



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 **December 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.** in the **Las Cruces City Council Chambers**, 700 N. 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. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ **Chair**
5. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
5.1. November 16, 2016 _____ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
6.1. *Resolution 16-16: A Resolution Adopting the 2017 MPO Calendar of Meetings ___ **MPO Staff**
6.2. Resolution 16-17: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program _____ **MPO Staff**
6.3. Resolution 16-18: A Resolution Rescinding the Camino Real Consortium of MPO Project Priorities (Resolution 16-15) and Advising the Camino Real Consortium of New MPO Project Priorities _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
7.1. NMDOT update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

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

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held November 16, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.
6 in 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 1:08)
9 Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
10 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
11 Councillor Jack Eakman (CLC)
12 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
13 Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC) (arrived 1:01)
14 Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
15 Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
16

17 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
18

19 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
20 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
21 Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
22 Dominik Loya (MPO Staff)
23

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

26 **1. CALL TO ORDER (1:00 PM)**
27

28 Sorg: Okay I'll call the meeting to order, it's one o'clock.
29

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

32 Sorg: The first item on the agenda is a conflict of interest inquiry. Does any
33 member of the Committee have any known or perceived conflict of interest
34 with any item on the agenda?
35

36 Pedroza: No.
37

38 Eakman: None.
39

40 Sorg: All right.
41

42 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**
43

44 Sorg: We'll move on then to public comment. Is there anybody from the public
45 here that would like to make comment? Seeing none.
46

1 **4. CONSENT AGENDA ***

2
3 Sorg: We'll move on to the next item, the consent agenda. Is there a motion to
4 approve the agenda?

5
6 Flores: So moved.

7
8 Eakman: Second.

9
10 Sorg: Moved by Trustee Flores and second by Councilor Eakman. Would staff
11 poll the members?

12
13 Wray: Trustee Flores:

14
15 Flores: Yes.

16
17 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

18
19 Doolittle: Yes.

20
21 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

22
23 Benavidez: Yes.

24
25 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

26
27 Pedroza: Yes.

28
29 Wray: Councilor Eakman.

30
31 Eakman: Yes.

32
33 Wray: Mr. Chair.

34
35 Sorg: Yes.

36
37 **5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

38
39 **5.1 * October 12, 2016**

40
41 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

42
43 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

44
45 **6.1 * Resolution 16-12: A Resolution Adopting the 2016 Annual Listing of**
46 **Obligated Projects**

1
2 - VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA
3

4 **6.2 Resolution 16-13: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021**
5 **Transportation Improvement Program**
6

7 Sorg: All right then we move onto action items. The first action item is approved
8 by the consent agenda. The second one is 6.2, resolution 16-13, a
9 resolution amending the 2016-2021 transportation improvement program.
10 And I make a comment that Commissioner Garrett has just arrived.
11

12 Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the committee to
13 page 33 in the packet. There are a number of amendments that have
14 been requested by NMDOT and RoadRUNNER Transit. I will deal with
15 the NMDOT amendments first as those are fairly straightforward.
16 LC00250 is an additional \$1.6 million in federal fiscal year 2017 for
17 preliminary engineering, construction is still intended to be in fiscal years
18 '18 and '19. And the last item on the table, LC00300 is a new project for
19 federal fiscal year 2018 which is a bridge and pavement preservation and
20 ADA improvements on US-70, Elks to Del Rey. The other three items that
21 are on the list; TL00011 all RoadRUNNER Transit has requested that all
22 of the money in that project be moved out of that project which would've
23 effectively eliminate that project out of the TIP. The money would go to,
24 both segments of the money will go to TL00016, \$1.1 million will go into
25 federal fiscal year 2017 and the remaining \$4 million will go into federal
26 fiscal year 2020. And I'll stand now for any questions.
27

28 Sorg: Do we have a motion to approve this resolution?
29

30 Wray: We do not.
31

32 Sorg: Would someone like ...
33

34 Flores: So moved.
35

36 Sorg: Trustee Flores made a motion to approve it. And ...
37

38 Eakman: Second.
39

40 Sorg: Second by Councilor Eakman. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Trent.
41

42 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to real briefly expand a little bit on
43 LC00300 only because there's been a lot of discussion tied to that section
44 of US-70. We are still currently working on a study for that same section
45 of road. If you'll notice this is just a pavement preservation. We've had
46 severe difficulties with that pavement specifically at the Elks intersection

1 where trucks are coming to stop and it's shoving that asphalt around. Our
2 maintenance guys have gone in there and kind of shaved off some of the
3 ruts and we're just afraid that the pavement has become very thin in that
4 section, so ultimately this is just to buy us a little bit of time while we
5 complete the study before we determine long-term what we're going to do.
6 And then the bridge preservation is mostly work on the I-25, I mean the
7 US-70 bridges over I-25 just as some pavement preservation. So I just
8 wanted to clarify that this is a completely separate project and scope than
9 the study that we're currently doing from Three Crosses to the Del Rey
10 intersection.

11
12 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. And other comments or questions? Seeing none.
13 Could you call the roll?

14
15 Wray: Trustee Flores.

16
17 Flores: Yes.

18
19 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

20
21 Doolittle: Yes.

22
23 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.

24
25 Benavidez: Yes.

26
27 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

28
29 Pedroza: Yes.

30
31 Wray: Councilor Eakman.

32
33 Eakman: Yes.

34
35 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

36
37 Garrett: Yes.

38
39 Wray: Mr. Chair.

40
41 Sorg: Yes.

42
43 **6.3 Resolution 16-14: A Resolution Accepting the Missouri Study**
44 **Corridor Phase A recommendations**
45

1 Sorg: Nest item on the agenda is 6.3, a resolution, 16-14, a resolution accepting
2 the Missouri study corridor phase A recommendations. Is there a motion
3 to approve?
4
5 Eakman: So moved.
6
7 Pedroza: Second.
8
9 Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman. Second by Councilor Pedroza. We've had
10 already a thorough presentation on this Missouri Study Corridor. We
11 aren't going to have a presentation today, but if there's any last minute
12 questions or comments the committee has, this is the time to do it.
13
14 Murphy: And Mr. Chair if I may add, since the last presentation we did not receive
15 any new public comment on there, so just essentially the two items to
16 move forward as recommended by the consultant it stands under what the
17 committee will be voting on.
18
19 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Seeing none, we'll have a roll call vote then.
20
21 Murphy: Member Flores.
22
23 Flores: Yes.
24
25 Murphy: Member Doolittle
26
27 Doolittle: Yes.
28
29 Murphy: Member Benavidez:
30
31 Benavidez: Yes.
32
33 Murphy: Member Pedroza.
34
35 Pedroza: Yes.
36
37 Murphy: Member Eakman.
38
39 Eakman: Yes.
40
41 Murphy: Member Garrett.
42
43 Garrett: Yes.
44
45 Murphy: Chair.
46

