett: Yes.
9
10 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.
11
12 Pedroza: Yes.
13
14 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
15
16 Eakman: Yes.
17
18 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
19
20 Hancock: Yes.
21
22 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
23
24 Flores: Yes.
25
26 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
27
28 Benavidez: Yes.
29
30 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.
31
32 Bernal: Yes.
33
34 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
35
36 Doolittle: Yes.
37
38 Murphy: Councilor Sorg.
39
40 Sorg: Yes.
41
42 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
43
44 Flores: Oh, I don't, you don't get, give us the results and I don't get to say
45 "Congratulations."
46

1 Murphy: I'll let you.
2
3 Flores: Okay. Well then it looks like we have a new Chair and, and a Vice-Chair.
4 Congratulations to Commissioner Garrett and Councilor Sorg. Do we
5 want to change, do you want to change seats so you, going to conduct the
6 meeting from where you're at?
7
8 Sorg: I'm comfortable here if everybody else is.
9
10 Flores: Okay. All right.
11
12 Sorg: So we go on? I'll take over the meeting then.
13
14 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
15
16 Sorg: Yes. Who said that? Commissioner Hancock, okay.
17
18 Hancock: Yes.
19
20 Sorg: Maybe I'm not in a good place.
21
22 Hancock: We'd like to thank the past Chair for her service and good luck in your
23 endeavors.
24
25 Sorg: Yes.
26
27 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair.
28
29 Sorg: You're welcome Commissioner Hancock.
30
31 **3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**
32
33 Sorg: The first, next order of business rather is the Conflict of Interest Inquiry.
34 Does any Member of the Committee or any member of staff have a
35 conflict of interest on any item on the agenda today?
36
37 ALL NO.
38
39 Sorg: Okay. Hearing none.
40
41 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**
42
43 Sorg: Then we'll go on to Public Comment. Is there any member of the public
44 would like to speak to the, to the Committee today? If you so raise your
45 hand. Okay. Seeing none.
46

1 **5. CONSENT AGENDA ***

2
3 Sorg: We'll move on. The Consent Agenda. Is there a motion to approve the
4 agenda?

5
6 Hancock: So moved.

7
8 Pedroza: Mr. Chair. I make a motion we approve the, the consent agenda.

9
10 Hancock: Second.

11
12 Sorg: Okay. Uh oh, motion has been made and second to approve the consent
13 agenda. Would the, would, would Tom poll the ...

14
15 Murphy: Okay.

16
17 Sorg: Committee.

18
19 Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

20
21 Barraza: Yes.

22
23 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

24
25 Garrett: Yes.

26
27 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

28
29 Pedroza: I'll abstain because I was not here in December.

30
31 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.

32
33 Eakman: I'll abstain also.

34
35 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

36
37 Hancock: Yes.

38
39 Murphy: Trustee Flores.

40
41 Flores: Yes.

42
43 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

44
45 Benavidez: Yes.

46

1 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.
2
3 Bernal: Abstain.
4
5 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
6
7 Doolittle: Yes.
8
9 Murphy: And Councilor Sorg.
10
11 Sorg: Yes.

12
13 MOTION PASSES.

14
15 Sorg: All right then.
16

17 **6. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

18
19 **6.1 * December 9, 2015**

20
21 - APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA VOTE.
22

23 **7. ACTION ITEMS**

24
25 **7.1 * Resolution 16-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the**
26 **Open Meetings Act for 2016 Calendar Year by the Mesilla Valley MPO**

27
28 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
29

30 **7.2 Resolution 16-02: A Resolution Approving the University Avenue**
31 **Phase A report**

32
33 Sorg: Moving on to Action Item number 7.2, Resolution 16-02: A Resolution
34 Approving the University Avenue Phase One report.
35

36 Benavidez: Mr. Chair.
37

38 Sorg: Yes.
39

40 Benavidez: Can I make a motion to approve Resolution 16-02?
41

42 Sorg: Yes you may. Is there a second?
43

44 Hancock: Second.
45

1 Sorg: Motion was made and seconded to approve the, to approve the resolution.
2 Is there a presentation?
3

4 Murphy: We do have a presentation, Denise Weston from Bohannon-Huston who
5 worked on the study for the MPO has a, I guess will give you a
6 presentation if, and then we'll ask for a vote.
7

8 Pedroza: Mr. Chair.
9

10 Sorg: Yes. Go ahead.
11

12 Pedroza: I had, I have a question about the resolution. I have 16-01 followed by 16-
13 02. So are we skipping 16-01?
14

15 Sorg: I believe it was on the consent agenda, 16-01.
16

17 Pedroza: 16-01 was on the consent agenda?
18

19 Murphy: Yes.
20

21 Sorg: Yes, it is.
22

23 Pedroza: Oh. Okay. Fine. That's what.
24

25 Sorg: If that's what the ...
26

27 Pedroza: Thank you.
28

29 Sorg: Asterix stands for still today. Okay.
30

31 Pedroza: Ah. Thank you.
32

33 Sorg: What's the difference between the colored one and this one? Anything?
34 Oh. Changes. Thank you. You may proceed. Gosh I hate this chair.
35

36 Weston: Good afternoon. Thank you so much. As Tom said I'm Denise Weston
37 with Bohannon-Huston. I've been the Project Manager on this project and
38 have really enjoyed working with the MPO on this. Thank you for the
39 opportunity. I'll do a presentation of the recommendations for you and
40 particularly discuss the stakeholder and outreach that we've done for this
41 project and then I'll go over a few of the edits we've made, two tiny edits
42 we made to the document before we request your approval on it, and of
43 course answer any questions that you may have.
44 So we'll start with giving you an overview on the purpose and need
45 for this project. It was, it is funded with Federal Highway Administration
46 planning funds so it was really important that we follow the New Mexico

1 Department of Transportation Location Study Procedures and that we
2 develop a purpose and need for this particular project. The purpose of the
3 University Avenue Corridor Study was to provide an enhanced multimodal
4 transportation corridor along University Avenue between Main Street and
5 Avenida de Mesilla. And the need as many of you know was established
6 due to safety concerns due to the potential pedestrian, bicycle, and
7 vehicular conflicts along that corridor particularly tied to the location of Zia
8 Middle School and the residential areas around there.

9 There are some physical deficiencies that were identified. There
10 are basically no, there are no shoulders along there, very few pedestrian
11 facilities, and no bicycle facilities. And then there's always the potential for
12 economic development whenever you improve bicycle and pedestrian
13 facilities along a major corridor within the city.

14 The outreach activities we did, we've been, we spent a fair amount
15 of time this year on this project and we did a public meeting in June which
16 was well-received and then we have been to the BPAC once and to the
17 TAC three times, and we did another public meeting in October and I'll
18 give you some results and the information that, the input we received
19 from, from those committees, stakeholders, and as well as the public. The
20 public meeting in October we had about 30 attendees. Some of the
21 concerns that were raised, I heard it was actually a pretty busy meeting. I
22 unfortunately was unable to attend but there were a lot of people there
23 and they had a lot of really interesting things to say so some of the
24 concerns were speed, noise, and lighting along the corridor; questions on
25 funding which again I'll reiterate this was paid for with Federal Highway
26 Planning funds; at this time there are no design or construction funds
27 identified for this project; concerns with the vehicular-bicycle-pedestrian
28 conflicts as well as the transit system; support, overall support for bicycle
29 facilities has been, has resonated throughout this project as well as the
30 support for pedestrian facilities. There's, the concern with the limited right-
31 of-way remains and is an issue that will have to be dealt with as the
32 project goes forward but is pretty minimal and over, and really overall
33 there's been great support for the project and the need for improvements
34 along this corridor has just been amplified by every person that we
35 communicate with.

36 The combination of what we've heard from BPAC and the TAC is
37 again bicycle facilities in the roadway is a critical feature. The bicyclists
38 clearly want that facility type; a separate space for pedestrians primarily
39 because we're talking about children, we're talking about young people
40 that need to have a safe place to walk to and from school. There was a
41 request for a consistent typical section along the corridor as best as that
42 could be designed, just not to confuse the users, to make it really clear for
43 the bicycles and pedestrians where they should be so that it makes it a
44 clear access to and from that school and those residential areas and again
45 I'll just reiterate we've had really strong support.

1 Some of the issues and concerns that we've dealt with in this study
2 and also still some of them will remain as this project moves forward in
3 project development is that limited, that the right-of-way is limited in some
4 areas and would require further coordination with the Elephant Butte
5 Irrigation District, the Las Cruces Public Schools system, and potentially
6 private landowners. I do have a map and a few slides that will give you
7 sort of a snapshot of where they may or may not need right-of-way for the
8 recommend, the recommended alternatives. The Elephant Butte Irrigation
9 District is currently considering some improvements along the lateral that
10 runs south of University Avenue, potentially piping that. We have been
11 working with them quite closely on ensuring that we're coordinating those
12 efforts and that what we recommend in this plan does not preclude what
13 they need to do to make their facility effective and efficient but that if there
14 are ways to coordinate on that going forward, that we can bring
15 community you know comprehensive benefit to the corridor but that each
16 project can handle its own recommendation separately. But if there's a
17 way to coordinate those efforts that's even better. And then the utilities,
18 there are utilities along there. I have a map that'll show you, give you a
19 snapshot as well of where those utilities are located but we have made
20 recommendations to minimize the relocation of those utilities primarily
21 because that reduces the cost.

22 So we're, here you have the right-of-way width. These figures are
23 all in the report but this is just an overall snapshot of what we're looking at
24 here. If you start from the east, the green indicates that, that the, there's
25 enough right-of-way for the recommended alternatives. The yellow-
26 orange means that it may be a little bit tight in there and that we would
27 have to utilize the Elephant Butte Irrigation District right-of-way to put in
28 the recommended alternative. Again it gets green near the school and
29 then tightens up as we head west, again needing either some right-of-way
30 from the School District or potentially private property owners. We're not,
31 we did not do on-the-ground surveys so we cannot give you an exact
32 footage on that. That would be, we would not be able to give you that but
33 it's really not a, it's not a significant amount of land so I think it's definitely
34 the recommendations are viable and then we do all, we do as I'll go to the
35 alternatives that we recommend shortly, there are two alternatives so that
36 we can ensure that they fit within the right-of-way that's available with
37 some slight modifications if additional right-of-way is available.

