



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://MesillaValleyMPO.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 **September 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **City of Las Cruces Council Chambers**, 700 North Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://MesillaValleyMPO.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** *Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.* _____ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 4.1. August 10, 2016 _____ **Chair**
 - 4.2. August 24, 2016 Special Meeting _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. Resolution 16-11: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a Memorandum of Understanding between the MPO and the Camino Real Consortium _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. Missouri Study Corridor _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 6.2. Committee Training _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **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 August 10, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in
6 the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrived 1:02)
9 Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
10 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
11 Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
12 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
13 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC) (arrived 1:02)
14 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
15 Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
16 Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
17

18 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
19 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
20 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
21 Marcus Lopez (MPO Co-Op)
22 Cody Sensiba (MPO Co-Op)
23

24 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
25

26 **1. CALL TO ORDER (1:02 p.m.)**
27

28 Sorg: It's time for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy
29 Committee to begin so I'm calling the meeting to order.
30

31 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**
32

33 Sorg: The first order of business is the Conflict of Interest Inquiry. Is there
34 anybody on the Committee or staff that is in conflict with any item on the
35 agenda?
36

37 Pedroza: No.
38

39 Hancock: No.
40

41 Eakman: None.
42

43 Doolittle: No.
44

45 Benavidez: No.
46

1 Flores: No.

2
3 Sorg: Okay. Thank you.

4
5 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

6
7 Sorg: Is there any, any member of the public that wishes to make a comment to
8 the Committee? Raise your hand and come forward. Seeing none.

9
10 **4. CONSENT AGENDA ***

11
12 Sorg: We'll move right on to the agenda, the rest of the agenda. We have a
13 couple corrections to make here and changes before we make an
14 approval. There's the date on the agenda sheet was the wrong date for
15 the minutes of the last meeting. It is, shows to be April 13th but the last
16 meeting was in June.

17
18 Murphy: June 8th.

19
20 Sorg: Eighth, June 8th it is. That change.

21
22 Murphy: The June 8th minutes were in the packet.

23
24 Sorg: And it, that's, the packet had the right date on it. The other change we're
25 going to do is pull Action Item 6.1, the Resolution concerning the Unified
26 Planning Work Program to an item for discussion. Any other changes by
27 the Committee?

28
29 Benavidez: Could you repeat that one.

30
31 Sorg: We are going to pull Action Item 6.1 from the Consent Agenda to the
32 Agenda for Discussion. Pull it off the Consent.

33
34 Murphy: Mr. Chair. We do wish that it, it still remain an Action Item, just not on the
35 Consent Agenda.

36
37 Sorg: Yes. Right. Okay, with that I'll accept a motion to approve the agenda.

38
39 Flores: So moved.

40
41 Pedroza: Move that they are as amended. Second.

42
43 Sorg: Moved by Trustee Torrez, Lopez, Flores, and a second by Councilor
44 Pedroza. Thomas, a roll call vote.

45
46 Murphy: Okay. Mayor Barraza.

1
2 Barraza: Here.

3
4 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

5
6 Benavidez: Here.

7
8 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

9
10 Doolittle: Yes.

11
12 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

13
14 Garrett: Yes.

15
16 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.

17
18 Pedroza: We're not calling roll, we're not calling roll. We're actually voting on the
19 motion to accept the, yes. Yes.

20
21 Sorg: That's very good. Thanks for the correction.

22
23 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

24
25 Hancock: Yes.

26
27 Sorg: Councilor Eakman.

28
29 Eakman: Yes.

30
31 Murphy: Trustee Flores.

32
33 Flores: Yes.

34
35 Murphy: And Chair Sorg.

36
37 Sorg: Yeah, the Chair votes yes too.

38
39 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

40
41 **5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

42
43 **5.1 *June 8, 2016**

44
45 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

1 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

2
3 **6.1 Resolution 16-08: A Resolution Amending the Federal Fiscal Year**
4 **2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**
5

6 Sorg: So the first item on the agenda for discussion would be Action Item 6.1.
7 Mr. Murphy would you please ...
8

9 Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair. This resolution is a resolution to amend the upcoming
10 Work Program for Fiscal Years' 2017 and Fiscal Years' 2018. Currently a,
11 a handout detailing the budget amounts and details are being passed out
12 to you. This involves two amendments to the Work Program. The first
13 amendment that we're aware of was we found out we are not going to be
14 able to get State Planning and Research money in FY17 for the A
15 Mountain Study Area so we have moved \$250,000 from FY2017 to
16 FY2018.

17 The second, second amendment will be on, on, shows, it starts to
18 show on page three of the handout, we're adding back, or we're adding
19 into this Work Program the Missouri Avenue Study Corridor which is
20 currently under, undergoing. We do not anticipate its completion by
21 October 1st so we need to amend the next year's UPWP to include that in
22 there and the UPWP begins on October 1st. And with that we added
23 \$40,000 of FY16 money into the FY17 budget that's shown on the last
24 page and those would be the, the amendments for this resolution. I'll
25 stand for any questions.
26

27 Sorg: Yes.
28

29 Pedroza: Thank you. When do we anticipate the, the Missouri project to be finished
30 if it's not going to be finished by October 1st?
31

32 Murphy: It's, Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It is currently ongoing. Essentially I, I,
33 I, December 31st would be the drop-dead date for the funds but we, we
34 are near the end of it. We just won't get to the finish line by October 1st.
35

36 Pedroza: All right. Thank you very much.
37

38 Sorg: Any other questions on this amendment? I think we need a motion don't
39 we to make this amendment? Commissioner Benavidez.
40

41 Benavidez: No I wasn't ...
42

43 Sorg: Your light is on.
44

45 Benavidez: I wasn't going to, sorry.
46

1 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
2
3 Sorg: Yes Commissioner Garrett.
4
5 Garrett: I move approval of Resolution 16-08.
6
7 Flores: I'll second the motion.
8
9 Sorg: Moved by Commissioner Garrett, second by Trustee Flores.
10
11 Murphy: Roll call. Commissioner Benavidez.
12
13 Benavidez: Yes.
14
15 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
16
17 Doolittle: Yes.
18
19 Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.
20
21 Garrett: Yes.
22
23 Murphy: Councilor Pedroza.
24
25 Pedroza: Yes.
26
27 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.
28
29 Hancock: Yes.
30
31 Murphy: Councilor Eakman.
32
33 Eakman: Yes.
34
35 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
36
37 Flores: Yes.
38
39 Murphy: Chair Sorg.
40
41 Sorg: Yes.
42

43 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
44

45 **6.2 * Resolution 16-09: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021**
46 **Transportation Improvement Program**

1
2 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
3

4 **6.3 Resolution 16-07: A Resolution Amending the 2015 Metropolitan**
5 **Transportation Plan (Transport 2040)**
6

7 Sorg: Next item on the agenda is 6.3, Resolution to Amend the 2015
8 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Is there a motion to approve?
9

10 Pedroza: Move to approve.
11

12 Sorg: Moved by Councilor Pedroza.
13

14 Hancock: Second.
15

16 Sorg: Second by Commissioner Hancock. Mr. Wray.
17

18 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the Committee to
19 page 59 of the packet. The amendment that's being proposed today is a
20 RoadRUNNER Transit amendment. This is a brand-new project although
21 it's not brand-new money. The reason why we are, or why RoadRUNNER
22 is requesting this amendment is ...
23

24 Murphy: Item 6.3. That was (*inaudible*) ...
25

26 Wray: Oh. Never mind. I apologize. I'd, I was, I had gotten behind myself.
27

28 Sorg: Yeah. Wrong page.
29

30 Wray: Wrong thing. Anyway, so rewinding, starting again. Thank you Mr. Chair.
31 As the Committee will no doubt recall, at the June meeting the Committee
32 continued the discussion item regarding the Metropolitan Transportation
33 Plan amendment, the multi-use loop trail.
34

35 Sorg: Mr. Wray. Could I refer the Committee to page 54. I think it begins on
36 page 54 of the packet.
37

38 Wray: No, Mr. Chair. That is, that's the wrong action item. That's actually the
39 TIP amendment that we already did. The information for the multi-use
40 loop trail starts on 64.
41

42 Sorg: Thank you, 64.
43

44 Wray: Sixty-four, yes. As, as this Committee has already had one presentation
45 regarding this particular item, I'm only going to briefly touch on the options
46 that were considered previously by the Committee and then go into further

1 detail regarding the options that the Committee requested that the
2 Advisory Committees look at in greater detail. The ones that the, that this
3 Committee has already seen: Option A would be to designate the route
4 primarily following University, in fact I'm just going to switch to the map
5 because that's probably easier to visualize for everyone. Option A is
6 going to proceed down from Calle del Norte, proceed down NM-28 to
7 connect with University and then across the campus along this path.
8 Option B is to go from Calle del Norte down to Union and proceed across
9 and then across the campus along that path. Option C which is one of the
10 new options that we just discussed at the last meeting, that one is to follow
11 the Mesilla Lateral down to Union and then across Union along the same
12 trajectory as University, excuse me University along the same alignment
13 as Option A. And then Option D is to follow the Mesilla Lateral all the way
14 down to Union and then across, and then across the campus. The option
15 that this Committee specifically requested that be analyzed before a
16 decision is taken is now so-called Option E. That one follows along from
17 La Llorona along Calle del Norte, stops at the intersection with the Mesilla
18 Lateral due to right-of-way issues, and then resumes here at the
19 intersection of Avenida de Mesilla and the Laguna Lateral, then follows
20 down the Laguna Lateral to Union where it connects the existing Union
21 trail facility, stops just barely short of the intersection with Laguna, and
22 then would proceed along the same alignment.

23 Again, Option A, I've already gone over this in some detail so I'll
24 just mention some of the, the high points there. If, if at any point during
25 the Committee's discussion I'm more than happy to go and discuss any of
26 the options in greater detail. But just, I want to note that the, the, one of
27 primary advantages of Option A is that it directly connects the heart of
28 Town of Mesilla with NMSU campus and it improves non-motorized
29 access past Zia Middle School. The most significant disadvantage to
30 Option A is the very difficult crossing of the Main Street/I-10 intersection,
31 would be substantial infrastructure improvements that would be required in
32 order to put a trail through, along this alignment. There are substantial
33 right-of-way issues and ownership issues additionally which are
34 impediments to the implementation of this trail, and due to the right-of-way
35 utilizing NM-28 it would not be possible for there to be a contiguous multi-
36 use trail along Option A alignment.

37 Option B, the significant advantage is that there are fewer right-of-
38 way issues along the length of this corridor than Option A. It is a shorter
39 distance to cross the Main Street and I-10 with more direct access to
40 NMSU. The disadvantage is this option does not connect as closely as
41 Option A does with the core of Town of Mesilla. There would be a greater
42 coordination required between more jurisdictions and the existing EBID,
43 excuse me, the, oh excuse me, yeah. I apologize, the, yeah, the existing
44 EBID lateral would require coordination with Dona Ana County, the, the,
45 the signing of the MOU in order to implement. And again due to the use of
46 NM-28 the, the multi-use trail would not be able to be contiguous.

1 Option C, this is where we bring in the options along the Mesilla
2 Lateral. It substantially parallels the same advantages and disadvantages
3 for Option A with the exception that a contiguous multi-use facility would
4 be possible given the fact that this will be, this proposal would be built on
5 EBID facilities and there would not be the conflict with NM-28. This would
6 require the MOU between the Town of Mesilla and EBID for this use of the
7 Mesilla Lateral.

8 And then Option D, this is an option that proceeds from Calle del
9 Norte and Mesilla Lateral all the way down the Mesilla Lateral to Union
10 and then across. Again substantially similar advantages and
11 disadvantages to Option B and again would not, would be able to be a, a
12 complete contiguous multi-use facility due to use of the lateral and again
13 this option would require the agreement between Town of Mesilla and
14 EBID for the use of that lateral.

15 And this is illustrative of the right-of-way that exists along the, the
16 path. Not going to recite all of the, the rights-of-way at, but I, our, our
17 intent with this slide is to show that there is enough room along all points
18 of the right, or along all points of the lateral to include a multi-use facility.
19 The greatest pinch points are up here. The east bank is only eight, eight
20 feet wide and again the east bank at this spot is also eight feet wide.
21 While that is a little bit constrained that is still enough room to get a facility
22 constructed.

23 And these are some pictures of the, the proposed areas. This is
24 the Mesilla Lateral at Calle de Colon looking northwards. And this is the
25 same, the same spot looking to the south. This is at Calle de Parian, do
26 want to note there is some, some obstruction on the east side here but
27 that could easily be cleared in the event of construction. And this is the
28 same intersection looking to the south and I do want to note here that
29 there is this wall that is existing along the, the, a potential selection that
30 does pinch the right-of-way down somewhat but again staff believes that
31 a, a multi-use facility could be constructed on either bank of the lateral.
32 And this is Calle de Santiago looking to the north, again there is some
33 vegetation in the way along the east side but that could easily be cleared.
34 And then this is the same, same spot looking to the south and again there
35 is vegetation present.