1 Sorg: Yes.

2
3 **6.4 Resolution 16-15: A Resolution Advising the Camino Real**
4 **Consortium of MPO Project Priorities**
5

6 Sorg: Next item on the agenda is the 6.4, resolution 16-15, a resolution advising
7 the Camino Real Consortium of MPO project priorities. Motion to approve.
8

9 Pedroza: Move to approve.

10
11 Eakman: Second.
12

13 Sorg: Moved to approve by Councilor Pedroza and second Councilor Eakman.
14 Could you explain this one a little bit?
15

16 Murphy: Yes Mr. Chair. The regional leadership consortium of which the MPO is a
17 member of is requesting priority projects from each of their members at
18 their next meeting December 2nd. What I have up on the screen and I will
19 zoom in as needed, is a copy of the map that illustrates the MPO's
20 transportation priorities as adopted in the MTP last summer. Also handed
21 out before you is a list of the projects that did not quite make that map
22 because we needed to be fiscally constrained so what I believe we can do
23 to satisfy the request of the RLC is for this Board to signify and I believe
24 the number is three, the top three projects from these two, the map and
25 the list, which the Board indicates is our top priorities and I'll defer to
26 Member Garrett or Member Flores if they want to add any more on what
27 the RLC is, oh and Member Pedroza you were there too.
28

29 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
30

31 Sorg: Commissioner Garrett.
32

33 Garrett: Yes, thank you. The point behind this is that the Camino Real Consortium
34 would like to be able to encourage legislative support as well as any other
35 kind of support that we need for projects that have regional implications
36 and are consistent with both the planning documents that have been
37 developed through the Viva Dona Ana initiative, and also the livability
38 principles that were developed by the residents of the County. And so
39 what we're, looking for are, the notion is that everybody's going to bring
40 three or up to three and then the RLC, the Regional Leadership
41 Committee will narrow that down to probably three that we will then
42 recommend to legislatures from the area. So I think in terms of looking at
43 this, it's important to keep those livability principles in mind and also to,
44 this can reinforce what's going on from a different entity or it can be
45 something that is not specifically on anybody's list but it's partly because it

1 really has implications that are regional in nature. I hope that that's
2 somewhat clearer.
3
4 Flores: Do you have a ...
5
6 Sorg: Trustee Flores.
7
8 Flores: I know that a copy of a livability principles was sent to the MPO and I was
9 hoping that that would be included in the packet so people could look at it
10 ahead of time that weren't in Viva Dona Ana, so they could look at the list
11 and then see if they wanted to move something.
12
13 Murphy: I apologize. I did not get that list out. Is that on your screen, is that
14 readable?
15
16 Pedroza: Mr. Chairman.
17
18 Garrett: Mr. Chair if I could. What you've got on the screen are the livability
19 principles that were developed in Dona Ana County. The model was
20 something that's been developed at a sustainable level, sustainable
21 communities level nationally but we tweaked these and have adopted
22 these at a local level and so the illustrations, for example the 20 miles
23 from home to the supermarket is simply a reminder that currently that's
24 how far it is for families in Colonia's to be able to get to fresh food and that
25 kind of thing which has an implication in terms of existing supporting
26 communities but also looking at economic competitiveness and a variety
27 of other things.
28
29 Sorg: This is in Viva Dona Ana.
30
31 Flores: Mr. Chair.
32
33 Garrett: This is in Viva Dona Ana. This is part of the Viva Dona Ana.
34
35 Flores: Might I add that the principles aren't necessarily in order of importance.
36 They're all ...
37
38 Garrett: Right.
39
40 Sorg: I couldn't hear.
41
42 Flores: Of equal importance.
43
44 Garrett: Say it again.
45

1 Flores: The principles are not in order of importance. They're all important.
2 They're just so many principles so.
3
4 Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.
5
6 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to see if I've got this correct. As I
7 understand somebody, possibly Tom, will be presenting this to the
8 Regional Leadership or whatever we are called at this point in order to add
9 to the projects that will be considered by the entire group for approval,
10 support, and any other kind of implementation that's possible. So do I
11 have that part right?
12
13 Garrett: Yes you do.
14
15 Pedroza: Okay. And do we know who will be presenting, will it be Tom or?
16
17 Garrett: I'm going to assume that the representative from the different entities will
18 make a presentation, so the County will have three, the City will have
19 three ...
20
21 Pedroza: Okay.
22
23 Garrett: Mesilla Valley MPO will have three, Town of Mesilla will have three or up
24 to three. So for all of us.
25
26 Pedroza: All right. Thank you very much.
27
28 Sorg: Okay.
29
30 Eakman: Mr. Chairman.
31
32 Sorg: Councilor Eakman.
33
34 Eakman: Yes, just a question for staff. Is the most comprehensive project here the
35 first one, Roadrunner Parkway? And are we only talking about redesign,
36 we're not talking about anything besides redesign? What is involved in
37 that very first one?
38
39 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councilor Eakman. I'm not sure we have these in any specific
40 order. I do know that the idea behind the Roadrunner Parkway would be
41 to make it multimodal which would involve probably narrowing the median
42 to have enough width to add bike lanes, some buffers for the sidewalks,
43 and therefore it would be a very expensive project relative to most of these
44 others, although the US-70/North Main bridge would also be quite an
45 expensive undertaking as well, but I don't believe we put these in any kind
46 of order that should infer any values. Just a list.