38 Utilities, these are a little hard to see up on the screen but in your
39 book you can see them. There's some overhead electric utilities along the
40 entire corridor. There's some water utility lines and there's some gas
41 utility lines. The ones that are most difficult for us to avoid are those
42 overhead electric utility poles so there could be potentially some weaving
43 of a sidewalk that may move around those poles just to minimize the cost
44 of that relocation.

45 So the recommended alternatives, we have two like I said. One is
46 the 60 point foot right-of-way; that is, that is the ultimate recommendation

1 and then an alternative of Typical Section G in places where it may or may
2 not need to be tightened up. So I'm going to actually jump to the pictures
3 cause I think it's easier to see. This one here you have two 12-foot driving
4 lanes, the five-foot bike lanes in the roadway, you have a curb and gutter,
5 a five-foot buffer on one side, a two-foot buffer on the other with a six-foot
6 sidewalk and a ten-foot multiuse trail. We did not make a decision
7 specifically. Our assumption is that that multiuse trail would go on the
8 south side just because of the opportunity to use that EBID right-of-way so
9 that's what, that's what we would be recommending but certainly there's
10 some ability to modify that if needed. This provides in-road bicycle
11 facilities, it provides separate pedestrian facilities, and then it also
12 provides that multiuse trail option for maybe younger children riding their
13 bike or families on the corridor and just provides a, you know a more
14 pleasant use of the corridor for the community. So the smaller, the
15 smaller typical section can be squeezed down to 44 feet at its tightest. It
16 could be reduced to 11-foot driving lanes, maintain the five-foot bike lane
17 within the corridor, still has the curb and gutter, does not have room for the
18 buffer, and then the four-to-six-foot sidewalk on both the north and south
19 side. Again it seemed really important to have those pedestrian facilities
20 on both sides of the roadway and this is just what we could put in there
21 with modifications as land and right-of-way became available.

22 In addition to this throughout the project we have offered up this
23 opportunity not, it's not mutually exclusive of the other alternatives it's in
24 addition to it, to look at a multiuse alternative that actually uses the EBID
25 laterals that surround this corridor both north and south and you can see
26 in the green they travel around, I don't, I never end up with a pointer,
27 sorry. They travel around the laterals that exist there and that just
28 provides an opportunity for additional bicycle and pedestrian use in the
29 area. If people want to not be on that corridor they could, this could you
30 know be a viable solution. EBID is in full support of this. They're willing to
31 work with the City on what it would take to do this. They gave me that
32 verbal response yesterday. They're not here today to speak for
33 themselves but they were very clear that they supported this alternative.
34 So we felt like it was important to put that in this plan given that when
35 something is in a plan and it's in an approved plan it just has better
36 opportunity for funding so we kept this throughout the entire planning
37 process. And again not, not instead of the others, in addition to.

38 These are just some renderings we built for the public. They're fun
39 to look at to give people an idea of what it would look like. This area on
40 the western edge is the tightest portion of the corridor so that is where we
41 would potentially have to put, squeeze in the 11-foot lanes and the four-
42 foot sidewalks without taking any right-of-way. This is, is tight in there but
43 still gives you a good use of that corridor. This is in the middle and this
44 gives you an idea of how we would, if we were, if we had the availability
45 with EBID we could skirt around those electric poles, not having to actually
46 relocate them, might not have to be quite a harsh turn but, but the idea is

1 there. And then this is on the eastern edge and again we show where we
2 have a sidewalk here but if that, if we could utilize the EBID right-of-way
3 and even if they pipe it or they don't pipe it, either way there's plenty of
4 room to put in the multiuse trail if that right-of-way could be utilized or
5 shared with EBID on that section of the corridor.

6 So one thing I want to go over are the two changes from the
7 version that you have. One comment we got from the Traffic Engineer,
8 City of Las Cruces Traffic Engineer was to be very clear about the bicycle
9 facility design and since this is just a planning document I didn't want to
10 put any clear recommendations on design type for bicycle facilities but I,
11 there is a statement that clearly states that as the project goes to design
12 all coordination on bicycle infrastructure specifically and pedestrian
13 infrastructure will go through the City of Las Cruces and make sure that it
14 matches their current standards, the current accepted standards for
15 bicycle facilities cause they are constantly in flux and we want to make
16 sure when this is designed it's designed to current standards. The other
17 change that, that, so that change is in the hard copy that you just got
18 today that's bound, but then we had one other change come in this
19 afternoon so we would have to make that change. That is on page 13,
20 section 4b. There's a discussion of future conditions and we would like to
21 recommend striking that entire paragraph just to minimize any liability to
22 the City or to the MPO or to the DOT with regard to safety concerns
23 because we don't actually have the appropriate level of traffic data to
24 make the statement that in the future there could potentially be more traffic
25 which would potentially have, raise the risk of more accidents but we
26 would like to, we would like to actually strike that entire paragraph.

27
28 Sorg: Ma'am, would you repeat that paragraph, future conditions?

29
30 Weston: Page 13, page 13.

31
32 Sorg: There, future conditions?

33
34 Weston: Yes.

35
36 Sorg: Yeah, okay.

37
38 Weston: That entire paragraph. It doesn't affect the recommendations in the plan.
39 It really just minimizes liability to the City and to the, to the New Mexico
40 Department of Transportation.

41
42 Sorg: Okay. Very good.

43
44 Weston: I, I think those are the only two changes we had from the most recent
45 TAC. We just, they presented it at the TAC in January so I apologize that
46 the comments are just coming in this late but those are the only two

1 changes otherwise. The version you have there does include the
2 comment about the, about the bicycle infrastructure so.
3
4 Sorg: Thank you.
5
6 Weston: I'm happy ...
7
8 Sorg: Any comments or questions from the Committee?
9
10 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
11
12 Sorg: Yes Trustee Flores. Oh. I'm sorry. I should be in the middle, maybe.
13 Mayor Barraza, yeah.
14
15 Barraza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to thank Denise from Bohannon-Huston
16 for the study. The collaboration I think that we have had with them and
17 with the MPO has just been fantastic and it's a project that I have
18 supported for many, many years due to public safety reasons on
19 University Avenue. I, I, I'm very visual and so this handout that you gave
20 us is very good and, and actually seeing what it could look like is very
21 beneficial for me also and I, I just hope that the rest of the Committee can
22 support this Phase A, the study for this project that is I feel long overdue
23 because it has been looked at in the past and the public participation was
24 great. The second one that we had in October the turnout was just
25 fantastic and the comments that were made by the citizens and the
26 surrounding area, especially the bicyclists that were there supporting the
27 project and encouraging adding the bike lanes into this project and also
28 collaborating with the Department of Transportation and with the City of
29 Las Cruces I'm just very thankful so I just want to say thank you.
30
31 Weston: You're welcome.
32
33 Sorg: Very good. Thank you. Commissioner Hancock.
34
35 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Does, does the Town of Mesilla have a complete
36 streets policy?
37
38 Barraza: I, I don't think I've heard the term "complete streets project." I know we
39 have rules and regulations regarding streets, roadways. If this is a, a
40 roadway that is from the Department of Transportation that they have
41 ownership of that road so any regulations that go into it have to comply
42 with New Mexico Department of Transportation.
43
44 Hancock: The, they're, Mr. Chair. I know the, I know the City of Las Cruces has a
45 complete streets policy.
46

1 Sorg: Correct.
2
3 Hancock: And I, Commissioner Garrett do we have a complete, have we accepted
4 complete streets yet?
5
6 Garrett: I don't think so.
7
8 Hancock: I, I didn't think we had yet. Complete streets is a, is a, a, a design. Can
9 you, can you tell us a little, I'm sorry, I'm taking over your meeting.
10
11 Weston: Sure.
12
13 Hancock: I don't mean to.
14
15 Sorg: That's okay. You go right ahead.
16
17 Hancock: I, I'd like to know about complete streets.
18
19 Sorg: You're Vice-Chair, no ...
20
21 Weston: Absolutely. So the, the concept of complete streets is to ensure that you
22 have considered all possible modes within a certain roadway and that
23 would be vehicular traffic, bicycle traffic, pedestrian traffic, and in some
24 cases even equestrian traffic and that not only have you looked at the use
25 of the, and the operations of those for all modes but how they interact with
26 the land use adjacent to that roadway. It becomes a land use-
27 transportation unifying process so yes.
28
29 Hancock: Good.
30
31 Weston: Do you want to ...
32
33 Hancock: I, I know there's ...
34
35 Weston: Say something ...
36
37 Hancock: A, a, Mr. Chair.
38
39 Weston: About the City's policy?
40
41 Sorg: Yes.
42
43 Hancock: I know there's a strong effort of this legislative session in Santa Fe to
44 encourage the state to adopt complete streets.
45
46 Sorg: That's, we're, correct. Yes.

1
2 Hancock: And, and ...
3
4 Sorg: I'm aware of that.
5
6 Hancock: And so we would naturally want to be sure that, that we're all on the same
7 page with this kind of thing.
8
9 Sorg: Right.
10
11 Hancock: So I just wanted to bring that up to, to kind of throw it out there. Thank
12 you.
13
14 Sorg: Well done Commissioner.
15
16 Hancock: Thank you.
17
18 Sorg: Well done. I, just to add and then I'll let Tom speak. Well described
19 complete street policy. Very well described there. And I, I wish that, I also
20 join with you in, in wanting to keep that policy going. Tom.
21
22 Murphy: Uh, thank you Mr. Chair. The MPO Policy Board itself I believe it was in
23 2008 or 2009 adopted a complete streets resolution and at that time I
24 believe that each, the, the County, the Town, and the City all joined in and
25 had adopted their own in that time frame. It might be, it might serve us
26 well to kind of renew that since there's been much turnover since that time
27 but I believe we, and if you, probably if you look on the National Complete
28 Streets Coalition all three jurisdictions are, are listed as having complete
29 streets policies in place and I know when the County's redid their design
30 standard several years ago the complete streets policy was one of the
31 driving factors for that and the City's currently working on, on that as well
32 under their complete streets resolution. Thank you.
33
34 Sorg: Thank you Tom. Did Trustee Flores have something to say?
35
36 Flores: I just wanted to say that I attended the October meeting as well and it was
37 standing room. All the seats were taken and I was just very impressed by
38 the amount of people that were willing to stand for such a long period of
39 time because they really wanted to see something done. In addition to
40 that I've seen a group of just regular people running on University and I
41 was very concerned for them because it is not a safe place to go if you're
42 a pedestrian and you know there was actually a group from Las Cruces,
43 they get online and, and they meet at different places and everybody just
44 runs to that place and in this case they were going to the Spotted Dog and
45 you know I, I've seen them once and I just think something like this would
46 make it so much more easier for them, safer for them. I've seen kids that