36 Option E, and this is the one I'm going to go into a little bit more
37 detail because this is the one that the Policy Committee requested that
38 staff take back to the, the Advisory Committees for their consideration. I
39 do want to note that we do terminate the, the proposed trail here at the
40 intersection with the Mesilla Lateral and then resume it at this point at the
41 intersection of the Laguna Lateral and Avenida de Mesilla. The reason
42 why we terminated it and why we did not terminate it on Options A and B,
43 and I mention this because the, the Advisory Committees asked us about
44 this, on Options A and B the presumption is that the trail going along NM-
45 28 would simply be an in-road facility. And so on that basis we thought it
46 appropriate to continue to highlight this portion of Calle del Norte as a, a

1 part of the trail. The intent of this alignment is to have as much of a
2 contiguous facility as possible and so for that reason we went ahead and,
3 and showed accurately what would have to be because there's no, there's
4 no right-of-way along this stretch to construct any sort of facility. The only
5 thing that would be possible would be a "Share the Road" sign whereas
6 along Laguna Lateral we'd be able to resume the trail at this point and
7 continue it all the way down.

8 Option E, this does have the advantage of having the fewest
9 conflicts with vehicular traffic of all the considered options. As I'll show in
10 a slide in just a minute, there are very few potential right-of-way issues
11 along the length of the Laguna Lateral. The disadvantages, this would
12 require again substantial coordination between multiple jurisdictions. This
13 would require EBID and Dona Ana County signing the multi, or excuse
14 me, the Memorandum of Understanding to allow this use. And again a
15 disadvantage is that the multi-use facility would not be able to be
16 contiguous utilizing this option.

17 And again this is, this is illustrating the right-of-way. There is plenty
18 of right-of-way all along the Laguna Lateral to allow for the construction of
19 a multi-use path. And just a couple of pictures here but this is the Laguna
20 Lateral at the intersection with Union looking north, plenty of right-of-way
21 on both sides, just some vegetation that needs to be cleared on the west
22 bank.

23 The, this is a proposed amendment to the Metropolitan
24 Transportation Plan. The adopted option would be entered into the Trail
25 Plan as a Tier 1 facility. Due to the ongoing uncertainty about other EBID
26 facilities listed on our Trail Plan, those would be downgraded to Tier 2 or
27 Tier 3. This does require a minimum 30-day public comment period as we
28 have already had a meeting where we, we believed we were going to
29 reach a decision that, that, that requirement has already been well-met.
30 At the June meeting as this Committee will recall, the Policy Committee
31 directed staff to return to the Advisory Committees with additional options.
32 At their July 9th meeting the BPAC under, with the new information
33 endorsed Option D. And at their August 4th meeting last week the TAC
34 also endorsed Option D. And I'll stand now for any questions. Would you
35 like me to move back to one of the previous slides that has a map, one of
36 the maps on it? I'll go back to the one that has all of the options on it if
37 that is preferred.

38
39 Sorg: That would probably be the best. I would say one thing though. I wish
40 you had labeled those paths or those, those, those structures that you're
41 using there. We know a, Highway 28 well and Calle de Sur, del Sur, and
42 Union but the, the laterals aren't, aren't labeled.

43
44 Wray: Oh.

1 Sorg: We'll get it, we'll get it. That'll be all right. Any questions from the
2 Committee? Councilor Eakman and then Mr. Trent and then (*inaudible*).
3

4 Eakman: Thank you so much for this presentation and I'm looking forward to
5 discussion on it. I'm ...
6

7 Wray: Oh. I'm sorry Councilor, if I could just interrupt. Mr. Chair we do have Mr.
8 Steve Howie from EBID who is in the audience who is here to, to answer
9 any questions should the, the Committee want to, to ask them. I
10 apologize again, Commissioner, or Councilor.
11

12 Eakman: Fine. Thank you. I just have a possible perception question from those
13 who live outside of our community. When they look at a, a couple of these
14 options, I'm going to show off my Spanish here and use the term
15 "mosquitoes." When people from out of, yeah, I know, that's impressive,
16 isn't it? I know when people look at a couple of these depictions and
17 they're going to see running right by the arroyos, I think in this day and
18 time talking about some of what's happening in our country, I'm just going
19 to bring it up to the rest of the community how we can possibly if we
20 choose such a thing educate the public about the real risk of riding
21 bicycles through those areas. I guess I'm not looking for an answer but if
22 anyone has one I'd be very willing to listen. Thank you.
23

24 Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.
25

26 Hancock: I, I think what you're seeing, the water that you're seeing, those are EBID
27 ditches and those do not have water most of the time, and the water that,
28 when the water is there it's running and you don't get mosquitoes in
29 running water. So I think that's the, that's the, the short answer. There's
30 really not a big problem. Now the portion that is within the City and the
31 County, I believe our Vector Control takes care of those issues because
32 there are hot spots where water does stand. Thank you Mr. Chair.
33

34 Eakman: I agree. I'm just wondering how we can be forward-thinking in how we
35 educate the public and not have them right away think something different.
36 I, I live by those arroyos and I second what you're saying but I'm just
37 thinking of public perception at this time. Thank you.
38

39 Sorg: Okay. Commissioner Hancock did you, you said you had your ...
40

41 Hancock: Yeah. I, I had mine on too. Your third from the last slide, and you
42 mentioned the west bank and some vegetation but I see a lateral coming
43 off of that one with a drainage port.
44

45 Wray: Yes.
46

1 Hancock: It looked like it'd have to have a bridge over it or something.
2
3 Wray: If it's consistent, let me see if I can ...
4
5 Hancock: Third, third from the last slide. There's a picture.
6
7 Wray: Actually let me do this the easy way.
8
9 Hancock: There you go. That one.
10
11 Wray: There, there would, there's in fact another lateral on ...
12
13 Hancock: Yeah. You see there, the one going off to the ...
14
15 Wray: Yeah. There, there are a couple of places where some, some additional
16 infrastructure might be required depending on which, when we get to
17 actual design should, should a lateral option be selected depending on
18 which side of the lateral is selected there might have to be some, some,
19 some type of facilities as that included as part of the design. Yes.
20
21 Hancock: The City was kind enough to, thank you, the City was kind enough to
22 provide to me the MOU that the City has with EBID. I'd forwarded that to
23 New Mexico Association of Counties for an analysis as to the risk and
24 liability to the County because that seemed to be the biggest factor for the
25 County and the answer that I got back was that the, with caveats naturally
26 depending upon changes that do occur but that that would not require
27 additional insurance on the part of the County for an MOU of that type, so
28 now that MOU has been forwarded on to County Legal Department for
29 analysis to see how it meets with County standards. So it is in process,
30 the issue with the MOU with the EBID and the County, and the County is
31 looking at it. But that's where it stands at the moment, as a matter of
32 information. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.
33
34 Benavidez: Mr. Chair. I'm over here.
35
36 Sorg: Commissioner Benavidez.
37
38 Benavidez: Thank you. I'd like to ask a question regarding, can you please explain to
39 us why Option E was implemented? What's the reason behind that?
40
41 Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Benavidez. I'm not totally sure I understand the
42 question. We, we included Option E because this Committee asked us to
43 do so. It was during the discussion month before last ...
44
45 Benavidez: Okay.
46

1 Wray: Laguna came up in the conversation and this Committee directed us to ...
2
3 Benavidez: Okay.
4
5 Wray: Send it back to the Advisory Committees with Option E as part of the
6 conversation.
7
8 Benavidez: So the Option E, was it to do, create a like a shortcut or to avoid the Town
9 of Mesilla or ...
10
11 Wray: Option E was selected because of the lack of vehicular conflicts along the,
12 that particular alignment. It was also mentioned by Ms. Curry at the, a
13 previous meeting where she was in attendance as a member of the public
14 as being one of the things that the BPAC had considered earlier in the
15 process but had discarded because of the, the issues regarding surround,
16 or signing the, the MOU.
17
18 Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. No more questions.
19
20 Sorg: Okay Mr. Doolittle.
21
22 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to clarify, Option D was the recommended from
23 both, correct?
24
25 Wray: That was the recommendation from both Advisory Committees the second
26 time around.
27
28 Doolittle: Okay.
29
30 Wray: The first time around it was Option B.
31
32 Doolittle: Okay. One other comment that I have is I just want to remind the Board
33 that even though specifically Option A wasn't recommended the, the
34 Department along with the Town of Mesilla is still pursuing the, the
35 pedestrian facilities and multi-use path and those types of things along
36 University. So I only bring that up because just if this Board approves or,
37 or, or votes to support the Advisory Committees and go with Option D we
38 are still pursuing additional facilities along University itself. So I just want
39 the Board to make sure they, they remember that.
40
41 Sorg: Thank you. That was good to point out. And that University Corridor is of
42 course very important for the school, Zia Middle School there, as we all
43 know.
44
45 Doolittle: And Mr. Chair just again to clarify, that's only, that, it's only that section
46 between Main and New Mexico 28.

1
2 Sorg: Right.
3
4 Doolittle: So it won't address any of the crossings across the railroad tracks, across
5 Main itself, under the bridge at University and I-10.
6
7 Sorg: Yeah. Yeah.
8
9 Doolittle: So just keep in mind that that corridor is, is shorter but again we're
10 pursuing those kinds of facilities ...
11
12 Sorg: Okay.
13
14 Doolittle: In the area.
15
16 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett, did you have something in a ...
17
18 Garrett: Thank you.
19
20 Sorg: Then ...
21
22 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
23
24 Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.
25
26 Garrett: I, as a matter of fact I, I was interested in making sure that the work on
27 University would continue and it seems to me that there's plenty of
28 reasons for us to support that and to have that continued while at the
29 same time looking at other criteria in terms of the multi, what is it called,
30 the, the, it's, it's the big loop.
31
32 Wray: Multi-use loop trail.
33
34 Garrett: Yeah, the multi-use loop trail, thank you which seems to me to have the
35 potential of a much larger audience and, and slightly different needs that
36 need to be addressed by, by people going through the area. You know it
37 wasn't until you had these up that I, I wondered about the connection
38 between Laguna Lateral at University and then running down University to
39 intersect with the Mesilla Lateral and going north on the Mesilla Lateral up
40 to Calle del, del Norte.
41
42 Wray: Is there a particular slide you'd like me to have up for this?
43
44 Garrett: Yeah, the one with all the, all the routes. I think this is actually a hybrid,
45 yeah. So I think that the discussions that we've had with this group and
46 listening to input at the last meeting, the idea of being able to go along

1 Union made a lot of sense in terms of overall traffic and this big loop
2 through the, the area. So part of the question was how do you get from
3 Union up to Calle del Norte. The idea of get, going onto New Mexico 28
4 isn't ideal in many respects and so we were looking at going with the
5 laterals. But what we didn't talk about was the idea of using the southern
6 part of the Laguna Lateral and the northern part of the Mesilla Lateral as it
7 shows on our map. Because what that would do is allow for there to be a
8 connection that goes from Union through sort of the western part of
9 Mesilla Park and into Mesilla, connecting in with University and then even
10 picking up on some of the work that's going to go along on University,
11 going down to 28, going across 28 at the Spotted Dog, past the Mesilla
12 Elementary School, and then picking up the lateral and going north. And
13 what you do by doing that is you have a lot of action through a potentially
14 very crowded area by keeping the bikes on the, and the hikes and hikers
15 and all that stuff, on the laterals for the majority of that distance and what
16 you do is you avoid the problems that we have where Calle del Norte
17 comes past that lateral and gets to Avenida de Mesilla. That's where it
18 necks down and there's no, there's no shoulders, there's no nothing. And
19 then you have a very awkward connection trying to figure out how to get
20 from the lateral around The Bean down to connect with the other area.
21 And what this actually does is to bring people who are driving through that
22 area very close to the downtown of Mesilla on a less crowded side of that
23 if you will. Seems like it might be, it, presuming that that section of
24 University between the Mesilla Lateral and Highway 28 is a viable option, I
25 mean we haven't said, nobody has said we can't do that option because
26 that's a bad stretch, stretch of road. It's, it's narrow, I understand that, and
27 you've got some issues but at the same that's a 20 mile per hour area. It's
28 very slow through there and it's a short distance. So I just wanted to raise
29 that as a possibility for a better connection through Mesilla that would tie
30 Union to University and to Calle del Norte by using two parts of the lateral.