1
2 Eakman: Oh, and correct, I did not mean that that was priority one, it was just listed
3 on the page as number one. So in those words "redesign" it is the full
4 scope of redesign; contracting, execution, opening, it's the entire.
5
6 Murphy: Yes sir.
7
8 Eakman: Thank you.
9
10 Sorg: If I may add a comment to that particular project in itself, the former
11 representative from District 6 often times spoke at the MPO and other
12 places about the danger that Roadrunner Parkway has in this area, this
13 part of it for pedestrians and for bicyclists and she's always asked for
14 remedies, should we call it, or fixes to that street or road and so I think it's
15 quite important that we have it on the list. Complete street, and then going
16 into this in general, it looks to me like without going in to, most of these
17 projects seem to be converting for more complete streets in general for
18 multimodal use of modes of transportation. Am I correct in saying that?
19
20 Murphy: Mr. Chair. I would say that's essentially correct because I think one of the
21 underlying principles of the last MTP was that we were going to
22 concentrate on the existing communities in line with that one liability
23 principle.
24
25 Sorg: Right.
26
27 Murphy: So we did not have developed a lot of new projects for the MTP.
28
29 Sorg: Okay. Well I'm glad to see this, this is something I've been wondering
30 about for a long time. I'm glad we're changing existing roads so there are
31 more along complete street standards. Any other questions or comments
32 about the resolution?
33
34 Pedroza: I have a question.
35
36 Sorg: Commissioner, Councilor Pedroza.
37
38 Pedroza: Then are we, do we have here the task of from the entire list, picking out
39 the top three that we want or what is it that we're supposed to be doing?
40
41 Sorg: I do not know. Would you like to explain that Mr. Murphy?
42
43 Murphy: From what I understood was the ROC had asked for no more than three.
44
45 Pedroza: We look at them all again so that we can.
46

1 Murphy: I'll move back over to the map.
2
3 Pedroza: Okay.
4
5 Murphy: So if you want me to zoom in any particular area. And I imagine if you just
6 want to pick one that would suffice with our instructions as well, but
7 probably should do three.
8
9 Pedroza: Okay.
10
11 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
12
13 Sorg: Go ahead.
14
15 Garrett: If I could I think we all are aware that the state is dealing with some pretty
16 significant financial issues and it's not at all clear how much money is
17 going to be available for capital projects. The discussion is that we had at
18 the RLC was that, this is really an opportunity for us to showcase to other
19 members of the consortium and to legislatures and to the general public
20 how the livability principles work for different entities that are part of the
21 consortium. And so I'm being very practical about this. I look at this in
22 sense as an educational effort as much as it is anything else and it's also
23 that we're sort of priming the pump for the future. So in order to kind of
24 move this off of neutral, I just want to suggest that something like the
25 Roadrunner Parkway which is moving toward a complete street concept,
26 it's something that's very much in alignment with a number of the livability
27 principles. I think that the idea of the connection to Bosque Park by
28 redoing the Calle Del Norte bridge crossing is another one that has to do
29 with access to different areas in the County. That this is something that's,
30 fourth from the bottom, and it's going to reinforce cycling, hiking, there's all
31 that kind of thing and I think the last one that I would just call to your
32 attention is the multiuse path on the south side of Tortugas. Again that's
33 something that has to do, these are all things that in sense have regional
34 implications or they certainly are bigger than one neighborhood. And I
35 think that they would stand in good stead in terms of presenting the
36 interests of the MPO and Viva Dona Ana. I'm just putting those out as a
37 reference point.
38
39 Flores: Mr. Chair.
40
41 Sorg: Go ahead.
42
43 Flores: Might I suggest that we number the ones on the page and then perhaps
44 give numbers to the ones up on the map and then maybe everybody pick
45 out three and then see if there's a consensus and then if there's a tie or

1 whatever maybe we can have some more discussion, just as a way to
2 move forward.
3
4 Sorg: I had a little difficult hearing you. May I try to understand, we, each of us
5 would number three of them.
6
7 Flores: Number the ones on the page so that way everybody's dealing with the
8 same projects, and the difficulty is going to be that the ones on the map
9 are not on the page, right?
10
11 Murphy: That's correct.
12
13 Flores: So we need to have those as possible options as well, however I will point
14 out that some of these on the page have already gotten, on the map have
15 already been funded and so for me I'm looking to, as a practical matter to
16 have this be a way to get funding and so I'm going to cut those out that
17 have already been funded, and basically look to what hasn't been funded
18 and that's how I'm going to rate things. But we need to have the ones on
19 the map numbered so perhaps we can go through the projects and add
20 those. There are 15 projects on the page, so maybe we can all just, if you
21 could just state the ones on the map and then give them a number starting
22 with 16 and then that way people on the committee can just kind of look
23 through them, decide what they want to, and put in three and then maybe
24 we can kind of count up and then discuss those that have been on there
25 and limit it that way.
26
27 Sorg: Very good. I think that's a good idea. Is the rest of the committee would
28 like to go that route? Okay.
29
30 Pedroza: I have one question. Can you tell, identify which of the ones on the list
31 have already been funded?
32
33 Sorg: Please that would, we're going to do that next. Yes.
34
35 Pedroza: Okay.
36
37 Sorg: Mr. Murphy you're in charge.
38
39 Murphy: Okay I'm trying to think through how to, if I can transfer this over to at least
40 the document.
41
42 Sorg: Can you highlight the ones that aren't funded? The ones we need to look
43 at.
44

1 Murphy: I'm going to try different color highlighting in order to ... That too dark?
2 You said to highlight the funded ones, is that correct or highlight the
3 unfunded ones?
4

5 Sorg: It doesn't matter.
6

7 Murphy: Okay.
8

9 Sorg: So long as we know which is which.
10

11 Doolittle: Mr. Chair.
12

13 Sorg: Yes Mr. Doolittle.
14

15 Doolittle: While he's doing that Trustee Flores brought up those on the map that
16 were already funded; so US-70/Picacho/17th Street intersection, we're
17 currently planning on putting a signal there.
18

19 Sorg: Yeah.
20

21 Doolittle: The Spitz/Three Crosses was also on the map, that one bids on Friday so
22 that one's currently being approved. The Triviz/University multiuse path
23 underneath to NMSU, we're currently under a study and design as part of
24 that interchange improvement. So I think those the three that Trustee
25 Flores was mentioning are on the map that we're currently pursuing
26 design, actually two of 'em it's a little late for, to include those in our list.
27 University I think we're always happy to have some money, but it is fully
28 funded at this point.
29 The other thing I just wanted to share my thoughts on this, a lot of
30 these honestly I'm not fully aware of. There's not a whole lot of
31 information on these. One of them that does show up on here that I'm a
32 little bit concerned about is a DOT route, it's the connection to the Bosque
33 Park on Calle Del Norte. Right now Calle Del Norte doesn't have any
34 shoulders so widening the bridge at this point, you still have access issues
35 on both sides of the bridge. Trustee Flores did mention to me that that is
36 part of their plan to incorporate a multiuse path to the path that runs along
37 the river to La Llorona Park. But I think at least from my perspective I'm
38 having some difficulty rating these only because other than a location and
39 a slight improvement or issue, I don't really know what the scope is, what
40 the intent is, you know how does it connect. So I just wanted to voice that.
41 I think I could go through here. I was jokingly sharing with the Trustee I'm
42 gonna pick all DOT routes but I think I know where that gets the DOT with
43 the Board, but I think I could come up with a list of three, I just, the limited
44 information makes it a little difficult for me personally.
45