1 are walking home from doing like a baseball or softball practice at Zia and
2 it's dark. And I just, I wince every time I see it because it's not safe right
3 now. So I encourage everybody to accept the Phase A. That's it.
4

5 Sorg: Thank you Trustee Flores. Someone else? Commissioner Garrett.
6

7 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah I, I appreciate the work that's been done here
8 and it, it seems to me that this is a very practical approach and, and
9 solution to, to the needs. My reservation or concern has to do with the
10 fact that just in terms of the future, I think that University's going to get
11 more and more and more traffic. It's, you know you're either going to get
12 traffic along Boutz and that's not an optimum situation there for either the
13 City or, or the Town or University and by the time you get down to Union
14 it's, you know it's pretty much out of, of a lot of the, the major circulation
15 paths and, and there's only so much that can, can do Avenida de Mesilla
16 so I don't think we're going to see traffic go down in, in this area and my
17 concern is that right now there are places that are not yet developed. It's,
18 it's sort of that if we're ever going to have any widening in order to get to
19 the optimum all the way through there so we, we didn't have bottlenecks at
20 the, at the, the west end it would be about being aware that it's important
21 try to acquire some of that additional right-of-way when we can in order to,
22 to have that as a contingency the, for the future. And I have no idea how
23 that fits into this but if I'm reading this right it's a little narrow at the west
24 end and you got a big open space on the, on the south side that hasn't yet
25 been developed. I don't know what it does to the alignments because
26 some of it's on the south side and some of it's on the north side of the
27 overall alignment. Is there, how does, how does the, this study at this
28 point anticipate that and, and, and what thoughts do you have in terms of
29 being able to kind of work, working toward a, a broader corridor for the
30 entire length or, or, or the, the recommended full width of the 60 feet?
31

32 Weston: Thank you. I'm happy to answer that. So our ultimate recommendation is
33 that 60.5-foot alternative and I tried to write it very clearly that that is the
34 recommendation and that would be including the need to acquire right-of-
35 way. And like I said at this time we can't tell you exactly how much but
36 going forward to let's say a Phase B study for, under the DOT Location
37 Study Procedures that's exactly what would be determined, how much
38 right-of-way. The alternative to include the smaller, the 44-foot one is just
39 to give you a buffer because of funding. It's actually not, it, it, it's not
40 intended to be an either/or. It's really recommended in a way to do your
41 very best to get the 60.5-foot right-of-way. That includes that full two 12-
42 foot driving lanes, the bike lanes, the, the multiuse path, and the sidewalk.
43 Cause I agree, if we're planning we need to plan for the future. Now, so,
44 so it is written in there to carry that on forward. The other one doesn't
45 have to be carried forward if you don't need it and I think it's very clear and
46 if you go to the next phase you could eliminate that on day two of the next

1 phase of this study. So I think that that is totally a viable solution. I think
2 your other concern about capacity and you're talking about if we're really
3 looking at four travel lanes over two, we did some preliminary analysis and
4 it did not indicate that in future years that that corridor would need four
5 lanes. We've never at any time recommended four lanes along that
6 corridor. We felt like at this level even looking in those future years out to
7 2035 that this corridor does function well to City standards as a two-lane
8 facility so I think that that is not being recommended to look at forward but
9 I feel strongly that, that we are recommending that full 60.5-foot in
10 response to exactly what your concerns are.

11
12 Garrett: Mr. Chair. Thank you.

13
14 Sorg: Yes.

15
16 Garrett: I wasn't suggesting the, the, a four-lane.

17
18 Weston: Okay. I just wanted to make sure ...

19
20 Garrett: I simply was saying ...

21
22 Weston: If you thought ...

23
24 Garrett: We're going to have more traffic I think.

25
26 Weston: Yes.

27
28 Garrett: And that going to the full 60 feet is, is important.

29
30 Weston: Yes.

31
32 Garrett: I don't know what the next steps are but Mr. Chair I would suggest that
33 one of the things that, that the MPO should know is where and, and more
34 specifically how much additional right-of-way is needed as soon as
35 possible because that can't do anything except go up in price, particularly
36 ...

37
38 Weston: Right.

39
40 Garrett: If development happens in the area.

41
42 Sorg: Yeah.

43
44 Weston: And, absolutely.

45

1 Garrett: So I, I would suggest that that's important information for us to have and
2 then to be able to understand how that additional right-of-way could be
3 acquired and, and how we could help with that.
4
5 Sorg: Very good. Yes, I agree.
6
7 Garrett: Thank you.
8
9 Sorg: Good point. Thank you Commissioner Garrett. And Mayor Barraza, you
10 have some more to say? Go ahead.
11
12 Barraza: I do. First I appreciate those comments by Commissioner Garrett in terms
13 of looking into the future and I sincerely agree that at this time since the
14 land is not developed it would be the perfect time to acquire that right-of-
15 way, just because in the future I, I know something is being planned out
16 there so definitely now is the time. The other is my concern was the berm,
17 excuse me the EBID ditch that's on the east side of McDowell. On one of
18 the drawings I saw that the sidewalk was still there and the berm was still
19 there. Is that including leaving the canal as it is, the ditch as it is or was it
20 putting it underground?
21
22 Weston: So at the end of this study so that we didn't conflict opportunities for either
23 agency we ensured that each project has sort of its own independent
24 utility. So in that picture the rendition is the ditch is just how it is just
25 because, because we can't sort of dictate what EBID is going to do with
26 their facility but they fully agreed, they're full supporters of the study and
27 they fully agree with participating with the land use so in that picture it's
28 like that but there are, there is language in the plan that states that if they
29 do cover that, if they do pipe that ditch they need to consider, coordinate
30 with the neighbors and understand exactly what impact that would, would
31 have along that corridor because they're very comfortable with that ditch
32 right now so that coordination would have to happen when EBID decides
33 to go forward and do those ditch improvements.
34
35 Barraza: Okay. And that was ...
36
37 Weston: But I wanted to leave the roadway project to have its own independent
38 utility just so that we don't slow either project down or limit funding
39 opportunities for either project.
40
41 Barraza: Okay. Thank you. Because that was a concern of the residents ...
42
43 Weston: Yes.
44
45 Barraza: That their homes are in the backyard of that berm and the noise factor.
46

1 Weston: Yes.
2
3 Barraza: They were very much concerned. The other was lighting as Trustee, or
4 Mayor Pro-Tem Flores mentioned that it's very dark there in the evening.
5 Was lighting taken into consideration?
6
7 Weston: The lighting was taken into consideration. It was, it was stated as a
8 concern. I didn't put a commitment whether there would be lighting or
9 there wouldn't be lighting but as the design details are worked out the
10 opportunity for lighting exists and that would be something that you would
11 take back to the public when, and when you're ready to show the design
12 and get their reaction again about the lighting cause not everybody agreed
13 that lighting was a great thing.
14
15 Barraza: Correct. Correct. Yes.
16
17 Weston: So yes. But, but certainly nothing, this study sets you up for proposing
18 lighting as you go forward with the design.
19
20 Barraza: Very good. Thank you.
21
22 Sorg: Thank you Mayor. Oh dear.
23
24 Pedroza: Pedroza.
25
26 Sorg: Councilor Pedroza. Yes.
27
28 Pedroza: Thank you very much.
29
30 Sorg: I had something else I was going to say.
31
32 Pedroza: Oh, I'm sorry.
33
34 Sorg: That's okay. Well I, I, could I make something very clear here?
35
36 Weston: Yeah.
37
38 Sorg: It's a little confusing in my mind. You showed us different typical sections
39 for the, the corridor. Are, you aren't proposing to have different typical
40 sections along the corridor, it'll be just one all the way from the east to
41 west end, right?
42
43 Weston: Yes. All, so, and I'm actually glad to have an opportunity to reiterate this.
44 We are recommending this alternative from east to west.
45
46 Sorg: Okay.

1
2 Weston: Okay. But I included this alternative just because you have a couple of
3 tight spots that are owned by private property owners and it would be up
4 to you to determine if you could or could not get that private land. I
5 wanted to give you the ability to, to do a tight section if you have to just to
6 give the project some viability going forward. That's really ...
7
8 Sorg: Okay.
9
10 Weston: Where that stands. You don't ever have to put this one in.
11
12 Sorg: Okay.
13
14 Weston: But I didn't want to trip the project up ...
15
16 Sorg: Yeah.
17
18 Weston: Entirely just because of those tiny tight spots with private land.
19
20 Sorg: Okay.
21
22 Weston: So here. Let's just all look at this beautiful picture.
23
24 Sorg: Okay. Yeah, right, very good. Okay. Councilor Pedroza.
25
26 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. In fact you asked exactly the same question I was
27 going to ask because I wanted to know are we having to choose today.
28
29 Weston: No. No, you don't, no.
30
31 Pedroza: No, okay. That's good. Cause I do like this one better.
32
33 Weston: Yes.
34
35 Pedroza: But thank you.
36
37 Sorg: I have one more comment to make if, oh, Councilor Eakman. Go ahead.
38
39 Eakman: Yes. A rookie question. Where Zia Middle School is located and they
40 now have an existing left turn lanes.
41
42 Weston: Yes.
43
44 Eakman: Are, is there accommodation for that to continue or what seems to be the
45 plan there?
46

1 Weston: No, this actual typical would be applied to that same location but it would,
2 the left turn lane would remain. We just didn't put the left turn lane in this
3 visual but they would have the 12-foot driving lanes and then the bike
4 lanes and this same sort of scenario. The left turn lane would remain for
5 the school. Now we, we are not proposing any improvements to the drop-
6 off or pick-up at Zia Middle School. I did speak with the school today to
7 get their input and they'd also agree just to verbalize, share their verbal
8 support for the study. They're perfectly comfortable with what's in the
9 report and that we left it so that they have the opportunity to deal with their
10 drop-off and pick-up issues on their site when they do their site, they're
11 planning to do a site reallocation and a re-look at their site plan in 2018, I
12 think Todd told me this morning. But, so nothing we do will preclude them.
13 Nothing we, nothing we're proposing will change the vehicular access to
14 the schools right now. It'll just enhance the opportunity for the bikes and
15 the peds to get to and from school, hopefully minimizing the vehicular
16 drop-off in the parking.
17
18 Eakman: Thank you.
19
20 Weston: So I hope that answers your question.
21
22 Eakman: It does. Thank you.
23
24 Weston: But yeah. And I appreciate the opportunity to share their support that they
25 gave this afternoon so, so and to go back to the alternative discussion this
26 is really a preliminary level and so the detail on the, you know we're at
27 Phase A and so we don't want to exclude every, anything really that we
28 feel comfortable with. So that's why all three of these alternatives would
29 go into Phase B and have a much more detailed look, both this one, the
30 44-foot one, as well as that multiuse alternative along the EBID ditches
31 and then we would look at all of them carefully and at that time if the 44-
32 foot one isn't necessary, nobody's interested in it, it simply goes away.
33
34 Sorg: Okay. You're welcome. Any other comments or questions from the
35 Committee? Yes Trustee Flores.
36
37 Flores: I just had one on the actual resolution. It just looks like there is a typo or
38 a, on the one, two, three, four whereas-es up it talks about us listing input
39 on the proposed amendment and I just think that was a, you know we're
40 talking about a resolution here so. This is on page 26, or is it ...
41
42 Sorg: Isn't the, it, it's ...
43
44 Flores: I don't have my glasses so I'm having a hard time ...
45
46 Murphy: It's page ...