31
32 Sorg: Yeah. I'm trying to digest what he just said. We'll go on to ...

33
34 Flores: Yeah.

35
36 Sorg: Trustee ... do you want to add something Commissioner Billie Garrett?

37
38 Garrett: Do you have a way of showing what I just indicated by, with your mouse?

39
40 Wray: Just utilizing the mouse ...

41
42 Garrett: That would be helpful.

43
44 Wray: Commissioner if I, if I'm understanding correctly what you are proposing is
45 utilizing Mesilla Lateral ...
46

1 Garrett: To there.
2
3 Wray: To this point.
4
5 Garrett: Yep.
6
7 Wray: Utilizing Calle del Sur to ...
8
9 Garrett: No.
10
11 Wray: Oh.
12
13 Garrett: Well yeah. It's Calle del Sur and University. Right. Yeah.
14
15 Wray: Along this alignment to this spot here with Laguna and then utilizing
16 Laguna down to Union. Is that ...
17
18 Garrett: That is what I was ...
19
20 Wray: Is it correct?
21
22 Garrett: I was suggesting as a possibility. It's a hybrid of two of the, well, well three
23 of the options.
24
25 Sorg: Okay. So the other Committee Members want to weigh in? Trustee
26 Flores.
27
28 Flores: I just want to say I think that's a great idea. On the side that's by Mesilla
29 Farms I know that there's very little ROW. That's where we have the least
30 amount I think because I know one of the residents there is very
31 concerned. He's already given up some of his property. But on the other
32 side there should be plenty of room, correct me if I'm wrong, Mayor.
33
34 Barraza: Are we talking University?
35
36 Flores: Right. You know that Mesilla ...
37
38 Barraza: We're talking west of University, west of Highway 28?
39
40 Flores: Right.
41
42 Barraza: Okay. My, if I may just put in my two cents' worth. Currently the bus, what
43 is, Las Cruces, the buses.
44
45 Wray: RoadRUNNER Transit.
46

1 Barraza: RoadRUNNER Transit has put up two stops for the buses right across
2 Mesilla Farms, one very close to the intersection there heading east and
3 one a little bit further up by Zia Middle School and there's not a lot of
4 shoulder there for them. If we have buses, the City buses stopping there
5 and we also have them across the street on the opposite side, on the
6 northern side of it they've added an additional stop there, that's going to
7 limit, if you have a bus there and bicyclists there it could be dangerous.
8

9 Sorg: Mayor, could you point out where Mesilla Farms is?

10

11 Barraza: I sure would. It is right in the corner of University, and let me just say
12 Calle del Sur south, I mean west of Highway 28 is Calle del Sur, where
13 Spotted Dog is, that's Calle del Sur. If you cross the Highway 28 it
14 becomes University, okay. So right in the corner there of University and
15 Highway 28 there's a small park on the north side, and the subdivision is
16 right next to that little park. That is Mesilla Farms and so, oh, okay. Right
17 where you see Teresita Street. Do you see that Andrew?
18

19 Wray: Yes. Yes.

20

21 Barraza: Okay. That's Mesilla Farms.

22

23 Wray: Yes.

24

25 Barraza: All that subdivision in there.

26

27 Sorg: There's a bus stop there, the little blue square.

28

29 Barraza: And now they have added another one closer to the intersection.

30

31 Sorg: Oh.

32

33 Barraza: Further down, further east, a little bit up, maybe right under the word,
34 under the R and S for "University" on the south side.
35

36 Wray: Right in there?

37

38 Barraza: Yeah, on the south side.

39

40 Wray: Oh. Here.

41

42 Barraza: Right there. They have a stop right there. Then they have the one where
43 you have the blue and then they have one a little bit further east by the ...
44

45 Wray: So ...

46

1 Barraza: By Zia Middle School.
2
3 Sorg: Mayor, could you explain one more time the pros and cons of, of what
4 you're saying here again?
5
6 Barraza: In terms of ...
7
8 Sorg: Of the ...
9
10 Barraza: Of what ...
11
12 Sorg: Of the path, of the multi-use path. Yeah.
13
14 Barraza: My opinion or what Commissioner Garrett mentioned?
15
16 Sorg: Your opinion.
17
18 Barraza: In my opinion. In my opinion I would like to see probably Option D
19 because of the Mesilla Lateral, and for those of you that are not familiar
20 with Mesilla, that Mesilla Lateral is north of the Post Office. It's right
21 between the Post Office and the Plaza. If you have been there, there's a
22 lateral. That's that lateral that they're talking about.
23
24 Sorg: Right.
25
26 Barraza: And that lateral is especially I think from the park that the Town of Mesilla
27 has all the way to Calle del Sur past that to Union, the roads are pretty
28 clear. There are a few areas there that the brush, the foliage is coming
29 over but nothing that can't be fixed. I think the roads are much better
30 there. Now if we were to go with that other option that Commissioner
31 Garrett just spoke about, my only concern would be coming off Calle del
32 Sur we only have a small sidewalk on the south side of Calle del Sur that
33 people that are walking to school or to the Spotted Dog or the store use,
34 that's about the only space that we have available there. Once you cross
35 over to Highway 28 and get on University, we are working with the New
36 Mexico DOT for that multi-use, to widen the street and to add those multi-
37 path, the bike paths and the walking paths on that. Once that is in place
38 that would be great, but for right now I think Option D would be our best
39 option.
40
41 Sorg: Is that D as in dog?
42
43 Barraza: D as in dog.
44
45 Sorg: Okay.
46

1 Barraza: Spotted Dog.
2
3 Sorg: Okay.
4
5 Barraza: Advertising here for Spotted Dog.
6
7 Sorg: But it, so you're saying that using Calle del Sur and University to connect
8 the laterals, Mesilla with Laguna, is it ...
9
10 Wray: Yes, Laguna.
11
12 Barraza: Yeah, Laguna.
13
14 Sorg: Is not as good as going all the way with D which continues on the Mesilla
15 to what is it?
16
17 Wray: Union Avenue.
18
19 Sorg: Union, Union Avenue, right.
20
21 Barraza: In terms of traffic I think the safest route right now would be going down
22 Mesilla Lateral.
23
24 Sorg: But in the future?
25
26 Barraza: In the future, once the DOT, that would be great. It would be an awesome
27 trail.
28
29 Sorg: How ...
30
31 Barraza: And the other is I do want to also say right in the corner of Calle de Parian
32 and that lateral, there is a public restroom there where bicyclists, it's right
33 there by the lateral so perfect place for them to take a break, a potty
34 break, the public restrooms are also right there. But I think, and you know
35 Trustee Flores step in whenever you'd like, I think at this time probably
36 Mesilla Lateral will be the best option right now.
37
38 Wray: And Mr. ...
39
40 Sorg: Thank you.
41
42 Wray: Mr. Chair.
43
44 Sorg: Trustee, Mayor.
45

1 Wray: If I, I could say at this time, nothing, we're not taking anything off any trail
2 plans. We're only potentially downgrading. So everything that, that we're
3 discussing, they'll still be on the trail plans and certainly eligible for any,
4 any sort of improvements or for funding applications in the future.
5

6 Sorg: I, I, I just have a quick question. Whatever trail is picked, will there be
7 signage telling people that this is the trail?
8

9 Wray: Mr. Chair. That would certainly be staff's hope. I mean that's getting to
10 beyond what we're really talking about right here but I, personally
11 speaking, personally I'd certainly hope that there would be signs ...
12

13 Sorg: Okay.
14

15 Wray: And, and pointing out that this is the trail.
16

17 Sorg: Okay. Trustee Flores, you have any more to add? Oh yes, Councilor
18 Pedroza, I'm sorry.
19

20 Pedroza: That, that's okay. Thank you. My question is kind of going back at,
21 beyond a couple of the discussions that we've had but I like the idea that
22 New Mexico DOT is thinking regardless of what we choose to make some
23 improvements to the interchange with I guess it's that really really bad
24 intersection, the one that we've talked about and my mind is just slipping
25 right now, where I guess it's University goes under the highway. No?
26 Where ...
27

28 Doolittle: Mr. Chair.
29

30 Pedroza: The ones that you're going to be making.
31

32 Doolittle: The, the current University project will only run from New Mexico 28 to the
33 intersection itself at University. There will not be any improvements or
34 proposed ...
35

36 Pedroza: Oh.
37

38 Doolittle: Improvements ...
39

40 Pedroza: For the intersection.
41

42 Doolittle: Across the railroad tracks ...
43

44 Pedroza: I see.
45

46 Doolittle: Across South Main, along University, and then over to the Valley Drive.

1
2 Pedroza: And ...
3
4 Doolittle: So it was improved ...
5
6 Pedroza: Those in the future or anything?
7
8 Doolittle: At this point ...
9
10 Pedroza: No.
11
12 Doolittle: The, again the only portion is right there in front of ...
13
14 Pedroza: Right.
15
16 Doolittle: Zia.
17
18 Pedroza: Okay. Well you've shattered my hopes. Okay. Thank you.
19
20 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
21
22 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. And I understand the, the concerns that the Mayor's
23 brought up in terms of, of sequencing. It seems to me that the section that
24 we're talking about from the Laguna Lateral to 28 is critical to get done,
25 be, in, because of safety issues, but because of traffic and school kids
26 and, and all that sort of thing. I just, I would also suggest that, that what
27 the Laguna Lateral south of University connecting to Union does is
28 actually to go through an area that there are a lot of bicycle riders and
29 although putting the designation for the multi-use loop trail somewhere
30 else doesn't preclude the possibility of some improvements there, certainly
31 if that was a part of the loop trail itself it would give it more likelihood, I
32 would think, of being funded and getting built, at least sooner. So I,
33 notwithstanding the issue of what happens on Calle del Sor, Sur on the,
34 on the west side of 28, this is I think supposed to be a long-term picture
35 and by, by finding a way through this sort of sector of the region that
36 allows for more people to connect in with the trail, use the trail, develops
37 and reinforces the trail sooner, that gives higher priority to the, these
38 construction projects. It seems to me that, that it's, it's really worth
39 considering that as a, an alternative way of, of designating this alignment.
40 Certainly, I mean I can live with any of these things that we've come up
41 with and it's all about safety and, and, but it's also about experience and,
42 and the quality of the experience coming through the, the area. So I just,
43 seems to me that a good strong case was made for the Laguna Lateral at
44 the last meeting and I, I hate to see that we lose that entire connection as,
45 as part of this because nobody was arguing strong for the southern part of
46 the Mesilla Lateral between Calle del Sur and, and Union as being a great

1 experience. I understand it's pretty clear but it's, it's not, doesn't have the
2 other advantages and attributes that you have with Laguna going through,
3 over where it does.
4

5 Barraza: Okay. Mr. Chair.
6

7 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Commissioner.
8

9 Barraza: Mr. ...
10

11 Sorg: Mayor.
12

13 Barraza: Okay. And I just want to say I strongly agree with what Commissioner
14 Garrett said. When you're looking for funding we're trying to find the best
15 possible use of the funds we have to get the project started as soon as
16 possible and get it completed and useable for people to go out there and
17 actually start using that trail and I, I sincerely agree with him because you
18 know it would be less money and people can start using that trail. But it, I
19 mean if we look at it in long-term also bicyclists are going to have three
20 options trying to get to Union, following Mesilla Lateral all the way down,
21 going down Calle del Sur through Highway 28, and then they could also
22 go, and I'm hoping we'll have that University multi-use trail and the road all
23 fixed within, in my lifetime anyway, through the Laguna Lateral also. So
24 eventually they will have three different ways of getting to Union if we just,
25 you know from Calle del Norte at least to Calle del Sur use that lateral
26 there ...
27

28 Sorg: Right.
29

30 Barraza: For the trail.
31

32 Sorg: Excellent point Mayor. Excellent point.
33

34 Barraza: Thank you.
35

36 Sorg: Variety. We like variety. I just had one more question for staff. In the big
37 picture, to get this trail completed from La Llorona trail along the river all
38 the way over to the university, there's going to be, how many projects are
39 we going to need? How many things are we going to have to work on to
40 get the trail complete besides deciding where it's going here?
41

42 Wray: Mr. Chair. I can't really answer that question. I don't know. Nobody
43 knows the answer to that question. If I can go back to my PowerPoint,
44 NMSU has indicated that they are planning to do this portion. Town of
45 Mesilla is currently working on a TAP application for this cycle to connect
46 the end of the La Llorona trail to Calle del Norte. So all of this portion in