46 Sorg: I have to agree. Trustee Flores.

1
2 Flores: Yes, I just want to say that we kind of decided to do this after having a
3 speaker come and it was just an idea that was out there and because of
4 the way we have our meetings, you know we're not having a meeting this
5 month, we're having a meeting next month, and the way funding gets
6 done, we just kind of wanted to quickly come up with some type of way to
7 bring some projects out there. And we're going to refine it and people will
8 have more time the next time around, but this is just kind of like the first
9 round of "Hey let's try and promote some projects in the region." So this is
10 the first time around and hopefully next year we'll be ahead of the ball and
11 that way our member organizations will be ahead of the ball and be given
12 some more warning so we apologize.
13
14 Sorg: Okay.
15
16 Flores: And then additionally, and I don't remember what I was going to say for
17 the second part we were commenting on. Never mind, I'll raise my hand if
18 I remember what I was going to say after that.
19
20 Sorg: Okay. Mr. Trent.
21
22 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just one other example that I've got for you is Stern
23 Drive is on this list, talks about road deterioration but Stern Drive runs all
24 the way from Union, really it runs all the way down to Vado and even
25 further and we recently just repaved Stern from Union to Cholla. So not
26 knowing termini tied to that section, again makes it a little bit difficult, but
27 just another comment.
28
29 Sorg: Sure. Thank you. So Mr. Murphy are we done with your ...
30
31 Murphy: I have the list numbered and split screen on there and I believe it should
32 be large enough for view.
33
34 Sorg: Oh yeah. Large enough in two ways. We can see it well and there's 40
35 different projects here, is there not?
36
37 Murphy: Yes, including the 15 on the other sheet.
38
39 Sorg: Oh includes these.
40
41 Murphy: Yes.
42
43 Sorg: Okay.
44
45 Murphy: Those are ...
46

1 Flores: Supposed to start with number 16.
2
3 Garrett: This goes to 15, that starts at 16.
4
5 Flores: So they'll all be on the same page.
6
7 Sorg: Okay, yeah. Okay, gotcha. So do you want us each to pick out three
8 projects from the whole list and then turn them in and you guys tally them
9 up and, how do you want to work this?
10
11 Murphy: I think that was Trustee Flores' suggestion of ...
12
13 Sorg: What is the ...
14
15 Murphy: It would be ...
16
17 Sorg: Yeah what does the committee think?
18
19 Murphy: That's fine with me.
20
21 Sorg: Is there any objection to doing that?
22
23 Benavidez: Mr. Chair.
24
25 Sorg: Yeah, Commissioner Benavidez.
26
27 Benavidez: Yes I have a question regarding the last, number 15, the south side of
28 Tortugas Hill. It's on BLM land, would that make a difference or is that
29 project going to be funded?
30
31 Sorg: Mr. Murphy could you answer her question please?
32
33 Murphy: I'm sorry. Please restate the question.
34
35 Benavidez: The south side of Tortugas Hill, A Mountain, it's on BLM land. How is that
36 going to, is it going to be funded?
37
38 Murphy: We wouldn't know the funding of any of this. I think that could be
39 something that could be a future TAP funding cycle, for instance BLM has
40 shown an interest in working with trails on their land. You know things
41 used for public purpose, so I think the project is viable. I think BLM
42 probably would support something like that, but again as Commissioner
43 Garrett had pointed out nobody knows where the funding's coming from at
44 this juncture.
45
46 Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. That's all.

1
2 Barraza: Mr. Chair.
3
4 Garrett: Thank you. Mr. Murphy I'm wondering if you or the staff have looked at
5 the list, both the 15 and then the other ones that we just pulled off the map
6 and if you have any sort of immediate sense of some of the projects that
7 from your perspective really do support and reinforce the livability
8 principles.
9
10 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Garrett. In addition to the three that you had
11 pointed out on the illustrative list, I would say maybe the Spruce and the
12 Walton road diets which would be numbers nine and ten, you know
13 particularly the Walton one due to the reconfiguration of the Roadrunner
14 Transit routes and the ability for people to cross to shopping across from
15 that transfer area. I would also probably point out the El Paseo complete
16 streets has been a significant project for the City which would be number
17 22. I think the number 34, the Hadley bicycle boulevard you know
18 providing connection into the City's Amador Proximo planning area would
19 be good. I think some of the pedestrian, number 33, pedestrian crossings
20 along University, I think a lot of those are moving towards funding right
21 now and I know at least one of them going through the City's CIP cycle so
22 maybe that one might be highlighted by this time next month. But those
23 would be the ones that I would, and then 37 the Rio Grande Trail, those
24 would be the ones that I would maybe take a close look at.
25
26 Sorg: Mayor Barraza.
27
28 Barraza: Mr. Chair. I guess in just listening to the discussion and the comments
29 that the Board has made or the Members have made here and this is the
30 first time that I've seen this list and not really even knowing what each of
31 the projects consist of and dollar amounts that are attached to it, I think
32 Commissioner Garrett had a good point in saying, we don't know what to
33 expect for next year in terms of funding throughout the whole state and
34 whether we'll even have any capital outlay money designated to our
35 different legislatures for capital outlay projects. I'm just, I guess it's difficult
36 for me to try to prioritize these without having more information on each of
37 the project with a dollar amount attached to it to be realistic on what we
38 can present to the Camino Real Consortium, so that's my thought on that.
39
40 Sorg: Thank you. I understand. Commissioner or Trustee Flores you have
41 some more to say?
42
43 Flores: No, I just kind of agree that that would've been nice to be added, but we
44 have what we have and the meeting at the RLC is going to be on
45 December 2nd, so unless you can quickly access the costs or Mr. Murphy
46 can quickly access the costs so that we can add those on, I just think we