1
2 Flores: Reading this.
3
4 Murphy: Page 29.
5
6 Flores: Right. So I would just ask that we kind of redo the language a little bit.
7
8 Barraza: Madam, Mr. Chair.
9
10 Sorg: Yes.
11
12 Barraza: Okay where, where's that?
13
14 Sorg: We're on page 29.
15
16 Flores: The, four whereas-es up.
17
18 Sorg: Fourth whereas, yeah.
19
20 Flores: From the bottom.
21
22 Sorg: Oh, from the bottom.
23
24 Flores: From the bottom. Sorry, did I not make that clear?
25
26 Sorg: Big difference.
27
28 Murphy: It is, the whereas ...
29
30 Flores: MPO staff held two public ...
31
32 Murphy: "MPO staff held two public input meetings to solicit input on the proposed
33 amendment, seek alternatives to the requested amendment, evaluate the
34 alternatives, and ...
35
36 Flores: Okay.
37
38 Murphy: Discuss recommendations to the MPO Transportation Plan." What that
39 really should read instead of "amendment" in each of those cases, the
40 proposed ...
41
42 Barraza: Resolution.
43
44 Flores: Resolution or Phase A.
45
46 Murphy: Yeah or, or study. I think ...

1
2 Flores: Study, yeah.
3
4 Murphy: We do need to reword that or we may strike that whereas. We kind of cut
5 and paste from a previous study corridor that we had done and, but that
6 particular one actually required an amendment to the Transportation Plan
7 itself, whereas the adoption of the Phase A does not require an, an
8 amendment to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. So I think we can
9 work to, to kind of change up that language or we could strike that
10 altogether.
11
12 Sorg: What is the will of the Committee here?
13
14 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
15
16 Sorg: Yes. Commissioner Hancock, or Garrett rather.
17
18 Garrett: It seems to me that it's not a bad idea just as a, as a record to say that,
19 that there had been these two public input meetings. I think we could
20 modify this just to say "the MPO staff held two public input meetings to
21 solicit input on the study."
22
23 Flores: I would agree with that.
24
25 Sorg: If you would like to make a motion Ms., Commissioner.
26
27 Garrett: It, it's not, it's not, it's, this isn't a proposed study. This is actually a, this is
28 a study. So yes I'd like to move, move to amend the resolution to have the
29 fourth whereas from the bottom read "Whereas MPO staff held two public
30 input meetings to solicit input on the study; and"
31
32 Pedroza: Are we striking amendment to *(inaudible)*?
33
34 Sorg: Which words are you striking out there Commissioner?
35
36 Garrett: I, from, from the beginning of "the first proposed amendment," I think the,
37 the point is that on the study there were alternatives looked at and there
38 evaluate, so if we just say that there was to solicit input on the study, it
39 encompasses everything that was done by the study.
40
41 Flores: Right.
42
43 Sorg: Yeah.
44

1 Garrett: So all I'm saying is that we would say "whereas MPO staff held two public
2 input meetings to solicit input on the study; and" and that's the end of that
3 whereas.
4
5 Sorg: And discuss recommendations to the MPO Transportation ...
6
7 Garrett: No.
8
9 Sorg: Plan.
10
11 Garrett: I, I, I'm ...
12
13 Sorg: Oh.
14
15 Garrett: I'm just saying this could be ...
16
17 Sorg: Strike all of it.
18
19 Garrett: A really short whereas.
20
21 Sorg: Okay.
22
23 Garrett: And the main point is that there were two public, yeah it could be that we
24 had, the MPO staff held two public meetings to solicit input on the study.
25
26 Sorg: I understand now.
27
28 Hancock: Mr. Chair. I'd second.
29
30 Sorg: Okay. Very good. Any further discussion?
31
32 Hancock: Mr. Chair. Was there a motion, an original motion made?
33
34 Garrett: I, I moved, oh.
35
36 Flores: Yeah.
37
38 Hancock: Did we make an original, okay so we have original motion and we have
39 now an amendment and a ...
40
41 Sorg: Right. Right.
42
43 Hancock: Second on the amendment.
44
45 Sorg: Right.
46

1 Hancock: Okay.
2
3 Sorg: So, if no further discussion I'll poll the Committee.
4
5 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
6
7 Sorg: Yes. Commissioner Hancock.
8
9 Hancock: Any public, any public discussion?
10
11 Sorg: Good call. Seeing none, let's vote.
12
13 Murphy: This is a vote on the ...
14
15 Garrett: We're voting on the amendment.
16
17 Murphy: On the motion to approve the Phase A study, motion made by Mayor
18 Barraza, seconded by Commissioner Hancock.
19
20 Sorg: No, no, no, no. This is the ...
21
22 Murphy: Oh. The ...
23
24 Barraza: First the amendment.
25
26 Eakman: On the amendment.
27
28 Sorg: This is a vote on the amendment.
29
30 Murphy: Okay. Vote on, vote on the amendment as proposed by Commissioner
31 Garrett and was seconded by Commissioner Hancock. Mayor Barraza.
32
33 Barraza: Yes.
34
35 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
36
37 Garrett: Yes.
38
39 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.
40
41 Pedroza: Yes.
42
43 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
44
45 Eakman: Yes.
46

1 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

2

3 Hancock: Yes.

4

5 Murphy: Trustee Flores.

6

7 Flores: Yes.

8

9 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

10

11 Benavidez: Yes.

12

13 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.

14

15 Bernal: Yes.

16

17 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

18

19 Doolittle: Yes.

20

21 Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

22

23 Sorg: Yes.

24

25 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

26

27 Sorg: And thank you for that catch there, Trustee Flores. That was good. So
28 there we are on the original motion. Is there any further discussion on the
29 original motion? I have one little piece here really quick. It's just a kind of
30 a question about the lanes, the driving lanes. One of the concerns of the
31 public is that speeding is too much on there. Don't we understand that a
32 narrower driving lane would slow people down? We could still do a 11-
33 foot lane there even if we approve this ...

34

35 Garrett: Complete streets.

36

37 Weston: Yes.

38

39 Sorg: Resolution. Okay. Very good.

40

41 Weston: Yes. We definitely could.

42

43 Sorg: And then ...

44

45 Weston: And I, I'll actually just add one comment to you ...

46

1 Sorg: Sure.
2
3 Weston: That there is a section on traffic calming under the recommendation that
4 traffic calming be considered when design, when you get to the design
5 phase.
6
7 Sorg: Very good.
8
9 Weston: So that would address your lanes ...
10
11 Sorg: Sure.
12
13 Weston: Or any other components that could be added.
14
15 Sorg: Okay.
16
17 Weston: Just to give you extra support for that.
18
19 Sorg: And I just want to give a shout-out to Safe Routes to School. This is a
20 excellent thing to do for that program. Awesome. And, and then there is
21 money in Safe Routes to School. Maybe we could tap into a little of that
22 and to get this project done somewhere, somehow. I'm just suggesting
23 not knowing what, whether we can or not.
24
25 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
26
27 Sorg: Yes Mayor Barraza.
28
29 Barraza: Just one short comment also. Safe Routes to School's coordinator
30 Ashleigh Curry was very active and participated at the public meetings on
31 this and the initial ...
32
33 Weston: And the project, she's part of the project team.
34
35 Barraza: Meet, yes. So I just wanted to make that.
36
37 Sorg: Oh, yeah. Very good.
38
39 Barraza: Thank you.
40
41 Sorg: Good to point that out, yes. She would be.
42
43 Barraza: Yes. Thank you.
44
45 Sorg: Well if there's no further discussion let's vote. Tom.
46

1 Murphy: Okay. Mayor Barraza.
2
3 Barraza: Yes. Yes. Yes.
4
5 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
6
7 Garrett: Yes.
8
9 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.
10
11 Pedroza: Yes.
12
13 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
14
15 Eakman: Yes.
16
17 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
18
19 Hancock: Yes.
20
21 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
22
23 Flores: Yes.
24
25 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
26
27 Benavidez: Yes.
28
29 Murphy: Trustee Bernal.
30
31 Bernal: Yes.
32
33 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
34
35 Doolittle: Yes.
36
37 Murphy: Councilor Sorg.
38
39 Sorg: Yes.

40
41 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

42
43 **8. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

44
45 **8.1 Arrowhead Research Park Presentation**

46

1 Sorg: And the next item is Discussion Items, 8.1: Arrowhead Research Park
2 presentation. Take the floor Mr. Wayne Savage.

3
4 Savage: So Chairman Sorg, Members of the Commission. Thanks for allowing me
5 to come today. My name's Wayne Savage. I know some of you but I've
6 not met all of you. I look forward to that in the future. I wanted to speak to
7 you for a few minutes on a subject that is not entirely unfamiliar to some of
8 you. It's the proposed interchange off of I-10 currently targeted at
9 Arrowhead Drive. So I wanted to walk through a few slides with you then
10 and open it up for any questions that you may have. As a condition of my
11 employment I'm required to give a shameless plug for Arrowhead Center
12 and I hope that after a few slides if you'll indulge me in this you'll see that it
13 is relevant to the conversation.