1 between right now is, does not have any potential funding identified for the
2 current ...
3
4 Sorg: Well I'm just getting at the point that there will be work done on, let me get
5 the right name, Calle del Sur, no Calle del Norte. There will have to be
6 work done on that road, right?
7
8 Wray: Yes, there ...
9
10 Sorg: Yeah.
11
12 Wray: The, there's only the road there right now. There's no ...
13
14 Sorg: Right.
15
16 Wray: There's no trail facility.
17
18 Sorg: Yeah, and narrow road at that. Okay. Okay, that's, that's what I wanted to
19 be clear was there's going to be several projects here to get this whole
20 path completed. Thank you.
21
22 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
23
24 Sorg: Any other questions? Oh.
25
26 Barraza: Yeah. Go ahead.
27
28 Sorg: Commissioner Eakman.
29
30 Eakman: Thank you Mr. Chair. There's also the possibility that this is going to
31 connect to the Rio Grande trail which is proposed by Steinborn at this time
32 and will come before the City pretty soon. And so I think that will have to
33 also be considered and it'll be interesting to see how all this connects
34 bilaterally. Thank you.
35
36 Sorg: Good point Councilor.
37
38 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
39
40 Sorg: Yes Mr. ...
41
42 Barraza: Just one more comment.
43
44 Sorg: Mayor.
45

1 Barraza: I'm sorry. I just, Calle del Norte is a DOT road. It is a state road and there
2 are no shoulders at this time on either side of Calle del Norte.
3
4 Sorg: Right.
5
6 Barraza: And Debbi gave me, or showed me, or told me a figure what it would take
7 to get the path going there and we're talking close to \$700,000.
8
9 Sorg: Wow.
10
11 Barraza: So, and the Town of Mesilla needs to come up with a percentage of a
12 match, I think 14%, something like that so ...
13
14 Wray: If it's for TAP funding then it's 14.56%.
15
16 Barraza: Percent, correct. So that's what we're looking at right now.
17
18 Sorg: I see.
19
20 Barraza: Okay?
21
22 Sorg: Yeah. It'll be a little ways in the future here at least. Okay. Any other
23 discussion on this? How do you want to go ahead and decide?
24
25 Wray: Mr. Chair. For the purposes of clarity it would probably be best if
26 someone makes a motion specifically endorsing one of the options and
27 then have a yes or no vote on, on that would be our recommendation.
28
29 Sorg: Okay.
30
31 Flores: I have a question.
32
33 Sorg: Is there a motion?
34
35 Flores: I just have one more question. Are we including Commissioner Garrett's
36 option as like an F of going through Union, University that, connecting the
37 two acequias or laterals?
38
39 Sorg: If Commissioner Garrett wants to do that, yes.
40
41 Baum: Mr. Sorg. I wanted to let you know that you already have a motion and a
42 second on this. Your motion was made by Ms. Pedroza and your second
43 was made by Mr. Hancock.
44
45 Sorg: Okay.
46

1 Pedroza: However, it was not targeted to a choice between the, the options which is
2 I believe what we're talking about right now.
3
4 Sorg: So I would say we have to have a motion on the choice and then a motion
5 on the whole resolution, and then a vote on the whole resolution rather.
6
7 Wray: Yes, I, I think, I think so.
8
9 Sorg: I think we'll go that route.
10
11 Wray: Sound, sounds reasonable.
12
13 Sorg: Yes.
14
15 Wray: Let's do that.
16
17 Sorg: Yeah. That's fine, if you want to propose Option F it's fine with me. Just
18 keep in mind it doesn't really matter if, if we have all three ways to go like
19 the Mayor mentioned. But if you want to do F that's fine. Go ahead and
20 make a motion.
21
22 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
23
24 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I just have a question. Maybe I'm putting the cart before the
25 horse but I, I would be in support of Option D only because of the Advisory
26 Committees had made that recommendation so I don't, not fully
27 understanding the process if Commissioner Garrett makes the
28 recommendation for Option E I just want to make sure that I have a
29 mechanism to either share Option D or, or say no with my comments.
30 Again, not understanding the process so maybe that can be clarified for
31 me personally.
32
33 Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.
34
35 Pedroza: And I think I'm confused as to, I thought the, the particular one that
36 Commissioner Garrett had been talking about was E and now I hear that
37 it's F and so I need to be clarified as to which is E and which is F so that I
38 can choose. Thank you.
39
40 Wray: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza, and Mr. Doolittle. I, I'll, I'll deal with
41 Councilor Pedroza's question first. Option E is the, the full extent of
42 Laguna from Avenida de Mesilla down to Union. Commissioner,
43 Commissioner Garrett's proposal is, is University, Laguna down. Mr.
44 Doolittle ...
45
46 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Wray.

1
2 Wray: It's my understanding that what, assuming someone makes a motion
3 endorsing let's say Option F then if you feel called upon to vote against
4 that in support of Option D then you vote no on the, on the, or on the
5 motion supporting Option F and then afterwards you make the motion in,
6 endorsing Option D would be how that would proceed.
7
8 Sorg: Thank you Mr., Mr. Wray for that clarification.
9
10 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
11
12 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
13
14 Garrett: I'd like to move an amendment to the motion to specify Option F as
15 discussed at this meeting.
16
17 Flores: I'd like to second the motion.
18
19 Sorg: Okay. Motion made by Commissioner Garrett, or an amendment made by
20 Commissioner Garrett and a second by Trustee Flores. Unless there's
21 something else that has to be said we'll go ahead and take a vote.
22
23 Barraza: Mr. Chair. Clarifying.
24
25 Sorg: Yes.
26
27 Barraza: And that is supporting, Commissioner Garrett is putting on the floor Option
28 F.
29
30 Sorg: F.
31
32 Barraza: Okay.
33
34 Sorg: Yeah.
35
36 Barraza: I just have one question. Since Option F just came up does that mean it
37 needs to go to the other Boards with another option?
38
39 Sorg: Good question.
40
41 Wray: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. No. The Policy Committee may do what it
42 sees fit.
43
44 Barraza: Okay. Very good.
45
46 Wray: Yes.

1
2 Barraza: Thank you.
3
4 Hancock: Mr. Chair.
5
6 Sorg: Commissioner Hancock.
7
8 Hancock: I'm, I'm assuming then that the amendment is to the current motion on the
9 table as it relates to the, the "I," that would be after the, now there are four
10 and the "I" being the Trail Plan Amendment and, as shown in the Exhibit A
11 would be specifying then the direction as outlined in what is being termed
12 "F."
13
14 Wray: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock.
15
16 Sorg: Yes.
17
18 Wray: If I could clarify. We were not able to include an Exhibit A attached to this
19 motion because we did not know what the selection of the Policy
20 Committee was going to be. There will be attached to the Resolution
21 when it is signed and sealed for eternity a, a map. There will be a map
22 that will be included as Exhibit A as part of this resolution.
23
24 Hancock: Okay. So the amendment then is, is that point in the discussion in the
25 original motion.
26
27 Wray: Yes.
28
29 Hancock: So we'll vote on the amendment first and then vote on the full motion.
30
31 Sorg: That's right.
32
33 Hancock: Very good. Thank you.
34
35 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
36
37 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. And, and because questions have been raised
38 about the relationship with, of this proposal with the other Advisory Groups
39 I, I just would say I have the greatest respect for them. As a matter of fact
40 I think that this builds on their recommendations as far as I'm concerned
41 and the considerations that we've had in terms of people coming and
42 talking to us. This isn't a completely different alignment. I mean it, it, it
43 basically takes some parts of some other things so it's trying to build on
44 the strengths rather than just come up with something completely
45 different. If, for example if we hadn't had Laguna Lateral at all and that
46 came up this time I would think that would not be as appropriate but we've

1 had the discussion about both the Mesilla Lateral and the Laguna and
2 about Union and about University and about all these other roads so it's,
3 it's simply tying them together in a slightly different way. So ...
4

5 Sorg: Okay.

6

7 Garrett: I just want it to be clear that I'm respectful and mindful of their input.
8

9 Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett.

10

11 Hancock: Mr. Chair.

12

13 Sorg: Good point. Commissioner Hancock.

14

15 Hancock: Could, could we review one last time that path that ...
16

17 Sorg: Route.

18

19 Hancock: Is being, the route that is being described as F so that if we could follow
20 your mouse so that we are all totally clear.
21

22 Wray: Certainly.

23

24 Hancock: Thank you.

25

26 Wray: Mr. Chair. The, the proposed Option F starts here at the, the current
27 termination of the La Llorona trail, continues down to connect with Calle
28 del Norte, proceeds along Calle del Norte to the intersection with the
29 Mesilla Lateral. Would then proceed down the Mesilla Lateral to the
30 intersection with Calle del Sur, would go along Calle del Sur till it crosses
31 NM-28 and becomes University, would proceed along University until it
32 intersects with the Laguna Lateral, would proceed down the Laguna
33 Lateral until it reaches Union, would, would follow Union crossing Main
34 Street and I-10 until it reaches what's, what street is this on campus.
35 Stewart, we'll call Stewart. Along Stewart until it reaches Espina,
36 proceeds down and then across to the proposed connection of the Triviz
37 trail extension that will be part of the currently on the TIP University,
38 putting Triviz under University.
39

40 Sorg: Okay.

41

42 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I just have one ...
43

44 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.
45

1 Doolittle: One last comment. So based on the motion I just want to clarify, I'm going
2 to vote no on the motion only because I support Option D, not because I
3 don't support the resolution or itself or what the MPO staff or the advisory
4 committees have, have done. I just want to clarify that that is why I'm
5 voting no, not that I don't support the resolution.
6
7 Sorg: The resolution or the amendment?
8
9 Hancock: I'm sorry. The amendment.
10
11 Sorg: Okay. One last question. On your map that you have there, the routes
12 that are in dash form instead of a solid color are routes that aren't built yet.
13 Is that correct?
14
15 Wray: That's correct. Yes.
16
17 Sorg: Okay. So we know on Union there is trail there now and that is why that is
18 solid blue.
19
20 Wray: That's, that's correct. That trail terminates just not very many feet from the
21 intersection ...
22
23 Sorg: Right.
24
25 Wray: With the Laguna Lateral.
26
27 Sorg: Right. And if you continue on Union to the west, southwest there's, there's
28 missing trail there.
29
30 Wray: Yes. That is correct. The, that trail does terminate there. There's no, the,
31 there's no continuation of that trail at any point to the west.
32
33 Sorg: And just to clarify one more thing, if we do take this Option F and, and,
34 and go with that, it would eliminate building a trail on Union from where,
35 what lateral is that where, where ...
36
37 Wray: Laguna Lateral.
38
39 Sorg: Laguna, right, to, all the way to the other lateral in Mesilla there.
40
41 Wray: Mr. Chair. No. What it would do is it would eliminate that particular
42 portion being considered part of the multi-use loop trail for the present. If
43 in future the, the MPO or the Town of Mesilla or Dona Ana County choose
44 to continue that facility to the west of where it currently terminates they're
45 more than able to do so.
46

1 Sorg: Of course.
2
3 Wray: It's just a question ...
4
5 Sorg: Yeah.
6
7 Wray: A question of getting ...
8
9 Sorg: But it's ...
10
11 Wray: The money and going even further from that, if let's say that that portion is
12 constructed, the Policy Committee could then make that a portion of the
13 multi-use loop trail as well.
14
15 Sorg: As well, okay. Thank you very much. You made that very clear. If there's
16 no further discussion we'll take a vote.
17
18 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
19
20 Barraza: I knew you were going to start over here.
21
22 Wray: I always do. I can't see them.
23
24 Barraza: No, and I just want to echo what Mr. Doolittle said and so I will, I will vote
25 nay.
26
27 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
28
29 Benavidez: No. For the same reasons. I think that the people that, that know the, the
30 area pretty good understand what's necessary. Thank you.
31
32 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
33
34 Doolittle: No.
35
36 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.
37
38 Garrett: Yes.
39
40 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
41
42 Pedroza: Yes.
43
44 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
45
46 Hancock: Yes.

1
2 Wray: Commissioner Eakman.
3
4 Eakman: Yes.
5
6 Wray: Trustee Flores.
7
8 Flores: Yes.
9
10 Wray: Mr. Chair.
11
12 Sorg: Interesting. The Town of Mesilla is split. I'll vote yes.
13
14 Wray: The, the amendment passes.
15
16 Sorg: Okay then, a, a, a vote on the original resolution.
17
18 Wray: Madam Mayor.
19
20 Barraza: Yes.
21
22 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
23
24 Benavidez: Yes.
25
26 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
27
28 Doolittle: Yes.
29
30 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.
31
32 Garrett: Yes.
33
34 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
35
36 Pedroza: Yes.
37
38 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
39
40 Hancock: Yes.
41
42 Wray: Commissioner Eakman.
43
44 Eakman: Yes.
45
46 Wray: Trustee Flores.

1
2 Flores: Yes.

3
4 Wray: Mr. Chair.