1 need to do what we can and make our votes and next year be mindful that
2 that that type of information needs to be included, maybe a packet on
3 each, a packet with a little more explanation on each project so that we'll
4 have better information while we're making decisions.
5
6 Sorg: Okay. Mr. Murphy wouldn't, let me throw something out and see if this
7 would work. Instead of just picking three, maybe picking five or six and if
8 one or two on the list because of costs aren't just able to be done,
9 because we don't know what the costs are at the moment, they could be
10 moved down and the ones that are affordable shall we call them, doable,
11 then take over, be higher on the list?
12
13 Murphy: Mr. Chair.
14
15 Sorg: Will that work? I don't know.
16
17 Murphy: I'm not sure. This list was developed as part of our public outreach project
18 and development of the MTP. We don't have any very distinct cost
19 estimates for it, that's something that's always meant to be figured out
20 later on in the process. Had some general ballpark, an interchange
21 versus a road restriping kind of magnitude to kind of guess at that so we
22 don't have any real good costs. I think it, this is list in its entirety
23 represents what our identified through our public process as priorities for
24 the region. My preference would be to give this whole list to the RLC and
25 say this came through our process, these are all priorities. The MPO's not
26 a implementing agency. We're not going to be building any of these so I
27 think it would be just encouragement from us to either the County or the
28 City, the Town, the state, these are projects we suggest you do. It sounds
29 like we're being asked to provide a greater degree of encouragement and
30 saying okay this one rises above all the others, taking into consideration
31 the livability principles. So ...
32
33 Sorg: Right.
34
35 Murphy: At this point I would advise to kind of stay away from the cost ...
36
37 Sorg: Right.
38
39 Murphy: Because we've not done it, and which ones are most, from speaking with
40 your constituents and reviewing the livability principles, which one of these
41 projects do you feel achieve everyone's goals best.
42
43 Sorg: Yeah I understand. And I appreciate that, that's kind of the way I thought
44 in the first place. Let's turn them all in and let it, let somebody else decide
45 which we can do by affording them. All of them are necessary. All of
46 them have livability principles and eventually at some point in time all of

1 them should be done as soon as we get the funding available for them.
2 So what does the Committee feel about that? Yes Commissioner Garrett.
3
4 Garrett: Mr. Chair. Mr. Murphy are any of these on the ICIP, on anybody's ICIP?
5
6 Murphy: I don't know off hand. I know that the Spruce and the Walton road diets in
7 working with the BPAC we had submitted those to be considered onto the
8 City's CIP. We've also been talking with Angela and Samuel over at the
9 County as far as when their CIP cycle comes in and which of the cycling
10 projects should be put onto that one. But beyond that I can't recall if any
11 of these are currently on a CIP.
12
13 Garrett: And are any of these projects on any other funding list? Perhaps as a
14 phase.
15
16 Murphy: The highlighted DOT projects are on the TIP. I think many of the, yeah
17 those are ...
18
19 Garrett: Could I make a suggestion? In order to sort of move this along. I
20 understand the interest in having numbers if we've got numbers. And also
21 I think an argument can be made for putting forward the entire list. What
22 that does is that there's the danger of the RLC just saying it's too much
23 and so we're not going to deal with anything on that list. So what I think
24 we could potentially do is to put all 40 on a list and put at the top any
25 project that we can find out that is in somebody's ICIP and then anything
26 that's on the TIP could also be highlighted up at the top and then all the
27 rest of them are projects that are worthy but haven't yet been developed to
28 the point that they're on the TIP or they're on anybody's ICIP. And that
29 way then if the RLC is going to concentrate on ICIP projects, that at least
30 we'll say "Well here's that set," or if it's a matter of supporting the TIP then
31 people can get behind that. But that at least will tell us that those are
32 projects that are advanced enough to be looking for money and also it
33 would mean that in those cases you'd be able to put down what the money
34 is. I'm just going to suggest that we let it go at that and say that that's
35 enough of input into the process.
36
37 Sorg: Any further comments? To my understanding I could be not completely
38 accurate here but except for the ones that are highlighted, I don't think any
39 of them are on current ICIP but some of them definitely would be
40 considered in the next year's ICIP. And if that helps people decide that we
41 pick out top priority ones here, fine. That's good. I think that'll be a good
42 idea, don't you think? What's the Committee think? So Mr. Murphy would
43 you like to instruct us how to proceed?
44
45 Murphy: I think if maybe on the back of the sheet handed out, each member can
46 write the number down of their top three, staff will then accumulate those

1 and see which gets multiple votes and we'll count that or assemble that
2 real quickly and see what we have to discuss based on that.
3
4 Sorg: Okay and then possibly arrange them all 40 on a piece of paper with those
5 top ones, one through three.
6
7 Murphy: I think there's no way ...
8
9 Sorg: Four, five, six.
10
11 Murphy: That this Board can pick more than 24 at this point, so we'll get 16
12 dropping off right away.
13
14 Sorg: Okay.
15
16 Murphy: Hopefully we'll filter some that way.
17
18 Sorg: Don't lose those 16 though.
19
20 Murphy: No.
21
22 Sorg: Yeah we'll save them for later. Okay. Thank you. So let's proceed and
23 go ahead and do that. I'll give you a minute to select three and write the
24 three numbers on the back of the page we got and then we'll proceed from
25 there.
26
27 Pedroza: Mr. Chair.
28
29 Sorg: Yes.
30
31 Pedroza: Could Tom give us the first 15 or are those first 15 the ones on the sheet?
32
33 Murphy: Yes.
34
35 Pedroza: I see. So we do have all of them here. Okay, thank you.
36
37 Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I do have one quick comment that kind of goes along with mine
38 a little bit earlier. I don't know if it's my engineering mind or the lack of
39 information, I just don't feel comfortable selecting projects out of this list of
40 40. I think you yourself made the comment that all of these have value
41 and at some point meet some of those bullets outlined. Not to cop out in
42 this exercise, but I think I'm going to have to abstain. I just don't feel
43 comfortable selecting three. Maybe once we reduce them down a little bit.
44 I just don't have enough information, even on my own internal DOT routes,
45 like the one I mentioned was Stern. I don't know where that is. I don't
46 know what they're planning on doing. So at this point I think at least for