14 Arrowhead is a unit of New Mexico State University. We exist in
15 two parts, one on the academic side and one a, a nonprofit but together
16 we're really focused on leading New Mexico State University's economic
17 development efforts. As you can see in the diagram we focus heavily on
18 education and training in the areas of entrepreneurship and business
19 incubation. We do all of the intellectual property commercialization for the
20 university, trying to get those good ideas out into the marketplace. And
21 then we do a lot of work partnering with both the local communities and
22 with industries to do that top bubble there which is creating businesses
23 and job growth, very much a, a key function that we exist for. This is a
24 slide that tries to summarize some of the, the quantitative impacts of our
25 work. We do work across the state: Middle school, high school, college
26 level, faculty researchers, and with private businesses to create jobs and
27 to facilitate economic development. But the two numbers on the right, the
28 90 and the 230, these were mid-2015 numbers. Currently we have over
29 130 college students working and starting new businesses right now.
30 That's an exciting thing for us to be involved in and this year for 2016
31 we're going to have 365 students at middle school and high school levels
32 across the state involved in the Innoventure program which trains them in
33 business startups, business incubation, and entrepreneurship. So very
34 exciting things that we're doing there across the state.

35 We like to think that we've got a, quite a successful track record
36 both regionally and nationally with over \$5 million in grants we've received
37 in the last three years. The Economic Development Administration and
38 their challenge grants, the first one for us was on the topic of regional
39 innovation. That came three years ago. We received another award from
40 the EDA for commercializing technologies and that is a statewide role that
41 we play. The Daniels Fund out of Colorado gave us an award this, this
42 last year to expand our high school and college level program statewide
43 so you'll be hearing more about our incubation programs going out to all
44 the community colleges statewide. The EDA also provided a grant
45 through their Regional Innovation Strategies Program for Arrowhead Park
46 and a part of that work is the, the work on the I-10 interchange that we'll

1 talk to you about today. We have 13 fulltime staff. We employ 30
2 graduate students every semester so they get hands-on work in the area
3 of entrepreneurship and starting businesses and then we've got a very
4 broad network of advisors that contribute to this from around the region.

5 Just an update on recent activities: We just completed a business
6 plan competition under contract to Mexico City and the USAID program
7 and we had 400 business plans submitted, narrowed it down to ten, made
8 our awards in December, and this year we expect six of those to come
9 work on growing their businesses here at New Mexico State University in
10 our community so we're excited about that, and we have already signed
11 the contract to do it again this coming year. Aggie Shark Tank, if you've
12 seen the TV show we actually did three episodes of our own this last year
13 and Lou Sisbarro assisted us in this. We had students again present for
14 business ideas and three of them were funded by local businessmen to
15 the tune of \$55,000 and they're working with those businessmen to make
16 those a reality right now. The Borderplex Alliance has a task force on
17 entrepreneurship, a regional task force and we chair that task force
18 working with them. We have a new group called Craftbox which is an
19 assembly of a wide variety of design professionals throughout the region
20 that we host on a weekly basis and we bring in speakers and, and train
21 them in their profession but also work to collectively find work
22 opportunities for them. We're putting on commercialization/technology
23 workshops in Albuquerque and around the state this year. We're working
24 with the City, with the University and the Community College, and
25 partnering on a film studio project here in our community. We're excited
26 that that will go forward this year. And then we've also developed what's
27 been called the Arrowhead Innovation Fund which is a million-dollar
28 technology development fund that'll focus on NMSU, technologies,
29 commercializing those, and hopefully starting businesses around them.
30 So I, I give you that background just to let you know that we're very active
31 both locally and statewide and we feel like the key to our region's future in
32 addition to the good planning work that you do revolves around economic
33 development opportunities.

34 The I-10 interchange: NMSU is very active with the MPO on your
35 committees and looking at planning needs for transportation in all of its
36 forms around the region. We work with DOT once or twice a year to
37 update on the projects they're working on and how that affects the
38 university and the region and through these meetings it's been known over
39 time that there were no funds available to complete the next round of
40 studies for the I-10 interchange and it was suggested that we find a way to
41 provide those funds. Through the EDA grant this last year we received
42 \$250,000 to put towards this so now we're working with DOT on an MOU
43 whereby we would fund the contractor, Molzen Corbin in this case, to
44 perform the needed studies and then DOT will oversee the process to
45 ensure that it's done according to Federal Highway Standards. The target
46 is to have the new justification document prepared for submittal to the

1 Federal Highway Administration this summer and once it's approved at
2 that level then we can look to work with DOT and our communities to get it
3 on the New Mexico State Transportation Plan.

4 This project, to my surprise goes back to a study done in 1991 and
5 just to compliment the communities here, executing a long-range plan
6 over a 25 period, 25-year period's a difficult thing to do but if you look at
7 this list you can see that the Arrowhead interchange is about the only item
8 that hasn't been done, so good study and good execution over a very long
9 period of time. In 2007 it was reviewed as a part of the corridor study
10 looking at I-10 from Las Cruces all the way down to the state line. Again
11 in 2009 the study and the approval of the work at I-10 and I-25, it was
12 considered there but not approved in the, in the final Federal Highway
13 Administration approval for budget reasons. And then in the construction
14 at I-10 and I-25 with, with direction from the Federal Highway
15 Administration there were pieces of this interchange that were built and
16 my understanding is so that when the interchange was approved in the
17 future at some point portions of the work that was done would not have to
18 be redone. So the bridge over Cholla was widened, the ramp from
19 eastbound I-10 onto I-25 north was widened or the span over that was
20 widened, the eastbound ramp from I-10 coming off of a future Arrowhead
21 interchange was constructed, and some right-of-way was acquired by
22 DOT as well. So all these things looking forward to a time when this
23 project could move forward were done in the last construction effort.

24 This is a diagram of the I-10/I-25 work and then the Arrowhead
25 interchange work and it's very complicated to see. There's a whole lot of
26 changes going on here but it's just a diagram which shows the work that
27 was done during the construction at I-10 and I-25 to facilitate this next
28 phase that we're looking to. Going back to the '91 study and subsequent
29 studies there are some very specific regional benefits that have been
30 identified to come from this next piece of work: Reducing congestion at I-
31 25 and the University Avenue interchange; reducing congestion along
32 University Avenue from, on it, across its full length; improving traffic on I-
33 10 from North Main down to Mesquite and again on I-25 from Lohman to
34 the I-10/I-25 interchange; regional events, concerts, games, graduation
35 events you've all experienced some of the congestion that can occur
36 around campus when those things take place; and then peak hour
37 circulations in and around the NMSU campus along University and the
38 area would also be improved.

39 The work that's being done this period of time that we're in now and
40 going into will do several things: The Federal Highway Administration has
41 replaced their prior IJR or Interstate Justification Request process with a
42 new process called the IACR which is an Interstate Access Change
43 Request and so this new document will reflect the requirements of the new
44 IACR process as well as updates to the Federal Highway Design
45 Standards that were passed in 2011. In collaboration with the MPO the
46 project will provide updates to traffic data in the VISUM model, I don't

1 know if I'm saying that correctly, and so there's work ongoing with the
2 MPO to make sure the data and the models are current and updated.
3 There will be an updated environmental document performed on the site in
4 question here. Strike that next bullet, that shouldn't be there. But then
5 there will be alternates evaluated as in any Federal Highway Review
6 project. And the interchange that you see proposed in that picture we'll
7 also be looking at the possibility of applying a roundabout design as
8 opposed to the typical diamond interchange and then routing alternatives
9 for Sam Steele along the freeway there.

10 So just in closing we think outcomes that could be expected from
11 not only this project but the implementation of it, we think the goals of the
12 MPO for efficiency in regional transportation capacity would be supported
13 by this project. The transportation and economic development goals at
14 NMSU for our campus and our surroundings would be supported. We
15 think it would enhance regional economic development opportunities and
16 this has been discussed, it would help with developing this gateway to the
17 south end of Las Cruces. We're also looking as part of the grant and as a
18 part of this project to figure out how we can tie the bike paths and the
19 multiuse trails around the campus into the system and so we'll be working
20 with your, the BPAC I think is the name of that committee as well. And
21 then we think it gives an opportunity to really better integrate the campus
22 as a whole into the community and, and create a better relationship there.
23 So with that I'll, I'll stop and open it up for any questions.

24
25 Sorg: Any questions or ...

26
27 Savage: Yes sir.

28
29 Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.

30
31 Hancock: Thank you. In looking, there's no page number. On this particular one ...

32
33 Savage: Yes sir.

34
35 Hancock: There is a, a problem there at the interchange between 25 going onto 10
36 going west. There's a very short on-ramp right there that is very
37 dangerous.

38
39 Savage: An existing ...

40
41 Hancock: An existing ...

42
43 Savage: Okay.

44
45 Hancock: Is, is that dealt with in this?
46

1 Savage: I'm going to ask Wyatt Kartchner with Molzen Corbin, our design firm to
2 kind of answer that one.
3
4 Sorg: Commissioner are you sure you have the right street, road there? There
5 is a Cholla Road. We're not talking about that. We're talking about
6 Arrowhead and, and it doesn't really identify it very clearly on the map.
7
8 Hancock: Is, is Arrowhead further up?
9
10 Sorg: Yeah. It's further west than Cholla.
11
12 Hancock: Up there where the green line starts going jagged, is that ...
13
14 Sorg: Can you point out ...
15
16 Hancock: I, I can't read the, the ...
17
18 Sorg: At, on the screen?
19
20 Savage: Yeah. It's hard to make ...
21
22 Kartchner: Commissioner, Members of the Committee. I'm Wyatt Kartchner with
23 Molzen Corbin.
24
25 Hancock: You could talk in the microphone.
26
27 Kartchner: We did, we did the actual design for the I-10/I-25 interchange and as part
28 of the, the Arrowhead interchange we looked at the future considerations
29 which Wayne described. One of the future considerations as part of the
30 Arrowhead interchange is this underpass at Cholla and I-10. That bridge
31 itself goes away with this new interchange. And so in the design of the I-
32 10/I-25 interchange this ramp from I-25 southbound to I-10 westbound
33 was, did not have the acceleration lanes that you see on the other side ...
34
35 Hancock: Right.
36
37 Kartchner: For the northbound movement. However it does meet the design
38 standards but because that bridge is going to be eliminated we didn't want
39 to spend money to widen that bridge at this time. And when this
40 Arrowhead interchange is built this bridge will be eliminated and then we
41 can widen that, that acceleration out to improve that ...
42
43 Hancock: Oh, I see.
44
45 Kartchner: Safety consideration.
46