5
6 Sorg: Yes.

7
8 Wray: The resolution is passed.
9

10 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

11 12 **7.1 Committee Training**

13
14 Sorg: Okay. Moving on to the rest of the agenda, we have Discussion Item 7.1,
15 Committee Training. MPO staff please.
16

17 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. I borrowed a FHWA module on
18 highway safety training that several of us staff were presented to a couple
19 months ago and I thought there, there's some good, good information in it
20 for you in your role as, as elected officials, not all pertinent but, so I'm
21 going to kind of fly through it a little quickly but I'll stop for any questions
22 along the way. This is ... Okay so we had a training on highway, highway
23 safety from the FHWA. They outlined their history, rules of the, the
24 Highway Safety Program, imparted upon us the, the four Es of highway
25 safety, and they discussed countermeasures and gonna to repeat it.

26 Kind of, the important of highway, highway safety and this is from
27 the FHWA standpoint: Nationwide 34,000 people a year die in, in crashes
28 and over three million, over 3.4 million people are injured each year so as
29 those of us who are responsible for planning the transportation system this
30 is a very, this is one of our, our prime tasks that we're, we're, we're, one of
31 our duties to look at. We get our safety guidance through, through the
32 United States Codes, MAP-21 at the time. Now it's the FAST Act that has
33 the Highway Safety Improvement Program in it which is what funds safety
34 improvements for highways and these are codified in the United States
35 Codes. Part of the MAP-21 and the FAST Act are actually developing
36 standards of, standards for highway safety measures. We also have
37 many resources available to us and these manuals come from FHWA,
38 they come from the American Association of State Highway and
39 Transportation Officials otherwise known as AASHTO. There are
40 roundabout guides developed, all sorts of, all sorts of best practices
41 assembled together to allow, allow us to help design better transportation
42 facilities.

43 From the AASHTO manuals this is our three contributing factors
44 towards unsafe conditions: Drivers factors, roadway factors, and vehicle
45 factors. And then the four Es that we go over: Engineering, Education,
46 Enforcement, and EMS. Primarily at the MPO we are, we're concerned

1 with the engineering aspects of it, where our roadway, you know where
2 our roadway's not safe and what can we do, you know what can we fix in
3 order to make them less dangerous. We also have some hand in
4 education through some of our public outreach. And then of course a lot
5 of safety is handled through enforcement and then when all goes wrong
6 we have emergency medical.

7 The Highway Safety Improvement Program or HSIP, it authorizes
8 lump sums to the, to the states. And the state, each state has developed
9 a process for which that money is disbursed around, around the state
10 whether it be to highway districts or to local governments to do safety
11 projects. As the time we had the training \$2.4 billion portioned to the
12 states, what they want is data-driven and I know you've, we've, probably
13 have gotten tired of me talking about the importance of data in the MPO's
14 work programs but this is, this is, you, everyone else is shaking their, their
15 heads the other way Councilor Sorg. The, that's where you know why,
16 why we are so in, intent on collecting data so that we know where our
17 problems are, where we can help make the best decisions.

18 There's also a State Strategic Highway Safety Plan that's
19 developed at the statewide level. MPOs and RTPs do have, we're,
20 we're part of the process with the developing that so we take the, we take
21 the local concerns and, and hope that they are heard into, into the safety
22 plan.

23 And the other big thing that I've been talking about and we're still,
24 we're still anticipating it is the Performance Management. We, the State
25 and the MPOs are supposed to set targets and measures and report on
26 our performance and then there will be consequences. If we adopt, if we
27 adopt our measures and we don't meet them we do, we will be risking
28 having less funding moving forward in the future. So as we develop our,
29 our performance measures, specifically in this case safety performance
30 measures, we need to have realistic goals set for ourselves.

31 The big take-away from the training was the fatal crash locations
32 are random. The crash types are not. Through the study of the data
33 these are the leading causes of crashes from 2007 through 2011 which I
34 believe is the latest time that, that the data was available. A lot of those,
35 lot of those have to do with aggressive driving. We addressed it in
36 enforcement level. You'll notice that "curves" is on there. That's, that's
37 something that we can address from an engineering and planning
38 standpoint. And so when, what we have to is as transportation
39 professionals focus on the predictable. We can, we can address lane
40 departure crashes, you know I'll let you go ahead and read the things. So
41 enforcement's been a big, big part of safety belt use, increasing the safety
42 belt use and I think we've had, if I, it's probably in here but the fatalities
43 have decreased from the all-time high in 2005, they decreased every year
44 to 2012, kind of gone up a little bit. We've worked about changing the, the
45 traffic safety culture. There's a lot of public service out there, "Do not

1 text," "Do not use the phone as you drive." These help deal with
2 inattention to driving.

3 FHWA has safety initiatives. Let me check, I have to refresh myself
4 on the notes on this one. So they, they devote resources to crash testing.
5 The National Cooperative Highway, National Cooperative Highway
6 Research Program establishes testing protocols and thresholds, safety,
7 safety measures. So the key is that the FHWA's had a long-term
8 commitment to research to improve highway safety, to, to create safer
9 roadways. These reports are available.

10 Another, another great tool is the Highway Safety Manual, well that
11 gives us predictive tools, gives us methods to integrate qualitative
12 estimates into plans, and helps us prioritize projects.

13 Roundabouts, another relatively, the modern roundabout relatively
14 recent, we've only seen that past 15, 15 years or so and they're becoming
15 more ubiquitous. They, they help with safety. They help reduce the
16 conflict points at intersections from 32 to eight. They lower speeds
17 through the intersection so when there are crashes those crashes are less
18 dangerous, will result in less fatalities.

19 Left, left turns have observed to be the, some of the most
20 dangerous activities for you know, you know driving out there. So they've,
21 they've come up with some direction and some recommendations on how
22 to modify left turns. What this picture represents is a, a separate the, the
23 left-hand turns so that they're not blocking each other's view and they can
24 judge gaps in the oncoming traffic better. They've developed J-turn
25 intersections to reduce left turns onto, onto busy roadways. A vehicle
26 comes, comes out of a crossing intersection, proceeds down there and is
27 allowed a U-turn downstream a little bit so that they can proceed to what
28 would've been a left-hand turn. There's also information on the
29 effectiveness of red-light cameras. So the roadway departures are a third
30 of all traffic fatalities. They happen at night and they happen for many
31 different reasons.

32 FHWA's also working to improve roadway visibility, larger signs,
33 curve chevrons, eliminate drop-offs so that leaving the road does not you
34 know result into, into rollovers. Breakaway, breakaway signs kind of
35 reduce the, reduce the hazard of, of crashes and collisions. They
36 advocate tree removal in some certain, some instances. And then there is
37 a list of the FHWA safety initiatives and, and these are some other, other
38 initiatives eligible for safety money.

39 They do have a, a reporting system for fatal crashes and reporting
40 on it helps, helps provide objective funding, or to target the funding
41 objectively to where there are problems seen. These information's
42 available on the web.

43 And I'll show you those last slides. I just wanted to present to you
44 some of the overview of safety. We'll make this presentation available on
45 the website so you can review it at, view it at your leisure and also look,
46 look on any resources you'd wish to follow up with.

1
2 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Murphy. Very good. I would like to point out a new guest
3 in the, in the room tonight, today. That is former Committee, Policy
4 Committee Member and Chairperson and Mayor Pro-Tem Emeritus
5 Sharon Thomas. Any questions on the safety slides? Yes, Trustee
6 Flores.

7
8 Flores: So I know one of the things that when we gather this data is we're going to
9 try and, the purpose is to try and improve on it from the next year. But it
10 occurs to me when I see older drivers and I know that it, you know we're
11 expecting to have a larger percentage of older drivers, so is that going to
12 be used when we're calculating whether we're doing better or not?
13 Because it seems like you're running uphill because you're going to have
14 even more older drivers on the road so when we calculate to see whether
15 we're doing better do we consider the fact that the number of older drivers
16 is increasing? And I'm saying, cause you're not, it's apples and oranges
17 as years progress.

18
19 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Trustee Flores. That is a very good point and it speaks to why
20 when we, when we do get the, the measures from the, from FHWA and
21 the State and us develop our targets, we probably need to keep those sort
22 of things in mind when we select our targets to make sure things, the, the
23 targets that we select are achievable realizing that we are having an aging
24 population and you know I think we probably want to put some of our, our
25 resources you know in, into the larger signage, that was one of the
26 examples on there, say, "Okay you know the older population ...

27
28 Flores: Worse, yeah.

29
30 Murphy: This is a more effective countermeasure for us to implement than this
31 other thing." So ...

32
33 Flores: Yeah.

34
35 Murphy: I think those are, they, those are very important points we need to keep in
36 mind as we move forward.

37
38 Sorg: Any others? Mr. Trent.

39
40 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Early on in Tom's presentation he talked about you
41 know the, the safety features being data-driven and in the past I frequently
42 have heard the comment, you know we don't do anything with our safety
43 money until we have a severe accident or we even have fatalities. I am
44 happy to say that you know we do seem to have more flexibility to being
45 proactive as opposed to reactive. I mean it is still data-driven but they're
46 allowing you know engineers and, and department staff to actually take

1 that data and look at it, even share our opinions and discussions on what's
2 taking place in some of these areas and actually submit some of these
3 applications for safety funding to be proactive instead of waiting for
4 something to happen. So you know that's one change that I've seen that's
5 been better than it has in the past. Because ultimately you know it's
6 always been our opinion that the intent is to prevent the accident, not
7 address it after something happens. So it is still data-driven but I just
8 wanted to clarify that it does seem to allow us to be more proactive.
9
10 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Trent. Councilor Eakman.
11
12 Eakman: Yes. I'd like to respond to my younger colleague, Trustee Flores. I am
13 aware that in just a few years I'm going to have to, have to requalify for my
14 driver's license annually. That is what we do here in New Mexico. I'm
15 going to have to have 20/40 vision and be able to prove it and I really
16 applaud New Mexico on taking that step. I've not lived in another state
17 that is, is so proactive in making sure that folks are continually qualified to
18 drive. Thank you.
19
20 Sorg: Thank you Councilor Eakman. Councilor Pedroza, I saw you first.
21
22 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you. Tom, is there any like a connection, say for instance
23 that staff here in the City were to want to pick Trent's brain about some
24 particular safety measure. Is, is there some way to do that in terms of like
25 engineering, safety, things on that, on the streets of the City?
26
27 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Councilor. I, I would be open to having any of those
28 discussions that, that you, that you would like to. I would also tell you that
29 your engineering staff also has a lot of that same information but anytime
30 feel free, and I can you know if there's something specific or a safety
31 device ...
32
33 Pedroza: It was just general.
34
35 Doolittle: You want to discuss, absolutely. Feel free ...
36
37 Pedroza: Okay.
38
39 Doolittle: To come visit with, with ...
40
41 Pedroza: All right.
42
43 Doolittle: Our staff.
44
45 Pedroza: Thank you very much.
46

1 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
2
3 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Chair. Does anyone know if there is a Highway Safety
4 Week? I mean we have all kinds of, it'd be helpful if someone could find
5 out an appropriate date for recognition of highway safety specifically. And
6 it occurs to me that the education, one of the four Es is something that we
7 might all be able to partner around. I know that we have talked about
8 projects that had safety dimensions to them but I don't know that I've ever
9 seen a list that said, "Here are the things we've accomplished that have to
10 do with it, road work that has directly improved, reduced accidents and
11 fatalities and this is why we're doing, at least it's one of the major reasons
12 we're doing some of these things." So if, if it would be possible to find out
13 if there's a time for us to, between the City and the Town and, and the
14 County to actually pass resolutions, go on local media, have newspapers
15 run articles, and really highlight so that we understand the, for example
16 the roundabouts, that a major part of that has to do with safety. And, and
17 just kind of go through some of the projects. I think the Highway 70
18 dividers of course jump out but there's other things that have been, been
19 done and some of them I think are fairly subtle. I will say until I saw this
20 presentation and had you walk it, walk us through it I thought crash-
21 worthiness actually had to do with cars being able to sustain crashes as
22 opposed to the way that roads were designed and what went into the
23 roads were designed in order to reduce the effect of crashes. And that's, I
24 mean there's a lot of, this, this is a different way of looking at the work that
25 we do and I think that it'd be something that would be worthwhile for the
26 public to better understand and appreciate.
27
28 Sorg: Thank you Commissioner Garrett. That's good. Commissioner, or Mr.
29 Doolittle.
30
31 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Commissioner Garrett. I did just real briefly pull up
32 on the internet and, and I couldn't remember the dates but we do actually
33 have a National Work Zone Awareness Week which is in April of each
34 year. I also pulled up from the, it is the National Work Zone Awareness.
35 Typically that's focusing more on our construction zones to you know
36 make sure our workers make it home safe, you know "Slow down through
37 work zones," those types of things. I also pulled up the National Highway
38 and Transverse, Transportation and Safety Administration's website and
39 there are probably three dozen safety-related ...
40
41 Sorg: Events.
42
43 Doolittle: Awareness items, you know Alcohol Awareness Month, National Work
44 Zone Awareness Week which I already mentioned, Police Week, Ride to
45 Work Safely Week, so there's, there's several that maybe we could