1 the initial round I can certainly provide some input, but I don't feel
2 comfortable selecting three projects.
3
4 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
5
6 Sorg: Okay. That's good. Commissioner Garrett.
7
8 Garrett: Well there is the alternative that I had suggested before and that is to
9 leave the list at 40, clean it up, and put at the top of the list any projects,
10 and I don't think it matters what order they're in cause there're not going to
11 be that many, any project that's on the list that's on an ICIP just goes to
12 the top and gets identified as this is on the Las Cruces ICIP or it's on the
13 Mesilla ICIP or whatever. Then identify in the next band any projects that
14 are on our list for TIP. And then just list everything else below that. And
15 that way we've giving them the whole list, we're identifying those that are
16 at a certain stage in the process in terms of specificity, budget, and
17 development. And it seems to me that that's, as we've said, you could
18 probably make an argument for any of our projects that to some degree
19 they're going to be supportive of the livability principle. This is the way
20 we've been working. So that's a suggestion in terms of narrowing it down
21 and not overstepping what we know.
22
23 Doolittle: Mr. Chair if ...
24
25 Sorg: Go ahead.
26
27 Doolittle: I tend to agree with that approach. I don't if we can make that as the
28 motion in an effort to move forward or how that would take place, but I feel
29 more comfortable with that because then it is tied to some sort of step in
30 the process but I appreciate that comment and that recommendation.
31
32 Sorg: Seeing a nodding head there I would suggest we make a motion.
33
34 Garrett: Mr. Chair. I ...
35
36 Sorg: Mr. Garrett.
37
38 Garrett: Move that we advance a list of 40 projects based on the ones that we
39 have seen today to the Camino Real, RLC and that at the very top of the
40 list we place any projects out of the 40 that are on an ICIP list and below
41 that we put a band of any projects of the 40 which are on the TIP funding
42 list and everything else is simply listed as it's been presented.
43
44 Doolittle: I second that motion.
45

1 Sorg: Okay it's moved, motion's been moved and seconded. Is there further
2 discussion? Trustee Flores.
3

4 Flores: I would just recommend that we eliminate anything that's no on the ICIP or
5 TIP just to make it easier because the request was for three projects so
6 that's my ...
7

8 Sorg: What projects do we have if we eliminate those two? If it's not on an ICIP
9 which as far as I'm concerned I don't remember seeing any of these on
10 the City's ICIP yet and I don't know what's on the County's and I don't
11 know what's on the TIP.
12

13 Garrett: Mr. Chair.
14

15 Sorg: Yeah, go ahead.
16

17 Garrett: If I could. I think that what this motion does is actually accomplish two
18 things that we talked about. One is that we want the RLC to be aware of
19 the projects that are in the mix from the point of view of the Mesilla Valley
20 MPO and I think that that's important for them to see the whole list of all
21 40. By also then highlighting the other two categories this will give staff
22 time to find out, to do the research to find out what's actually on an ICP, if
23 we've got it. If not, it'll just be TIP projects and so I think it will, from that
24 we'll be able to say here's a list to look at. So I think we can do both
25 objectives that we were talking about.
26

27 Sorg: Okay. Councilor Eakman.
28

29 Eakman: Yes, thank you. I appreciate everyone's view on this. I will be voting
30 against this motion because I do believe that we could advance some
31 things based on just livability issues and it's not a firm decision, nothing is
32 in concrete, but you know I would prefer to give my own three to staff to
33 see what happens and so please understand I know what you're doing, I'll
34 just be voting against it.
35

36 Sorg: Any other further comments? Questions?
37

38 Barraza: Mr. Chair just for ...
39

40 Sorg: Mayor.
41

42 Barraza: Clarification on the motion that is on the floor made by Commissioner
43 Garrett. Basically I like that idea that we'll list all 40 projects but then we're
44 going to show the trail whether they're on someone's ICIP or on the TIP
45 list, but it's going to show a history of each of the projects that we're going
46 to be listing. Am I correct in saying that?

1
2 Garrett: I'm not sure what you mean by "history."

3
4 Barraza: Well just that they're on someone's list as a project to move forward.

5
6 Garrett: Right. The motion is basically that at the very top of the list we would
7 have a band and it would be any projects that are on an ICIP. The second
8 band would take out of the 40 and put second as a grouping anything
9 that's on the TIP and that everything else would be below that. And I think
10 that the idea is that the presentation to the RLC would consist of the things
11 that are at the very top. There's not a great deal of additional analysis
12 here. We're doing exactly I think what was intended by this exercise
13 which is think about the bigger picture and how this stuff relates to the
14 livability principles and if we're not actually doing that in a rigorous way we
15 need to be doing that in a more rigorous way as we move forward so.

16
17 Barraza: Okay. And Mr. Chair I guess it's just difficult decision to make not knowing
18 the history of each of the different projects that are being presented
19 because I would want to push a project that's for the Town of Mesilla
20 forward and make that you know as one on the top as I'm sure the other
21 members here that are representing their municipality or county and we
22 would like to see those moving forward. So to me it's a difficult decision to
23 make I guess.

24
25 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle and then Councilor Pedroza.

26
27 Doolittle: So it was brought to my attention that any thing that's currently a TIP
28 project is already fully funded, so do we need to include that on a list
29 because we don't need additional funding for those projects?

30
31 Sorg: Good point Mr. Doolittle. We don't need to put that on the list.

32
33 Flores: Maybe we could put it on the bottom of the list and say this is already
34 funded, just for education purposes.

35
36 Sorg: All right.

37
38 Flores: So for educational purposes we're letting you know what we've worked on
39 and what's already being funded.

40
41 Sorg: Kind of a separate side list. Okay, Councilor.

42
43 Pedroza: Thank you. I think that we shouldn't think that the RLC is not going to ask
44 questions. Absolutely there are going to be questions, but I think that we
45 do not need to provide every single answer to every possible question
46 today. I don't see how anybody could. I think that the compromise, the

1 motion to present them all and say which ones are on somebody's wish
2 list or ICIP list, etc., will be very, very helpful to people. And if all the ones
3 on the TIP are funded, well then will certainly be information that's helpful
4 to the RLC to know. So I would not try to be all things to all people, and
5 instead just kind of present the RLC with as much information, valid, as we
6 can. Thank you.
7

8 Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.
9

10 Doolittle: I'm sorry Mr. Chair. I just have one more quick comment. Looking at the
11 list numbers 21 and 27 are the same project. So we need to take one of
12 those off. And then I also noticed on the bullets on the map that the US-
13 70/17th Street intersection although fully funded was on the map, but I
14 didn't find it on this list anywhere so I would just, I think we just need to
15 make sure that the list is truly comprehensive and there's no duplications
16 when MPO staff compiles that list.
17

18 Sorg: Good point. Thank you.
19

20 Garrett: Mr. Chair, I'll take that as a friendly amendment as well as the point about
21 putting the funded projects at the bottom of the list.
22