1 Hancock: I see. Okay. So, so eventually it'll be dealt with.
2
3 Kartchner: Yes sir.
4
5 Hancock: I, I thought that was the right spot. Very good. Thank you. Appreciate
6 that.
7
8 Savage: Thanks Wyatt.
9
10 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair.
11
12 Savage: I couldn't have answered that one. Thank you.
13
14 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
15
16 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
17
18 Garrett: I, I feel like we need semaphores or Morse code or some, some, some,
19 some telegraph system. Thank you very much for the, the presentation.
20
21 Savage: Absolutely.
22
23 Garrett: I think the, there, there are two immediate reactions I have. I mean I, I
24 appreciate the presentation in part because I think it helps bring us current
25 on this issue. I, language is always very interesting and how we label
26 things. Quite honestly I see this as simply the south NMSU entrance.
27 And, and to some degree I, I appreciate the fact that this is going to be,
28 benefit Arrowhead. It seems to me that there is a huge impact in terms of
29 NMSU as a whole: The various big events that happen; the overall
30 circulation within the campus and so forth; the idea of reducing congestion
31 at I-10 and University or I, I-25 and, and University as well as I-10. I mean
32 it, it seems to me that, that one of the things that's happened is that we
33 actually need to understand that this is an interchange that is not just
34 about Arrowhead, that Arrowhead is right there and that there's, that,
35 that's kind of an entrance now for Arrowhead at, when, when this would be
36 done. But I think we need to look at it in, in terms of the overall circulation
37 system of that area and that this has real implications for the whole area.
38 So to the degree that we talk about that I'm almost inclined to say that this
39 is NMSU South/Arrowhead and, and that we need some way of, of making
40 sure that we're real clear about that. Because frankly I'm not sure that the
41 millions and millions of dollars that are going to be required for this are
42 justified just by Arrowhead but I do believe that it's justified by the overall
43 flow of traffic in and around that area. So that's sort of a semantics point
44 but it has to do also with perception of the project.
45
46 Savage: Yes.

1
2 Garrett: Frankly in the past when I would, just saw it listed as Arrowhead I was not
3 convinced that this was all that important. So this has helped me
4 understand a little bit more about that. I think the other thing is that it's
5 interesting that you show us the 1991 list of projects and that now 25
6 years later we're trying to get the last one on the list taken care of, or next
7 to last. I'm almost inclined to think that we need to see what the current
8 list is and I am mindful of the fact that this project is going to be both
9 complementary to and competing with other improvement projects that are
10 very important to Dona Ana County including "How do we ever get the
11 Upham interchange taken care of in terms of the spaceport access?" and
12 "How do we deal with the connection between Santa Teresa and I-10
13 before we get into El Paso?" issue which would be the interchange at
14 NM404.
15
16 Savage: Right.
17
18 Garrett: I'd like to see a more, an updated list of important projects that are going
19 to be for the next 25 years and I wouldn't have a problem seeing that this
20 project was not another 25 years out but I think that we need to see it as
21 part of a new system that has to do with economic development and new
22 traffic patterns that we want to work toward over the next decade or so.
23 So that's not directly to the points exactly that you're making. It's actually
24 to say that I think we need an update and I don't know how we'd do that
25 but having an updated list, I'm sure that this would play a central role in
26 terms of those improvements and so I'm asking for our MPO staff to brief
27 us at some point about how we might look at such an updated list if we
28 don't already have one, but I'm not aware of one that actually deals with
29 this and in particular takes us all the way from Upham down to Santa
30 Teresa which gets into another MPO. Thank you.
31
32 Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.
33
34 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Since you shamelessly brought up all the things that
35 Arrowhead does I had a question about that part of the presentation.
36 Thank you for the presentation also.
37
38 Savage: Yeah.
39
40 Hancock: Is, is there a particular requirement in, in developing these entrepreneurial
41 ventures that the ventures stay local or stay within the state?
42
43 Savage: There is not a requirement as far as working with Arrowhead that they stay
44 locally. Some funding sources may require that they grow their business
45 in New Mexico but we actually work with businesses all throughout the
46 region.

1
2 Hancock: Okay.
3
4 Savage: We invest our dollars in training, though we invest those locally in, in the
5 state.
6
7 Hancock: Very good. Thank you Mr. Chair.
8
9 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Hancock. Any others? If not.
10
11 Savage: Okay. Thank you very much.

12 **8.2 Interstate Access Request Training**

13
14
15 Sorg: We'll proceed on to the next discussion item: The Interstate Access
16 Request Training. Mr. Wray.

17
18 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. MPO staff thought it prudent to follow-up on Mr.
19 Savage's presentation to give a little bit of an overview over what FHWA is
20 looking for when they are considering interstate access change requests.
21 This presentation is meant to be more informative on the process in,
22 excuse me, in general. I will touch on the, the proposed Arrowhead
23 interchange periodically in my presentation as it's appropriate but do keep
24 in mind this is, this is a general presentation. This is the sort of thing that
25 FHWA looks at in all of the requests that they receive. The Title 23 US
26 Code Highway Section 111 specifically delegates to the Federal Highway
27 Administration the, to, ability to approve all points of access to or exit from
28 the, the interstate system. FHWA holds that full control of interstate
29 access is critical to its mission and requests to approve new or revised
30 access points must be supported by justifying information and
31 documentation, i.e. that is what the Interstate Access Change Request is.
32 FHWA's interest is they wish to have a decision-making process that's
33 based on information and analysis. It has to have environmental design
34 safety and operational aspects considered. A very important key piece of
35 the puzzle is that the request must support the intended purpose of the
36 interstate system and I'll get into that in a little bit more detail when I get
37 down to the specific requirements. The request must also not have an
38 adverse impact on the safety or operation of the interstate system and it
39 must also connect to a local roadway network or other elements of the
40 transportation system and it must be designed to acceptable standards.

41 Now there is a piece of nomenclature that Mr. Savage did allude to.
42 The, the new name of the process is an Interstate System Access Change
43 Request. That is however good only for the FHWA. They do not
44 prescribe a particular nomenclature down to the state DOTs so while
45 FHWA does refer to it as such individual DOTs can, can refer to it by
46 different means which does kind of lend itself to a bit of confusion. I'm not

1 sure what, I, I believe NMDOT generally refers to it as Access Change
2 Request but I have heard NMDOT staff still say IJR so it, it, it's kind of
3 fluid. Early coordination between the state DOT and Federal Highway is
4 encouraged to determine project feasibility basically from the word go and
5 to allow for the review process to be as efficient and cost-effective as
6 possible.

7 There are a couple common reasons why Interstate Change
8 Requests, or Interstate Access Change Requests are made: Obviously
9 system linkage or connectivity, road user benefits, access to areas not
10 currently served, addressing existing congestion or safety problem, and
11 prevention of future congestion or safety problems. And I want to, to note
12 at this point though that and I'll, I'll mention this again that FHWA does not
13 look favorably upon using the interstate system to solve local traffic
14 problems. It is a tool that is intended for regional transportation, regional
15 and national transportation. A proposal that just focuses on local
16 transportation situations, congestion, what have you FHWA is not going to
17 be very inclined to look favorably on that request.

18 Now there are eight specific policy requirements laid out that the
19 Federal Highway Administration looks at for each change request. The,
20 the first one is that the need being addressed cannot be adequately
21 satisfied by the existing facilities. Now again this is tying into what I just
22 said, the requirement is to ensure that it's regional and national
23 transportation facilities, or transportation impacts that are being
24 considered. This is not, FHWA does not want the interstate system to be
25 used for purely local purposes. The second one is that the need being
26 addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by alternative
27 measures to, i.e. geometric design improvements, or other improvements.
28 This also includes HOV lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, also
29 implementation of mass transit in the vicinity of the proposed interchange
30 that might have an alleviating effect on the congestion in the area. The
31 third one is a requirement that there be an operational and safety analysis,
32 that the proposal does not have a severe, or a significant adverse impact
33 on the safety and operation. This must include all of the surrounding
34 collector and distributor roads and must provide a comprehensive analysis
35 of the, what the no-build and the build options would be in the intended
36 design year. It, it can be beneficial for, during the review of an application
37 for the, the request to expand its scope beyond just the minimum
38 requirements. Sometimes the FHWA does require such an extension of
39 scope in urban areas where there are already existing frequent points of
40 access to the interstate system. Again this is also intended to ensure, or
41 that the analysis must give priority to the intended purpose of the
42 interstate system, again regional and national connectivity and this has to,
43 this, that particular consideration does have to take priority over the
44 requirements of local planning. The fourth requirement, proposed access
45 connects only to public roads and will provide for all traffic movements.
46 Again it, it's, should be obvious that this is becoming a theme now. FHWA

1 wants this to only be used for regional transportation purposes and not
2 local. The, the interchange must also provide for all the eight basic
3 movements. Partial interchanges can be provisionally approved by
4 FHWA, provisionally might not be the best word but the, they can be
5 approved but FHWA is almost certainly going to want there to be
6 commitments on down the road for there to be a full interchange built at
7 any existing, at any point of access. This, points of access can also
8 include special transit lanes, HOV lanes, access to park-and-rides, those
9 can be approved but FHWA considers each one of those on a case by
10 case basis. And the, the fifth one is very important to this body: The
11 proposed access change must be consistent with local and regional land
12 use and transportation plans, i.e. it must be in conformance with the MPO
13 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. As Mr. Savage alluded to in his
14 presentation, we do have a reference to the Arrowhead interchange
15 currently in our MTP but depending on the year when they wish to begin
16 work on it, it may require an amendment to the MTP in order to go
17 forward. The sixth one, again this is also one that Mr. Savage alluded to
18 in his presentation with regards to the recent completion of the I-10 and I-
19 25 interchange. The, that was constructed with the potential for the
20 Arrowhead interchange in mind. That is a requirement of FHWA is if there
21 are multiple access or potential interchange additions that all of those
22 must be considered as a part of the application. They don't want to see a
23 situation where a, a lot of work and money is poured into one particular
24 area and then just a few years later it has to be done all over again
25 because there's a new issue that may or may not have been foreseen and
26 if it was foreseen they're not going to be pleased. The seventh one is
27 basically FHWA wants to make sure that all of the parties, all of the
28 relevant stakeholders are closely coordinating with each other from before
29 the, the access change request is made through the process all the way
30 up until the end. They want to make sure that the, the process is
31 comprehensive from start to finish. Anything that comes along that is a
32 surprise is likely to cause the, the request to be rejected. And lastly the,
33 there is a possibility for the application to be, basically essentially it's a
34 two-step process. FHWA will review initially to see operational and
35 engineering acceptability but at that point the process has to go through
36 the NEPA process in order to be, receive final approval from FHWA. This
37 is the case regardless of funding source. Any changes to, to interstate
38 access have to go through the NEPA process.