1 piggyback off of but I know for the Department the big one is the Work
2 Zone Awareness Week.
3
4 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Trent. I saw that too. Commissioner Garrett.
5
6 Garrett: Mr. Chair. Since I brought this up I'd be willing to work with one or two
7 members of the Policy Committee to bring together some, some ideas,
8 talk with Mr. Doolittle and our MPO staff, and come forward with a
9 proposal if, you know at least to consider whether it'd be worthwhile
10 highlighting the work that's done that is about improving safety in terms of
11 the projects that we do.
12
13 Sorg: Thank you. That sounds great.
14
15 Garrett: So if I have any volunteers, it we'll take some volunteers.
16
17 Sorg: Yes. Understand. Any other questions? Trustee Flores.
18
19 Flores: I was just going to go ahead and volunteer to be on that committee.
20
21 Sorg: Thank you. Looks like he's got a couple volunteers. Very good. Not you.
22 I, I just had one little question about the, the presentation. It was on the
23 slide that had "Fatal Crash Types Aren't Random," and you have the years
24 2007 to 2011 and I just, just want to be clear on this cause I, I didn't quite
25 get it as you went through it. Are they ranked in the frequency of those
26 kind of crashes, the fatal crashes, the seat belts being the most and
27 inattentional being the least?
28
29 Murphy: Mr. Chair. I believe that is the implication ...
30
31 Sorg: Okay.
32
33 Murphy: From the, from the, from the way they ordered them.
34
35 Sorg: Okay. I, it just doesn't ...
36
37 Murphy: Cause ...
38
39 Sorg: Seem like, well I suppose if we carried on from 2012 to 2016 they might
40 change ...
41
42 Murphy: This ...
43
44 Sorg: In order.
45
46 Murphy: An, inattention and impaired swapped a couple of times.

1
2 Sorg: Yeah. I see that.

3
4 Murphy: So ...

5
6 Sorg: But they're at the bottom of the list anyway. Okay. Just saying current
7 data might change that. I, that's all we have here I think.

8
9 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

10
11 Sorg: And the next item on the agenda is staff comments or Committee
12 comments. Is there anyone that has comments? Mr. Trent. Yes, you
13 have a report.

14
15 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I do if you'll allow. I just want to touch real briefly on
16 our construction projects. We're actually in the process of finishing up
17 most of the work here in, in town which I think a lot of people will be happy
18 that we're going to get the orange barrels off the road, at least for a little
19 while.

20 The Missouri bridge and the Union bridge projects are both for the
21 most part finished. We're working on some final clean-up punch-list items
22 but for the most part we are substantially complete and working on closing
23 the projects so you shouldn't see any kind of interference in those two
24 areas.

25 The other two big projects that we had were the mill and inlays,
26 again two projects but really by the same contractor so it seems like one
27 big project but that's the one on I-10 basically from Corralitos all the way to
28 the Texas state line. We are finished with the pavement. All of the
29 straight-line striping is finished. The only thing we have left to do is
30 striping of the gores but for the most part that one is finished. I'm happy to
31 say that Mountain States, our contractor's going to get 100% payment on
32 the smoothness so they're typically one of our state competitors when it
33 comes to the Statewide Smoothness Award. Hopefully that won't allow
34 people to fall asleep cause it's a nice ride between here and El Paso now.

35 Ultimately those are the only four ongoing projects we have in the
36 area. I just wanted to touch real briefly on some, on one thing that
37 happened at the, in the border area. We had been pursuing rather
38 aggressively a concrete overlay of NM-136 which is the Pete Domenici
39 Highway between the port of entry and the Texas state line. Ultimately we
40 submitted a TIGER application, I, I mean a FASTLANE application, I'm
41 sorry for about \$40 million. We're still awaiting that but in the meantime
42 we were pushing forward on the design of that project. We should be
43 finished sometime in December or January with the design. While we
44 were doing that, executive staff ultimately found some funding and we've
45 currently been notified that the District will receive about \$31 million to
46 fund Segment 1 and Segment 3. We need ...

1
2 Barraza: You found that much money?
3

4 Doolittle: That is, that is correct Mayor. What they're doing is every year they go
5 through a redistribution process at the General Office. So what happens
6 is let's say I have a project that bids, we allocate \$20 million in our STIP
7 for whatever reason and it comes in at \$15 million, which is happening
8 right now quite frequently because of the drop in price of oil. So what they
9 then do is they take that \$5 million of savings from that specific project,
10 they put it into a big pot, and then at the end of the fiscal year they look at
11 you know which projects are ready, ultimately who's been managing their
12 projects well, those kinds of things and New Mexico 136 because we had
13 been aggressively pursuing it because of the FASTLANE, we're going to
14 be ready to meet those timelines. So again we received \$16 million in
15 Fiscal Year 17, \$15 million in Fiscal Year 18 which we're going to try to do
16 advance construction and build it all as one project. So ultimately I'm
17 pursuing an additional \$5 million or so which will allow us to complete that
18 entire corridor. Just to give you an idea, my normal STIP budget is right at
19 \$30 million. This project is going to add about \$35 or \$36 million to the
20 District so in one year I've doubled my budget on one project. So it's a
21 little bit out of this area but it's really good news for us in the border,
22 basically maintaining our current infrastructure. It's not going to expand.
23 We're going to do some improvements along with the County specifically
24 at Airport and 136 but it's just to maintain our current infrastructure with
25 concrete overlay. But that's exciting for us. I, I honestly never thought it
26 would happen before I retired but it's good news for us. I'll keep you in the
27 loop on, as I get information on the studies that we're doing you know in
28 the area, US-70 for instance, we've had a few public meetings on the
29 study for the six-lane you know that Councilor Sorg has been interested in.
30 I don't have any updates yet because we're in the very preliminary stages
31 but I just wanted to share that bit of good news at least for the District and
32 for southern Dona Ana County. And with that I'll stand for any questions.
33

34 Sorg: Any questions? Councilor Eakman.
35

36 Eakman: Yes. Thank you Mr. Doolittle. I was wondering, would the news that the
37 State is going to claw back funds of 5% probably from other projects
38 through the end of this fiscal year, it would be my understanding that fuel
39 taxes pretty much are the revenue sources for a lot of road improvements.
40 So for the sake of my education, are the road improvements and the
41 planning for road improvements insulated from that 5% cut?
42

43 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. Purely by coincidence this morning I had a
44 conversation with Deputy Secretary Anthony Lujan very specifically
45 related to that and you're absolutely correct. Right now it seems like the
46 Department will continue to do business as usual. We do honestly have a

1 little bit of a surplus because of, of we're not, we're not out of the General
2 Fund, we're based on, on gas tax. So ultimately we as a department are
3 actually doing better than usual but at the same time if the rest of the state
4 tends to fall into revenue problems or, or those kinds of things they tend to
5 look at our budget to, to borrow from or steal from, whatever terminology
6 you want to use. But at this point the discussion I had with Deputy
7 Secretary Lujan this morning is we're to continue doing business as usual
8 and District 1 honestly has benefited greatly the past few years. So we'll
9 be busy down here.

10
11 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. Any other comments from Committee or staff?

12
13 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT**

14
15 Sorg: Okay. Any public comments? Any public comments from the public here?
16 We have two members of the public here that, no comments from them?
17 Okay.

18
19 **10. ADJOURNMENT (2:34 p.m.)**

20
21 Sorg: That's it. There's no more items on the agenda. I'll entertain a motion to
22 adjourn.

23
24 Pedroza: So move.

25
26 Sorg: Moved by Councilor Pedroza.

27
28 Eakman: Second.

29
30 Sorg: Second by Councilor Eakman. All in favor say "aye."

31
32 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

33
34 Sorg: Meeting is adjourned.

35
36
37
38
39
40 _____
Chairperson

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

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 August 24, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. in
6 City Hall Council Chambers, 700 N. Main St., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
9 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
10 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
11 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
12 Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
13

14 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
15 Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
16 Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
17 Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
18

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

23 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
24

25 **1. CALL TO ORDER (11:05 a.m.)**
26

27 Garrett: Meeting will come to order. This is a special meeting of the Policy
28 Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. This
29 is August 24th, 2016 and the time is 11:05. Can I get a roll call?
30

31 Baum: Board Member Benavidez is not here. Board Member Barraza is not here.
32 Mr. Doolittle.
33

34 Doolittle: Here.
35

36 Baum: Board Member Eakman is not here. Ms. Flores.
37

38 Flores: Here.
39

40 Baum: Mr. Garrett.
41

42 Garrett: Here.
43

44 Baum: Mr. Hancock.
45

46 Hancock: Here.

1
2 Baum: Ms. Pedroza.

3
4 Pedroza: Here.

5
6 Baum: Board Member Sorg is not here and Board Member Arzabal is not here.

7
8 Garrett: Mr. Murphy do we have a quorum?

9
10 Murphy: Yes we have a quorum.

11
12 Garrett: Thank you very much.

13
14 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**

15
16 Garrett: Does any Member of the Committee have any known or perceived conflict
17 of interest with any item on the agenda? If so that committee member
18 may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter or if they feel they
19 can be impartial we will put the participation up to a vote by the rest of the
20 committee. Are there any conflicts of interest?

21
22 Hancock: No.

23
24 Pedroza: No.

25
26 Doolittle: No.

27
28 Flores: No.

29
30 Garrett: And I do not have one either.

31
32 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

33
34 Garrett: Do we have any public comment? Thank you.

35
36 **4. ACTION ITEMS**

37
38 **4.1 Resolution 16-10: A Resolution Amending the Federal Fiscal Year**
39 **2015 and 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

40
41 Garrett: In that case we will move onto the only item we have for Action on, at this
42 special meeting. Mr. Murphy.

43
44 Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. Action Item 4.1 Resolution 16-10 is a resolution to
45 amend our current, the fiscal year 2015 and the fiscal year 2016 Unified
46 Planning Work Program. What we need to do is move a little over

1 \$200,000 from the special studies plans projects and programs from FY15
2 into FY16. This, these monies are mainly budgeted towards the
3 university, university/Missouri study projects that we had anticipated
4 completing in FY15 but due to various reasons and, and lengthening of
5 the schedule they've extended well into FY16 and maybe a little bit into '17
6 which we amended last month. Due to the program, the program policies
7 and procedures established by NMDOT we're not allowed to just simply
8 slide that over in the two year UPWP, we need to distinctly move it from
9 one fiscal year to the other fiscal year, so we're asking for your approval of
10 this amendment so that we may seek reimbursement for funds expended
11 on, on this, on these projects and other MPO activities.
12

13 Flores: So moved.

14
15 Hancock: Second.

16
17 Garrett: Thank you Mr. Murphy. And we have a, a motion to approve Action Item
18 number 4.1 which is a resolution amending the FY15 and '16 Unified
19 Planning Work Programs. Any discussion by members of the Committee?
20 Any public input? Would you please poll the Committee? Those in favor
21 say "yes", those opposed "no."
22

23 Baum: Mr. Doolittle.

24
25 Doolittle: Yes.

26
27 Baum: Ms. Flores.

28
29 Flores: Yes.

30
31 Baum: Ms. Pedroza.

32
33 Pedroza: Yes.

34
35 Baum: Mr. Hancock.

36
37 Hancock: Yes.

38
39 Baum: Mr. Garrett.

40
41 Garrett: Yes. The vote is unanimous.
42

43 **5. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

44
45 Garrett: Do we have any committee or staff comments at this point?
46

1 Murphy: No sir.

2
3 **6. PUBLIC COMMENT**

4
5 **7. ADJOURNMENT (11:08 a.m.)**

6
7 Garrett: In that case without objection we are adjourned.

8
9
10
11
12
13 _____
14 Chairperson
15

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (505) 528-3222 | FAX (505) 528-3155
<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 14, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

RESOLUTION NO. 16-11: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MPO CHAIR TO SIGN A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and adoption of Resolution 16-11

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

1. Copy of draft MOA
2. Copy of Camino Real Consortium Bylaws

DISCUSSION:

Committee Discussion

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-11

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MPO CHAIR TO SIGN A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM.