23 Sorg: All right. Then I think we should have a vote on the, I think we're ready to
24 have a vote on the motion. Mr. Murphy could you poll.
25

26 Murphy: Member Barraza.
27

28 Sorg: One more question. Hold it. Commissioner Benavidez.
29

30 Benavidez: Yes can you pull back the list of projects back. Can you explain number
31 37, the Rio Grande Trail from Sunland Park to Albuquerque? What is that
32 please?
33

34 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Benavidez. That is the, in our region it'd be the
35 extension of the La Llorona Trail that kind of fits into the Rio Grande Trail
36 that goes statewide that I believe Jeff Steinborn had been promoting
37 through the legislature and I think they recently dedicated La Llorona as
38 part of that system. This project list's an extension of that within the MPO
39 area.
40

41 Benavidez: And it would go through the Rio Grande, all the way from Albuquerque to
42 Sunland Park?
43

44 Murphy: It would be part of that system, yes.
45

46 Benavidez: Okay. Thank you. No further questions.

1
2 Sorg: Okay. Seeing no more lights on. Now you can poll, on the motion.
3
4 Murphy: Member Barraza.
5
6 Barraza: No.
7
8 Murphy: Member Flores.
9
10 Flores: I'm sorry, what are we voting on again? I was talking. I apologize.
11
12 Sorg: The motion.
13
14 Murphy: The motion to submit the 40 list with the friendly amendments.
15
16 Flores: Okay. Yes.
17
18 Murphy: Member Doolittle.
19
20 Doolittle: Yes.
21
22 Murphy: Member Benavidez.
23
24 Benavidez: No.
25
26 Murphy: Member Pedroza.
27
28 Pedroza: Yes.
29
30 Murphy: Member Eakman.
31
32 Eakman: No.
33
34 Murphy: Member Garrett.
35
36 Garrett: Yes.
37
38 Murphy: And Chair.
39
40 Sorg: Yes. So ...
41
42 Murphy: That passes.
43
44 Sorg: Now we need to vote on the resolution itself. Any last words? Seeing
45 none. Poll the Committee Mr. Murphy for the resolution.
46

1 Murphy: Member Barraza.
2
3 Barraza: No.
4
5 Murphy: Member Flores.
6
7 Flores: Yes.
8
9 Murphy: Member Doolittle.
10
11 Doolittle: Yes.
12
13 Murphy: Member Benavidez.
14
15 Benavidez: No.
16
17 Murphy: Member Pedroza.
18
19 Pedroza: Yes.
20
21 Murphy: Member Eakman.
22
23 Eakman: No.
24
25 Murphy: Member Garrett.
26
27 Garrett: Yes.
28
29 Murphy: And Chair.
30
31 Sorg: Yes.
32

33 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

34 35 7.1 NMDOT update

36
37 Sorg: Okay, now going on. There's discussion items is the next thing on the
38 agenda. Is there any discussion items from NMDOT?
39
40 Doolittle: I gave just a relief brief update last week but officially I just wanted to
41 remind the Board that on Friday we are opening bids for the Spitz/Three
42 Crosses project. So next month I'll have an update on our potential low
43 bidder and then I'll have a better update on construction season but
44 between now and probably February our update's going to be pretty quiet.
45
46 Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mr. Doolittle.

1
2 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**
3

4 Sorg: Is there any other comments from the Committee or staff? Seeing none.
5

6 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT**
7

8 **10. ADJOURNMENT (2:00 PM)**
9

10 Sorg: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
11

12 Eakman: So moved.
13

14 Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman.
15

16 Barraza: Second.
17

18 Sorg: Second by Mayor Barraza. All those in favor say "aye."
19

20 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
21

22 Sorg: The Committee meeting is adjourned.
23
24
25
26

27
28 _____
Chairperson
29
30

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

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

<http://mesllavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

POLICY COMMITTEE

ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF December 14, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

2017 MPO Meeting Schedule

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of 2017 MPO Meeting Schedule

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

2017 MPO Schedule of Meetings

DISCUSSION:

This item is to adopt the 2017 MPO Meeting Schedule.

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-16

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2017 MEETING SCHEDULE

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley MPO's Policy Committee has the authority to adopt and amend the MPO's schedule of meetings as it deems appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the MPO's Bylaws and Open Meetings Resolution have identified the guidelines for regular, special and emergency meetings; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the 2017 Schedule of Meetings for all MPO Committees to be APPROVED.

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

(I)

THAT the proposed 2017 Schedule of Meetings for all MPO committees, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made part of this resolution, be APPROVED.

(II)

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

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

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney



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>

Exhibit “A” 2017 Schedule of Meetings

Month	Policy Committee	TAC	BPAC
January	11 th	5 th	17 th (TIP)
February	8 th (TIP)	2 nd (TIP)	21 st
March		2 nd	
April	12 th	6 th	18 th (TIP)
May	10 th (TIP)	4 th (TIP)	16 th
June	14 th	1 st	
July			18 th (TIP)
August	9 th (TIP)	3 rd (TIP)	15 th
September	13 th	7 th	
October	11 th	5 th	17 th (TIP)
November	8 th (TIP)	2 nd (TIP)	21 st (if needed)
December	13 th	7 th	
January 2018	10 th	4 th	16 th (TIP)

Policy Committee Meetings for January – June 2017 and January 2018

Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Policy Committee Meetings for August – December 2017

Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings for January – June 2017 and January 2018

Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard

Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings for August – December 2017

Place: City Council Chambers, 700 North Main Street

Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meetings 2017

Place: County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard

Time: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

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
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF December 14, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM:

6.2 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Out-of-Cycle TIP Amendment Request Letter from NMDOT

DISCUSSION:

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

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

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00160	2017	NMDOT	Valley Drive – Picacho to CLC Limits	Road Reconstruction and ADA Improvements	Added \$1.4 Million in FY2017 for Preliminary Engineering

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



November 28, 2016

Councilor Gill Sorg
Mesilla Valley MPO Policy Committee Chair
700 North Main Street
Las Cruces, NM 88001

RE: Request for Out-of-Cycle TIP Amendment

Dear Council Sorg,

This letter is a request for an Out-of-Cycle TIP Amendment for the Valley Drive project, control number LC00160. The reason for the Out-of-Cycle request is because this funding was mistakenly left off the TIP Amendment request for the November 9, 2016 Policy Committee meeting. In order to keep the scheduled let date of May 19, 2017, NMDOT will need this Amendment processed as soon as possible.