39 Once the, the request has been submitted FHWA will evaluate, find
40 out whether the, the request complies with the FHWA policy requirements.
41 It has to satisfy every single one of the eight policy requirements. Any,
42 basically they're kind of almost eight points of failure. If any one of the
43 policy requirements is not met the request will be denied. If the access
44 point is approved the state DOT will then be responsible for following the
45 project development stages before construction can begin. And that
46 concludes my presentation and I'll stand now for any questions.

1
2 Sorg: Any questions? Councilor Pedroza.
3
4 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair.
5
6 Sorg: I could barely see your hand.
7
8 Pedroza: Oh, I'm sorry. Do I understand you to say then Andrew that the
9 presentation that we just saw of the proposed Arrowhead interchange, has
10 that already been approved by the, the, these folks, the Federal Highway
11 Department or, or is that, does it not apply or ...
12
13 Sorg: Somebody's phone is ringing here. Can you check your phones please?
14 Thank you.
15
16 Pedroza: Excuse me, it's me.
17
18 Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It has not. The request has not been
19 submitted to FHWA yet.
20
21 Pedroza: And is it going to have to be?
22
23 Wray: Yes.
24
25 Pedroza: I see. Okay. Is there any input or anything that this body can do or should
26 be doing in terms of either ...
27
28 Wray: Formerly this body if, if it becomes necessary would have to amend the
29 Metropolitan Transportation Plan to allow this to go forward depending on
30 the, the intended year of construction.
31
32 Pedroza: And the gentleman who presented the previous, made the previous
33 presentation is no long here so we don't know ...
34
35 Sorg: Yeah. He's no longer here.
36
37 Pedroza: Yeah. So we don't know how soon they're, they're expecting to, to put this
38 forward to FHWA.
39
40 Wray: He did say in his presentation that they were hoping to have it done before
41 the end of this year I believe but I, I do not know as, as far as when their
42 intended date of construction or anything like that. I, I don't know that
43 information.
44
45 Sorg: Councilor Pedroza. Mr. Doolittle has a word.
46

1 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Andrew's correct. The NMSU is currently working
2 with Molzen to design or, or put together the modifications to the original
3 Interstate Justification Request that they submitted as part of the entire I-
4 10 corridor study. That MOU that we currently are working with NMSU to
5 execute will be the first step in that process so once we enter that MOU to
6 oversee and handle the funding that they received for that study or that,
7 that request to Federal Highway, NMSU and Molzen will then begin the,
8 the formal process of that request to Federal Highway.
9

10 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you Andrew.

11

12 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.

13

14 Garrett: Thank you Chair. According to this presentation the Upham interchange
15 would need to have an IACR, is that correct? Is that, is that part of the ...
16

17 Wray: In order for there to be a change in capacity I believe so, that there would
18 be.
19

20 Garrett: No, that's not what I'm asking. What I, right now there's no plan, there's
21 no document, there's nothing in anybody's stream of planning or
22 projections of work that calls for an interchange at Upham that is anything
23 more than a farm road.
24

25 Wray: Then yes.

26

27 Garrett: Okay so ...

28

29 Wray: It, it would have to.

30

31 Garrett: So that, that's partly what I'm trying to clarify. That's also outside the
32 boundaries of this MPO, correct?
33

34 Wray: Yes.
35

36 Garrett: Okay. We have talked about coordination with the El Paso MPO in terms
37 of planning and we have agreed that we would have exchange of
38 information and so forth. What I'm wondering is whether or not staff could
39 come back to us with recommendations at the next meeting about how we
40 might work with I believe it's the RPO in developing the information that
41 would be necessary to develop an IACR for the Upham interchange. The
42 reason for the change being that this is the southern end of the southern
43 road between Dona Ana County and the spaceport and in order to
44 understand what the jurisdictional issues are as well as the requirements
45 of information so that such a request could be put together, it seems to me
46 that that needs to start somewhere and that potentially that could start

1 here and I'd like for the MPO to be able to consider that at a future
2 meeting. I'm not calling for a study. I'm, I'm asking for the information
3 about what could, what's necessary and what are the steps to move us out
4 of the limbo that we're in on that particular project.
5
6 Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett.
7
8 Garrett: Mr. Chair. Could I just ask if the rest of the, of this Committee in general
9 agrees that that's an important thing for us to understand?
10
11 Sorg: Yeah I'm, that's what she should do, yeah. Is there any opposition to this
12 idea that Commissioner Garrett has given?
13
14 Garrett: I'm just asking that we have a presentation from staff to explore that ...
15
16 Sorg: Right.
17
18 Garrett: How we would work through that ...
19
20 Sorg: Right.
21
22 Garrett: Including the fact that we would have to be coordinating with the RPO.
23
24 Sorg: Right. And how the process might have to go, yes.
25
26 Garrett: And, and how, how might that, that work.
27
28 Sorg: Very good. Okay let's, then in that case I, I will task the staff to do that.
29 Mr. Doolittle has a word.
30
31 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Commissioner Garrett I think that's a good idea
32 because it, it, it's not only at Upham but we're, we're talking about doing
33 some improvements for, for instance at the Hatch interchange because
34 right now if you're headed southbound and you get off you can't cross over
35 that bridge to the north side of Hatch so ultimately that type of discussion
36 could be representative of many interchanges within the Dona Ana County
37 where we cross MPO or RPO boundaries so I think it's a good idea.
38
39 Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Doolittle. If there's no further discussion on this
40 item.
41
42 **8.3 FY 17/FY 18 UPWP Discussion**
43
44 Sorg: Let's go to the next one: FY 17/FY 18 UPWP Discussion.
45

1 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. It's that time. Every
2 two years we put together the MPO Work Program and we'll be doing this
3 for the, for the Federal Fiscal Years of 2017 and 2018 and we'll have this
4 back several times over the next month, next few months as this comes,
5 comes into development. This is the time where we're, we're really putting
6 you on notice that we're starting to do it and we're looking for ideas of
7 what kind of work do you want to see staff pursue over the next two years.
8 The, you know it's called our Unified Planning Work Program. It's a
9 required federal document out of the federal regulations. The time period
10 it'll cover is from October 16th of this year to September 30th of 2018.
11 Below that you'll see the, as prescribed by the New Mexico DOT's Policies
12 and Procedures Manual that they apply towards MPOs and RTPOs the,
13 statewide we're to begin our UP development, UPWP development and
14 have a draft document to them by May 1st. The setup I'm, you know we
15 provide this in your MPO 101 books, it's on our, our website but just to
16 kind of go over the basic framework the UPWP has an introduction. It tells
17 a little bit about the requirements of having an MPO. It tells a little bit
18 about the history of this particular MPO and about the work in the
19 document. The main body of the, of the UPWP is broken into work
20 program tasks and those are the things that we do each I guess day in,
21 day out for lack of a better term. So I'm going to break, break, I'm going to
22 go through these a little bit at a time.

23 Task 1, program support and administration: These break down
24 into the, to the more mundane things, making sure that we advertise, you
25 know advertise our committee meetings in the newspaper, that we do the
26 reporting, that I sign the time sheets for, for the employees. Probably the
27 most exciting thing coming out of this one is we are looking to you know
28 as part of our public participation we are looking at garnering our, or
29 developing our own web page. Got a little screen shot of the Lauren
30 Ipsum mock-up of what that website could look at but it's something that
31 we're hoping to appear a little, appear more independent from the City,
32 kind of give the MPO more regional stature and presentation, have a, a
33 web address that doesn't, is not tied to the City so that we, you know so
34 that we can appear more independent.

35 The second task is the maintenance of the Transportation
36 Improvement Program, kind of put down the kind of the whole UPWP
37 section on that. It, it specifies our times for releasing our call for projects
38 and then this, you know the steps that we take up until we get that
39 Transportation Improvement Plan adopted and then the steps that we take
40 to maintain it and you know we process administrative modifications and
41 amendments throughout the year and then it finally culminates in each,
42 each year we do an annual listing of, of obligated, obligated projects that
43 we present to, to you here to show what federal funds have been
44 expended in the MPO area.

45 This, task 3 starts getting us into kind of the more, more interesting
46 or more I guess groundbreaking aspects of transportation planning. It's

1 where we do general development data collection. I guess only, only a
2 planner could stand here and tell you that data collection is more
3 interesting but this, this is a you know we have, we have some ongoing
4 duties that we've been doing you know since the 19, you know since even
5 before the 1991 IHAS report was out there and that's, we do the traffic
6 counts on, on all the road, all the major roadways in the region. We
7 collect population and land use data. We maintain a forecast model
8 known as the VISUM. Mr. Savage referenced it in his presentation so it's
9 a very important thing that we do. We you know time, time we purchase
10 upgrades to that model so it's a software upgrade. And then we did
11 another little screen shot there, one of the more interesting things that's a
12 subtask listed under three, it's under if you go into the UPWP it's under
13 3.1. We're going to, we're working with RoadRUNNER Transit. I've
14 probably mentioned it here a few times. We've purchased automated,
15 automated passenger counting units and the way that works into our, into
16 our traffic counting, it's part of counting the transportation system so that's
17 probably the most in, one of the interesting things that we're doing,
18 undergoing under that task.

19 Task 4 is the transportation planning. The big one over the last two
20 years was our work on the adopting the Metropolitan Transportation Plan
21 which we do every, every five years. We do have some room in the
22 UPWP in case we need to amend it. The, you know the previous
23 Arrowhead the, may require that we amend that transportation plan here
24 in the next couple of months or years. Another big activity upcoming in
25 this one, we're going to be updating the Safe Routes to School Action
26 Plan. That was a plan that was, you know allowed us, we got a half a
27 million dollars of Safe Routes to School money to, to do infrastructure
28 improvements, sidewalk, ADA improvements in the vicinity of several
29 schools within the MPO area. We're back out, or we're continuing to meet
30 with the Safe Routes to School team, members of the, the Transportation
31 Department, the Public Schools, the police, and kind of find out what the,
32 what are the big needs now, what should we, what should we pursue for
33 improvements for our schools. This also, this task also represents our,
34 you know it gives us our tie-in to work with the Regional Transit District.

35 And then task 5, special studies, plans, projects and I, I posted, I
36 posted the wrong thing there I believe but under this, this is the, this is the
37 one that, where we list our commitment to participating in the RLC, the
38 Regional Leadership Consortium we discussed last meeting. We wanted
39 to devote, you know from our Transportation Plan we have the Asset and
40 Safety Management which we hope to you know develop into strong
41 performance measures as required by FHWA.