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

WHEREAS, the MPO is a public agency and is empowered to enter into this MOU; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of the State of New Mexico designated the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization as an MPO pursuant to Section 112 of the Federal Highway Act of 1973. The results of said action allowing the MPO to be responsible for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. §134, Metropolitan Planning, 23 U.S.C. §104(f)(3), to include participating in a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Camino Real Consortium is comprised of other public, private, and non-profit agencies that are dedicated to coordinating planning at the regional level.

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

(I)

THAT the MPO Chair is authorized to sign the attached MOU, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made part of this Resolution.

(II)

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

DONE and **APPROVED** this 14th day of September , 2016.

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Between [Insert Name of Agency] and the Camino Real Consortium

1. Purpose

The Camino Real Consortium (Consortium) commits to advancing regional development consistent with the Program Goals and Long-Term Desired Outcomes listed in *Attachment A*.

2. Background/Introduction

Leaders from public and private sectors and community members of Doña Ana County recognize the importance of working together to maintain and improve the region's strengths in economic opportunity, excellent natural resources, and quality of life. Challenges – such as efficient and equitable transportation, improving water quality, providing housing options near jobs and transit, increasing capital investments and jobs, and fostering career opportunities for all – are interrelated and span municipal, state and international borders. They cannot be solved by individual municipalities or organizations acting alone or through single-focus methods. They require public-private collaboration and multi-pronged approaches. As a result of a HUD-funded project, the Viva Doña Ana (VDA) Initiative began. The Consortium-lead VDA Initiative continues on to promote regional collaboration and sustainable communities through a range of planning and implementation activities.

3. Commitment to the Consortium

In pursuit of the VDA Initiative's long-term desired outcomes, Consortium members commit to work together to carry out the activities of the VDA Initiative as described in *Attachment B*.

4. Benefits to Members

Through participation in the VDA Initiative, the Consortium member may realize the following benefits:

- A. Greater opportunity to contribute to a shared understanding, vision, and goals for sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County and the neighboring region.
- B. Better alignment of organizational goals with broader regional goals.
- C. Increased understanding of sustainable communities' issues and regional approaches to address those issues.
- D. Increased capacity of members and the region to accomplish goals and achieve desired results.
- E. More access to funding and investment opportunities from public and private sources that recognize the value of coordinated approaches to regional challenges.
- F. Enhanced connections with others across sectors and disciplines.

- G. Greater recognition for leadership and involvement in regional sustainable community efforts.

5. Common Responsibilities of Consortium Members

Members work to achieve the following:

- A. Appoint a representative and an alternate to serve on the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC) – the voting body of the Consortium – who are responsible for: 1) informing other key people within the municipality, agency, or organization of the Consortium’s activities and, 2) relaying information to the Consortium about relevant work being contemplated or completed by their entity.
- B. Advance sustainable communities initiatives through their commitment to the program goals and long-term desired outcomes; the activities of the VDA Initiative; and, where feasible, the recommendations established by the RLC.
- C. Participate in the Consortium. Effectiveness of the Consortium depends on full participation. Member representatives or their designees to the RLC will attend and actively participate in RLC meetings or Subcommittee meetings or other Consortium events. The appointed representative and/or alternate will notify the RLC in advance if they are both unable to attend meetings, and will seek to designate someone else to attend the meeting in their place. Representatives should expect to participate in Subcommittees as established by the RLC.
- D. Agree to share appropriate and relevant technology and data with the intent of creating a comprehensive regional set of data that promotes the goals of the VDA Initiative, including but not limited to, traffic and transportation models, GIS data, demographic information, etc.
- E. Explore grants and address each grant’s reporting and administrative requirements.
- F. The Consortium will identify a lead agency to be responsible for entering into grant agreements to carry out projects as described in the grant application and work plan.
- G. The lead agency will issue news releases and contact or respond to contacts with representatives of the media as appropriate.
- H. The Consortium will identify a lead agency to host and maintain a VDA Initiative website as well as an email listserv to provide information related to the VDA Initiative for Consortium members and interested members of the public.
- I. In addition to the common responsibilities listed above, individual members may have specific responsibilities as the VDA Initiative work plan evolves.

6. Consortium and Regional Leadership Committee (RLC) Membership

The Consortium is comprised of member organizations that have entered into the Camino Real Consortium Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Each member organization has a designated representative and alternate that together comprises the RLC. These members are individual signatory members to this MOU with the Consortium as established in *Attachment C*. It is the intent of the Consortium to be inclusive and broadly representative. Consortium members will seek to encourage new members as needed to ensure broad representation. Any organization seeking Consortium membership shall submit in writing a formal request for membership to the Chair and Vice Chair. Memberships may be added subject to the approval of the current RLC membership in accordance with the Consortium Bylaws. Participation in the Consortium is voluntary. Members may withdraw from the Consortium at any time by submitting a letter to the Chair and Vice Chair stating the reasons for the withdrawal, in accordance with the organization's established procedure. The Consortium reserves the right to expel a Consortium member. If a consortium member has missed three consecutive meetings without the approval of the Chair or Vice Chair, or if the Consortium member has not substantially fulfilled its obligation, the Chair or Vice Chair shall alert the Consortium member in writing and present the issue to the RLC for discussion and action. The Chair or Vice Chair may initiate discussion and action to expel the member in accordance with the bylaws.

7. Meetings

The RLC will meet monthly, unless determined otherwise. The designated lead agency will send meeting notices, agendas, and any meeting materials by email to RLC members at least five days in advance of the meetings. A quorum, in accordance with the bylaws, must be present to hold a meeting requiring formal action.

8. Subcommittees

The RLC will form subcommittees to focus efforts on specific projects or tasks of the VDA Initiative, and make recommendations to the RLC. RLC and subcommittee members will discuss and refine, as necessary, recommendations with the goal of reaching consensus. Subcommittees will be responsible for appointing a project lead, setting a meeting schedule, establishing goals, deliverables and a timeline for completion, and reporting to the RLC.

9. Decision-Making

The goal of the RLC is to make decisions, where possible, by consensus. Members commit to seeking consensus through a mutually respectful give-and-take of thoughts and ideas with the intent of reaching a decision acceptable to all. RLC members also recognize that dissent is a healthy component of constructive dialog; however, final decisions of the RLC will be made in accordance with the bylaws. Decision/action items must be included on the meeting agenda distributed to RLC members in advance. The Consortium acts through its RLC.

10. Term of MOU

This MOU is effective upon the day and date last signed and executed by the duly authorized representatives of the parties to this MOU. This MOU shall remain in effect until formal termination of the MOU. This MOU may be terminated, without cause, by either party upon written notice, which shall be delivered by hand or certified mail.

11. Signatures

In witness whereof, the parties to this MOU through their duly authorized representatives have executed this MOU on the days and dates set below, and certify that they have read, understood, and agreed to the terms and conditions of this MOU as set forth herein.

The effective date of this MOU is the date of the signature last affixed to this page.

[INSERT NAME OF AGENCY]

[Insert Name of Authorized Representative]

Signature

[Insert Date]

Date

[Please Print Name and Title]

Name and Title

CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM

[Insert Name of Authorized Representative]

Signature

[Insert Date]

Date

[Please Print Name and Title]

Name and Title

Attachment A

The Camino Real Consortium's Program Goals and Long-Term Desired Outcomes

Program Goals

The goals of the Camino Real Consortium are to do the following:

1. Foster the development of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County that are consistent with the following Doña Ana County **Livability Principles**:
 - A. Support Existing Communities**

Target funding and resources toward existing communities—through strategies like transit-oriented, mixed-use development, and land recycling—to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.
 - B. Preserve Our Heritage**

Recognize and integrate local traditions and culture into planning goals and process as appropriate.
 - C. Provide More Transportation Choice**

Develop safe, reliable, and affordable transportation to broaden the range of choices beyond exclusive reliance on privately owned automobiles. Promote transportation options that decrease household transportation costs, reduce energy consumption, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.
 - D. Promote Affordable Communities**

Develop a range of tools to enhance community affordability to lower energy and transportation costs, promote innovations in housing design and construction, implement zoning that reduces barriers and promotes a full range of residential and commercial alternatives within walking distance, expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to lower the combined cost of housing and transportation and enhance communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods—rural, urban, or suburban.
 - E. Enhance Economic Opportunity**

Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services, and other basic needs of residents, as well as expanded business access to markets. Coordinate economic development strategies with regional partners including neighboring counties, states and countries. Plan with an eye to integrating economic development goals with other Livability Principles including those aimed at promoting affordable communities and expanding transportation choice.

F. Coordinate Policies and Investment.

Seek ways to plan collaboratively with agencies, departments and organizations at every level – federal, state, regional, local, private sector, non-profit, etc. – to maximize public investments and funding opportunities and better align policies. Align policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth.

2. Support urban, suburban and rural areas and multijurisdictional partnerships that commit to adopt integrated plans, strategies, and management tools to become more sustainable.
3. Facilitate strong alliances of residents and regional interest groups that are able to maintain a long-term vision for a region over time and simultaneously support progress through incremental sustainable development practices.
4. Build greater transparency and accountability into planning and implementation efforts.
5. Expedite implementation of the Doña Ana County Livability Principles through changes in local zoning and land use laws and regulations that remove barriers to sustainable development for housing, economic development, transportation, infrastructure and environmental quality issues.
6. Work to align local, state, national, and bi-national capital improvement programs with the Livability Principles.
7. Assist the region to move toward sustainability and livability, and, for the regions that have shown a long-term commitment to sustainability and livability, prepare them for implementation to demonstrate results.

Long-Term Desired Outcomes

The outcomes of the ongoing Viva Doña Ana Initiative will be an implementation of regional plans that are configured to produce the following:

1. Creation of shared elements in regional transportation, housing, water, and air quality plans tied to local comprehensive land use and capital investment plans.
2. Aligned planning and investment resources for local and regional strategies in achieving sustainable communities.
3. Increased participation and decision-making in developing and implementing a long-range vision for the region by populations traditionally marginalized in public planning processes.
4. Reduced social and economic disparities for the low-income and marginalized communities within the region.

5. Decreased per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and transportation-related emissions for the region.
6. Decreased overall combined housing and transportation costs per household.
7. Increase in the share of residential and commercial construction on underutilized infill development sites that encourage revitalization, while minimizing displacement in neighborhoods with significant disadvantaged populations.
8. Increased proportion of low and very low-income households within a 30-minute transit commute of major employment centers in urban, suburban, and rural settings.
9. Increased protection of natural resources, rural areas and preserve farmland and agriculture in the region.
10. Increased proportion of affordable housing units that have good access to services including fresh foods, health care, employment and education.
11. Increased options in mobility – walking, biking and transit.

Attachment B

Viva Doña Ana Initiative Activities

Activity A

Develop a broad partnership to advance regional sustainable development. The Camino Real Consortium will work together to identify shared long-term desired outcomes for regional sustainable development, provide guidance for the Viva Doña Ana Initiative and associated projects, provide leadership to advance desired outcomes through engagement and education, and promote implementation of the desired outcomes through their incorporation into local plans, policies and practices, and by using sustainability indicators to measure progress.

Activity B

Assist with the implementation of current and future regionally developed and accepted plans that integrate land use, transportation, housing and economic development. The Initiative will take a comprehensive look at the challenges faced throughout Doña Ana County including within municipalities, colonias, and other unincorporated areas.

Attachment C

Viva Doña Ana Initiative

The following jurisdiction, agency, or organization submitted a Letter of Interest/Commitment to join the Camino Real Consortium and support the Viva Doña Ana Initiative.

The entity listed below agrees to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Camino Real Consortium to carry out the Viva Doña Ana Initiative.