The requested amendment is to add \$1.4M for preliminary engineering to complete the final design phase of the project. This amount is in addition to the \$15.4M already programmed in the TIP for this project making the amended project total \$16.8M.

If you have any questions or concerns about this request please don't hesitate to contact me at (575) 525-7358 or Jolenem.Herrera@state.nm.us.

Thank you for your consideration of this time sensitive matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jolene Herrera".

Jolene Herrera
NMDOT Urban & Regional Planner

CC: Tom Murphy, MVMPO Officer
Andrew Wray, MVMPO Transportation Planner
Trent Doolittle, NMDOT District 1 Engineer

Susana Martinez
Governor

Tom Church
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners

Ronald Schmeits
Chairman
District 4

Dr. Kenneth White
Secretary
District 1

David Sepich
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Butch Mathews
Commissioner
District 5

Jackson Gibson
Commissioner
District 6

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-17

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the NMDOT has requested an Out-of-Cycle amendment to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

WHEREAS, NMDOT has provided the required Out-of-Cycle amendment justification letter; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its December 1, 2016 meeting; and

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

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

(I)

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

(II)

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

(III)

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

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

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 16-18

A RESOLUTION RESCENDING THE CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM OF MPO PROJECT PRIORITIES (RESOLUTION 16-15) AND ADVISING THE CAMINO REAL CONSORTIUM OF NEW MPO PROJECT PRIORITIES

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

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization developed a list of regionally significant projects as part of Transport 2040: Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, the Camino Real Consortium requested a list of project priorities from the Mesilla Valley MPO; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee developed a list of recommended list of projects and submitted it to the Camino Real Consortium (see Resolution 16-15);

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has reconsidered the list of recommended list of projects recommended to the Camino Real Consortium and developed a revised list of recommended projects (see Exhibit "A");

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

(I)

THAT the revised project list as shown in Exhibit "A" attached replaces the previous list in Resolution 16-15.

(II)

THAT the revised project list Exhibit "A" be submitted to the Camino Real Consortium as the recommend list of projects;

(III)

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

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

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

Exhibit "A"

Location	Issue/Improvement	Status
ITS Implementation	ITS Signal Coordination Plan for City of Las Cruces	\$3.5M funded by City Hold Harmless GRT
Roadrunner Parkway (US 70 to Lohman)	Redesign as a Complete Street	Applied to CLC ICIP
Spruce (Main to Triviz)	Road diet	Applied to CLC ICIP
Walton (Lohman to Griggs)	Road diet	Applied to CLC ICIP
Idaho	Road diet	Applied to CLC ICIP
Walnut (Lohman to Griggs)	Road diet	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority/ Applied to CLC ICIP
Missouri/Roadrunner Extension to Sonoma Ranch	Connection of Missouri/Roadrunner to Sonoma Ranch	Phase A report adopted
Sonoma Ranch	Sonoma Ranch Study Area	MPO UPWP FY18 (\$200K State Planning and Research (SPR)funds)
Connection to Bosque Park	Improve Calle del Norte bridge crossing	Proposed Tier 1 Trail System Priorities Plan
South Side of Tortugas Hill (A Mountain)	Multi-Use Path	On BLM Land
Melendres	Bike Boulevard	MPO Coord. w/CLC
Carver Road	Shoulders	MPO Coord. w/DAC

US 70/North Main bridge widening	Bridge not wide enough for bicycle lanes or pedestrians	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
Las Alturas (University to Mesquite Interchange)	Road deterioration and bicycle lanes/shoulders	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
Stern	Road deterioration and bicycle lanes/shoulders	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
Griggs	Wide street needs bicycle lanes for traffic calming	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
Alameda Arroyo	Designated Trail	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
Las Cruces Arroyo South Fork	Designated Trail	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
South Main (Downtown to University)	Shoulder work for bicycle facility	Tier 1 Bicycle Priority
Engler Interchange	Requires Interstate Access Request	Engler grade separation project allotted for future interchange geometry
Arrowhead Interchange at I-10	Requires Interstate Access Request – I-10/I-25 IAR considered possible future interchange at Arrowhead	A new IAR will be required for future interchange geometry
Brazitos Interchange at I-10	Requires Interstate Access Request	Potential location identified during I-10 widening (2010)
El Paseo and Idaho	Safety Improvements	MPO Coord. w/CLC
Intersections	Adapting intersection striping for bicycle use per NACTO guidelines	MPO Coord. w/Jurisdictions
El Paseo	El Paseo Complete Street Implementation	MPO Coord. w/CLC

Town of Mesilla	Sidewalk assessment	MPO Coord. w/TOM
Sidewalks	Asset Management on Sidewalks	MPO Coord. w/Juridictions
Sidewalks	Improvements leading to ZTrans bus stop on East Mesa	MPO Coord. w/ZTrans
Sidewalks	Improvements leading to RoadRUNNER bus stops	MPO Coord. w/RoadRUNNER
Hadley	Hadley bicycle boulevard	MPO Coord. w/CLC
Boutz	Installation of bike lanes	MPO Coord. w/CLC
State Bike Route 7	Reroute State Bike Route 7 off US 70	MPO Coord. w/NMDOT
RoadRUNNER Transit	Relocate Mesilla Valley Mall Transfer Point	MPO Coord. w/RoadRUNNER

Projects Already Funded/on TIP

Location	Issue/Improvement	Status
Triviz Grade Separation at University	Interchange Redesign	MPO Coord. w/NMDOT
West Mesa Corridor Study	Study of potential West Mesa Road	MPO Coord. w/NMDOT
University	Pedestrian crossing improvements on University	MPO Coord. w/CLC
Rio Grande Trail	Portion of statewide trail from Albuquerque to Sunland Park	MPO Coord. w/CLC

Short Range Transit Plan	Implement findings of short range transit plan	MPO Coord. w/RoadRUNNER
--------------------------	--	-------------------------

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE

EL PASO MPO INFORMATION FORM FOR THE TPB MEETING OF November 18, 2016

INFORMATION REPORT:

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

DISCUSSION:

The El Paso Metropolitan Transportation Board met on November 18, 2016.

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

Trent Doolittle, NMDOT D1 Engineer

Mayor Diana Trujillo, City of Anthony, NM

Representative Bealquin Gomez, New Mexico State Representative, District 34

New Mexico Related Items

There were no New Mexico related items discussed at this meeting.