42 And then, and then the last three I kind of put out a couple of
43 suggestions that, that will be new for us and these replace in the current
44 one where we have the university study area, we have the Missouri study
45 area, and we have the short-range transit plan. We're looking to do some
46 participatory mapping activities, kind of partnering with Place Matters,

1 some of the work that they've done in the, in the far south part of Dona
2 Ana County outside of our MPO area we would be looking at replicating
3 closer, closer to, or further north in Vado, Berino, La Mesa, some, some of
4 those areas that are in our MPO area and also possibly partnering with the
5 City. I'm doing some participating, participatory mapping within the city
6 itself so having an urban and rural things. What that is is it's, it's kind of a
7 combination of data collection and public involvement where we, we go
8 out, we work with community groups, get them kind, get them apps for
9 their phones or, or temporary phones where they can identify
10 transportation shortfalls in the area, allow us to map them. We feel that
11 this could be a, a, a very important tool for further transportation planning
12 so we want to investigate that. We'll probably be asking the DOT Planning
13 Office to, to help us out with some additional funding on that but the way it
14 gets started is we put it into our work program and we start on that. This
15 body I believe, I believe it was the last meeting talked about the need to
16 do an A Mountain study area given some of the potential developments
17 happening there so we'll be putting that into our work program if you all
18 agree and, and seek some funding to, to fund a study on that. BLM has
19 suggested to us that we do a transportation study to see how the national
20 monument designation affects our transportation system, how our
21 transportation system could support that national monument. And then
22 also I, as I'm standing here and I, I kind of heard one a little bit earlier, do
23 we update, do we update the IHAS, if so we, we put it in here. And so
24 with that I will ask if you have any questions or wish to give me any
25 direction.

26
27 Sorg: Anybody? Commissioner Garrett.

28
29 Garrett: Thank you. And I would just say Mr. Murphy to you and your entire staff
30 that your planning for your work plan is among the best that I have ever
31 seen just consistently so you've really got that down and I really
32 appreciate that. I, I think it's important that the MPO continue to be
33 involved with the, the Camino Real Consortium and the Regional
34 Leadership Committee as we work into implementation of the various
35 projects that we've got going and I think there's an important role to be
36 played by the MPO as far as transportation in a number of those projects
37 and we don't know yet quite the, what that's going to look like but leaving
38 space for that is important. The more that we, we've had these
39 discussions the more that I'm concerned with what happens at the fringes
40 and I just had reflected that in my earlier comments so the idea of
41 updating the IH ...

42
43 Murphy: IHAS.

44
45 Garrett: IHAS I think is important. I'm wondering if it would be worthwhile as part
46 of that to look at specific projects that call for collaborative planning at both

1 the north and the south ends of our jurisdiction and we have touched on
2 the idea of coordination with the El Paso MPO but I'm not sure that we
3 want to simply leave that as an annual coordination meeting. It seems to
4 me that Dona Ana County and this MPO have a real vested interest in
5 what happens in terms of transportation planning in the south part of this,
6 of the county and in order to move beyond simply accepting what the El
7 Paso MPO is doing, in a sense I would like for us to have some space in
8 the work plan to address joint planning interests in the south part of the
9 county and in the north part of the county. We need to be thinking
10 regionally and I don't see any other entity being in a position to do that.
11 The County Comprehensive Plan, the new one is pretty vague when you
12 actually get to some of the transportation planning pieces and I think that
13 the MPO is the logical group of professionals to help flesh that out. So I
14 would like to see that reflected in the work plan or brought before the
15 Committee for consideration.

16
17 Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett. Any other comments? Questions?
18 Commissioner Hancock.

19
20 Hancock: Thank you. I'll be, I'll be quick. In the Organ Mountains/Desert Peak, the
21 Dripping Springs, and, and the Baylor Canyon, is that work to be done to,
22 to help identify how Baylor Canyon should be modified or if it should be
23 modified for making it a, a more mountain-friendly, more tourist-oriented
24 kind of a, a thoroughfare in, to include some of the planning stuff like
25 recreational vehicles and parks and other kinds of things or, or does it
26 include any of that? Thank you Mr. Chair.

27
28 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. It's, probably the, the best answer I
29 can give you at this time is that, that really has not been scoped out as of
30 this moment. I gave a, a variation of this presentation to the Technical
31 Advisory Committee last week and Bill Childress of the BLM suggested
32 that we need to be doing this, how the transportation system affects and is
33 affected by the national monument so and it, the, said yeah, you know yes
34 that is a very, a very big development for our region and by all means we
35 need to look into that ...

36
37 Hancock: Okay.

38
39 Murphy: And that's where we're, we're standing at this moment.

40
41 Hancock: Good. Understand. It's, it's on the radar. Thank you Mr. Chair.

42
43 Sorg: Good. Thank you Commissioner Hancock. Any other comments or
44 questions?

45
46

1 **9. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

2
3 Sorg: Then we'll move on to general comments and questions from the, for the,
4 with the staff and the Committee. Seeing none.

5
6 **10. PUBLIC COMMENT**

7
8 Sorg: I will move to Public Comment and there's no new public here so I assume
9 there's no new public comment.

10
11 **11. ADJOURNMENT (2:57 p.m.)**

12
13 Sorg: With that I'll ask for a motion to adjourn.

14
15 Garrett: So moved.

16
17 Sorg: Okay. All those in favor say "aye."

18
19 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Chairperson

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF February 10, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Removal of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee (BPAC) member for nonfeasance of office

ACTION REQUESTED:

Removal of BPAC member for nonfeasance of office

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Email from George Pearson, Chair of the BPAC

DISCUSSION:

George Pearson, Chair of the BPAC, requests that Duane Bentley, Bicycle Community Citizen Representative on the BPAC, be removed for nonfeasance of office.

The Policy Committee will take a vote on whether to remove Mr. Bentley.

If Mr. Bentley is removed, MPO Staff will initiate a call for candidates to fill the vacancy.

6.1 Removal of BPAC committee member

From: George Pearson <george@nmbikeed.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 10:00 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Tom Murphy
Subject: Removal of BPAC committee member

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

MPO Policy Committee Chair Sorg,

The MPO Policy Committee appointed Duane Bentley to the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee on May 13, 2015. Mr. Bentley attended the first BPAC meeting after his appointment, but no others. The BPAC bylaws state that committee meeting attendance is required and that absence for more than two consecutive meetings is grounds for committee membership termination. I contacted this member by email and did not receive a response. Notwithstanding any possible reason for his absence, it appears that the member has vacated by nonattendance. Since this is an action by the Policy Committee, I am asking that Policy Committee act to remove Duane Bentley as a member of the BPAC.

Thank you.

Regards,

George Pearson
Chair, Mesilla Valley MPO Bicycle Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee League of American Bicyclists
Cycling Instructor #2614

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF February 10, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

6.2 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Email from Mike Bartholomew, RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator

DISCUSSION:

On June 10, 2015, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

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

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
TL00013	2016	RoadRUNNER Transit	Support and Rolling Stock	Rollover of unobligated Federal Funds from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016	New FTA 5307 amount of \$1,038,719 New Local Match amount of \$127,021

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-03

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee adopted the FY 2016-2021 TIP on June 10, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the NMDOT has requested amendments to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its January 19, 2016 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its February 4, 2016 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program to be approved.

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

(I)

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Year 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

(II)

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

(III)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 10th day of February , 2016.

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

FY2016-FY2019 TIP Exhibit "A"

CN	FY	Agency	Project	Scope	Funds listed on TIP	Project total	Change
TL00013	2016	RoadRUNNER Transit	Support and Rolling Stock	Rollover of unobligated Federal Funds from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016	\$846,811	\$1,165,740	New FTA 5307 Amount of \$1,038,719; new Local Match Amount of \$127,021
					Total:	\$1,165,740	

6.2 Request to amend TIP project TL00013

From: Michael Bartholomew
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2016 9:00 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Cc: Tom Murphy; Gabriel Sapient; David Maestas
Subject: Request to amend TIP project TL00013

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Andrew,

Because the final 2/12ths of the FFY2015 Section 5307 apportionment to Las Cruces was authorized in September 2015, it was received too late to obligate it into a grant in FFY 2015. These funds will be applied for as a new grant in FFY 2016 under the scope of MPO project TL00013 (Support Equipment and Rolling Stock) in the TIP. To account for these additional unobligated federal funds that are being rolled over from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016, the FFY 2016 figures for project TL00013 need to be amended to:

From \$719,790 (currently in TIP) to \$1,038,719 for the FTA 5307 fund source
From \$127,021 (currently in TIP) to \$220,924 for the local match fund source

Mike Bartholomew
RoadRUNNER Transit Administrator
City of Las Cruces NM

Phone: (575) 541-2537
Fax: (575) 541-2733

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF February 10, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Committee Training, the Planning Procedures Manual

DISCUSSION:

MPO Staff will give a presentation regarding the Planning Procedures Manual.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF February 10, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

7.2 Viva Doña Ana! Presentation

DISCUSSION:

This item has been postponed.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE EL PASO MPO INFORMATION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF February 10, 2016

INFORMATION REPORT:

This report is for informational purposes only, MPO Staff has no presentation on this item.

DISCUSSION:

The El Paso Metropolitan Transportation Board met on January 22, 2016.

The New Mexico members of the Transportation Policy Board who were present:

Trent Doolittle, NMDOT D1 Engineer

Arnulfo Castaneda, Mayor of Anthony, NM

New Mexico Related Items on the January 22 Agenda:

Item 9. Status report of the FTA 5310 El Paso Urbanized Area FY 2015 Requests for Proposals –

The El Paso MPO is holding a call for projects for 5310 funds which are available for capital (55%) and operating (45%) expenses to support the provision of transportation services to meet the specific needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities within the El Paso urbanized area, which includes portions of southern Doña Ana County. For more information regarding this call for projects, please contact El Paso MPO Staff.

Non-New Mexico Related Items on the January 22 Agenda:

Item 1. Executive Director's Report on Training Requirements

Item 3. Amend FFY 2016-2017 UPWP

Item 4. Amend the Horizon 2040 MTP and 2015-2018 TIP, moving some projects from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016

Item 5. Approve the 2015 Project Readiness Report

Item 6. Amend the Horizon 2040 MTP and 2015-2018 TIP adding some projects to FFY 2016

Item 7. Approve modification to the El Paso MPO Federal Transit Administration Program Management Plan