[INSERT NAME OF AGENCY]

Point of Contact:

[Insert Point of Contact]

Name

[Insert Date]

Date

[Insert Phone Number]

Phone Number

[Insert Email]

Email

Designated Representative:

[Insert Designated Representative]

Name

[Insert Date]

Date

[Insert Phone Number]

Phone Number

[Insert Email]

Email

Designated Alternate:

[Insert Designated Alternate]

Name

[Insert Date]

Date

[Insert Phone Number]

Phone Number

[Insert Email]

Email

The Camino Real Consortium Bylaws

A Doña Ana County, New Mexico Organization Committed to the Viva Doña Ana Initiative

Adopted March 23, 2012

Revised May 9, 2014

Revised March 25, 2016

Table of Contents

Article I—Name	<i>01</i>
-----------------------	------------------

Article II—Purpose & Membership	<i>01</i>
--	------------------

Article 2. Section 1 **Purpose**

Article 2. Section 2 **Establishing Membership**

Article III—Governance of the Consortium	<i>01</i>
---	------------------

Article 3. Section 1 **Regional Leadership Committee**

Article 3. Section 2 **Committees and Subcommittees**

Article 3. Section 3 **Regional Leadership Committee Representative Withdrawal or Termination**

Article 3. Section 4 **Consortium Member Withdrawal or Termination**

Article IV—Officers and Duties	<i>02</i>
---------------------------------------	------------------

Article 4. Section 1 **Roles and Responsibilities**

Article 4. Section 2 **Election of Officers**

Article V—Responsibilities, Authorization, and Meetings	<i>03</i>
--	------------------

Article 5. Section 1 **Responsibility and Functions**

Article 5. Section 2 **Representatives and Authorization to Vote**

Article 5. Section 3 **Meetings**

Article 5. Section 4 **Special Meetings**

Article 5. Section 5 **Participation**

Article VI—Quorum and Voting	<i>04</i>
-------------------------------------	------------------

Article VII—Lead Agencies	<i>04</i>
----------------------------------	------------------

Article 7. Section 1 **Consortium Logistics**

Article 7. Section 2 **Viva Doña Ana Initiative Website**

Article 7. Section 3 **Grant Applications and Agreements**

Article 7. Section 4 **Planning Initiatives/Projects**

Article VIII—Amendments	<i>05</i>
--------------------------------	------------------

Article IX—Definitions	<i>05</i>
-------------------------------	------------------

Attachments	<i>07</i>
--------------------	------------------

Attachment 1 **Voting Requirements Matrix**

Article I—Name

The name of this organization shall be the Camino Real Consortium (Consortium). A revision to the formal name of the Consortium is subject to a majority vote of the membership of the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC).

Article II—Purpose & Membership

Section 1: Purpose

The Consortium was established in 2011 to oversee the application and work plan for the Viva Doña Ana Initiative (VDA Initiative). The Consortium serves to advance and integrate regional planning in an effort to support and facilitate the building of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County.

Section 2: Establishing Membership

Membership in the Consortium consists of those organizations that have entered into the Camino Real Consortium Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Any additional organizations who support the purpose of the Consortium as set forth in Article II Section 1 may seek Consortium membership by submitting in writing to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC a formal request for membership including a description of the specific activities that it is prepared to provide toward the VDA Initiative.

Additional members may join the Consortium subject to the approval of a majority vote of the membership of the RLC.

Consortium membership is effective upon execution of the MOU between the requesting agency and the Camino Real Consortium.

Article III—Governance of the Consortium

The Consortium shall comply with all applicable Local, State, and Federal laws.

This document establishes the bylaws for the Consortium and is in accord with the membership and responsibilities set forth in the Camino Real Consortium MOU.

Section 1: Regional Leadership Committee (RLC)

The RLC is comprised of the designated voting membership of the Consortium. The voting membership of the RLC shall perform the governance responsibilities of the Consortium.

- A. Membership of the RLC shall consist of one representative and designated alternate from each of the Consortium members in accordance with procedures of their respective organizations. Names of the representatives and alternates shall be formally transmitted in writing to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC by each Consortium member.

- B. The representative has voting authority, whereas the designated alternate has voting authority in the absence of the representative.

Section 2: Committees and Subcommittees

The RLC shall create, appoint, and oversee subcommittees, including but not limited to the following: Steering Committee and Project Support Teams (PST). The RLC shall appoint both voting and non-voting members as deemed necessary to fulfill the purposes of Consortium supported projects.

Section 3: Regional Leadership Committee Representative Withdrawal or Termination

Any representative seeking withdrawal from the RLC shall submit in writing notice of such to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC. Failure of a representative to properly fulfill the specific activities that he or she commits to provide may result in his or her suspension or termination of the representative seat by a majority vote of the quorum of the RLC. In either case, the respective Consortium member shall appoint a replacement to serve on the RLC.

Section 4: Consortium Member Withdrawal or Termination

Members may withdraw from the Consortium at any time by submitting a letter to the Chair and Vice Chair stating the reasons for the withdrawal, in accordance with the organization's established procedure.

The Consortium reserves the right to expel a Consortium member. If a Consortium member has missed three (3) consecutive meetings without the approval of the Chair or Vice Chair, or if the Consortium member has not substantially fulfilled its obligation, the Chair or Vice Chair shall alert the Consortium member in writing and present the issue to the RLC for discussion and action. The Chair or Vice Chair may initiate discussion and action to terminate the membership by a majority vote of the RLC membership excluding the Consortium member in question.

Article IV—Officers and Duties

The officers of the RLC are a Chair and a Vice Chair.

Section 1: Roles and Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities of the officers are as follows:

- A. The Chair presides at all meetings, coordinates with staff to prepare the agenda for the meetings, calls special meetings, and sets the time and place of meetings in consultation with the membership. The Chair officially represents the RLC before other groups and agencies and carries out other duties as designated by the Consortium.
- B. The Chair and Vice Chair positions must be occupied by a designated representative of their respective organizations (See Article III Section 1).
- C. The Vice Chair serves in the Chair's absence.

- D. The Chair and Vice Chair shall communicate as needed regarding all relevant administrative matters of the RLC to ensure proper and thorough coordination to carry out their responsibilities.

Section 2: Election of Officers

Officers are elected from among the representatives of the voting members. Officers are elected by a majority vote of the quorum of the RLC.

If either the Chair or Vice Chair cannot fulfill the term for any reason, the RLC shall nominate and approve by a majority vote of the quorum a new officer from the representatives of the RLC to complete the term of the vacated position.

Election of officers shall occur at the first meeting upon adoption of the bylaws and annually thereafter. Subsequent annual elections shall be held in the same month as the original adoption of the bylaws.

Article V—RLC Responsibilities, Authorization, and Meetings

Section 1: Responsibilities and Functions

The RLC is the policy making body of the VDA Initiative. Its responsibilities and functions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. Use the Doña Ana County Livability Principles to guide and inform the planning process
- B. Provide and promote meaningful participation opportunities in the planning process for regional planning partners, stakeholders and the public (especially by under-represented/underserved communities)
- C. Develop, recommend for adoption and implement the plans resulting from the VDA Initiative as well as other regionally significant plans that align with the Doña Ana County Livability Principles and VDA Initiative
- D. Ensure that work plan outcomes are successfully met
- E. Create, appoint, and serve on subcommittees, including delegation of other staff or representatives of the members, as deemed necessary to fulfill the purposes of the VDA Initiative (See Article III, Section 2)
- F. Explore and pursue funding opportunities and ways to leverage resources for the Consortium
- G. Resolve disputes as appropriate

Section 2: Representatives and Authorization to Vote

Each Consortium member shall have one (1) vote and shall designate in writing to the Chair and Vice Chair of the RLC a representative and alternate representative who have the authority to vote on behalf of the Consortium member (See Article III Section 1).

Section 3: Meetings

The RLC shall meet monthly or more frequently as deemed desirable, appropriate, or necessary by the RLC. Notice of all RLC meetings shall be communicated via electronic and/or regular mail to all representatives and alternates. Notices of meetings are transmitted to all representatives and alternates at least five (5) days prior to the date of the meeting. Robert's Rules of Order will be observed at all meetings. Cancellation of specific RLC meetings may be determined by consensus of a quorum or by the Steering Committee. Cancellation notices of meetings are transmitted to all representatives and alternates at least five (5) days prior to the date of the meeting.

Section 4: Special Meetings

Special Meetings of the RLC may be called by the Chair or by request of 25 percent of the member representatives of the RLC.

Section 5: Participation

In the event that the designated representative is unable to attend an RLC meeting the designated alternate shall serve in his or her absence. In the event that both the designated representative and alternate are unable to attend they shall notify the Chair and/or the lead agency point of contact responsible for Consortium logistics at least 24 hours in advance.

Participation in-person is preferred and encouraged as it is most advantageous for all members; however, telephonic or electronic participation at meetings is permitted as necessary and appropriate. The representative shall contact the lead agency point of contact at least 24 hours in advance to request participation telephonically or electronically. The lead agency will make every reasonable attempt to accommodate the request; however, there is no guarantee of participation via telephone or other technology.

Article VI—Quorum and Voting

All actions before the RLC require a quorum. A quorum will consist of the presence of at least 50% of the voting membership plus one. Actions will be decided by a simple majority of the quorum unless prescribed otherwise.

Article VII—Lead Agencies

The RLC will designate a lead agency for certain functions including but not limited to facilitating Consortium logistics, operating and maintaining the VDA Initiative website, serving as the fiscal agent for grant agreements and managing individual planning initiatives/projects.

Section 1: Consortium Logistics

The designated lead agency will send meeting notices, agendas, and any meeting materials electronically to RLC members at least five (5) days in advance of the meetings. A quorum must be present to hold a meeting requiring formal action.

Section 2: Viva Doña Ana Initiative Website

The designated lead agency will host and maintain a VDA Initiative website as well as an email listserv to provide information related to the VDA Initiative for Consortium members and interested members of the public.

Section 3: Grant Applications and Agreements

The designated lead agency will be responsible for entering into grant agreements to carry out Consortium supported initiatives/projects as described in the grant application and work plan. The lead agency will issue news releases and contact or respond to contacts with representatives of the media as appropriate.

Section 4: Planning Initiatives/Projects

The designated lead agency will be responsible for project management of Consortium supported planning initiatives. The lead agency will work with the RLC to develop and formalize project scope of work and approach to community engagement including participation of planning partners, stakeholders and the public. The lead agency will issue news releases and contact or respond to contacts with representatives of the media as appropriate.

Article VIII—Amendments

These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the RLC membership. Amendments shall be by written notice outlining the proposed amendment(s) and reasons thereto and sent to each member via electronic and/or regular mail at least 15 days prior to the meeting. Such amendment(s) shall be consistent with the purpose of the VDA Initiative.

- Adopted by unanimous vote of the RLC on March 23, 2012
- Amended bylaws adopted by the RLC on May 09, 2014
- Amended bylaws adopted by the RLC on March 25, 2016

Article IX — Definitions

- Camino Real Consortium (Consortium):** The member organizations that serve to advance and integrate regional planning in an effort to support and facilitate the building of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County
- Consortium Member:** Organization that has entered into the Camino Real Consortium Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Designated Alternate:** Individual appointed by a member organization to serve on the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC) in the absence of the Designated Representative; has voting authority in the absence of the designated representative
- Designated Representative:** Individual appointed by a member organization to serve on the Regional Leadership Committee (RLC); has voting authority

- E. **Majority Vote:** More than half the votes cast; minimum of 50% plus one
- F. **Planning Partners:** Organizations and/or individuals with a strong commitment to the VDA Initiative
- G. **Project Support Teams (PST):** Organization comprised of any variation of project staff, RLC members, consultants, key planning partners and stakeholders
- H. **Quorum:** The presence of at least 50% of the voting membership plus one
- I. **Regional Leadership Committee (RLC):** Governing body for the Consortium that provides oversight and guidance of the VDA Initiative; composed of designated representatives and designated alternates (who have voting authority) along with staff from member organizations and planning partners (non-voting participation)
- J. **Stakeholder:** A person interested in the outcome of a particular initiative/project; participates and provides input into the process
- K. **Steering Committee:** Advisory group that coordinates administrative functions of the RLC; composed of the RLC Chair and Vice Chair, key RLC members and key staff from Consortium members
- L. **Viva Doña Ana Initiative (VDA Initiative):** Regional planning initiative focused on advancing and integrating planning efforts to support and facilitate the building of sustainable communities throughout Doña Ana County

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Voting Requirements Matrix

Camino Real Consortium

Voting Requirements Matrix

Article VI – Quorum and Voting

“All actions before the RLC require a quorum. A quorum will consist of the presence of at least 50% of the voting membership plus one. Actions will be decided by a simple majority of the quorum unless prescribed otherwise.”

SUBJECT	VOTING REQUIREMENT	ARTICLE	PAGE
Name change of Consortium	Majority vote of RLC membership	Article I – Name	01
New members of Consortium	Majority vote of RLC membership	Article II – Purpose and Membership	01
Removal of RLC representative	Majority vote of the quorum	Article III – Governance of Consortium	02
Removal of Consortium member	Majority vote of RLC membership	Article III – Governance of Consortium	02
Election of officers	Majority vote of the quorum	Article III – Governance of Consortium	03
Filling vacant officer seat	Majority vote of the quorum	Article IV – Officers and Duties	03
Amendment of Bylaws	Majority vote of the RLC membership	Article VIII – Amendments	05

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://mesillavalleympo.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 14, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

6.1 Presentation on the Missouri Study Corridor

DISCUSSION:

MPO Staff will present on the progress of the Missouri Study Corridor.

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://mesillavalleympo.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF September 14, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

6.2 Committee Training

DISCUSSION:

MPO Staff will discuss crash data from 2012-2014 in terms of crash rate, severity and type.