



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AMENDED AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **March 19, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.** in the **Doña Ana Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Boulevard**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Las Cruces MPO website](http://lcmpoweb.las-cruces.org).

The Las Cruces MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Las Cruces MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Las Cruces MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 528-3016 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 528-3016 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 4.1. October 16, 2012 Minutes _____ **Chair**
5. **ACTION ITEM** _____
 - 5.1. 2014 - 2019 Transportation Improvement Program _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. Urbanized Area Boundary Adjustment _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 6.1. BPAC Subcommittee _____ **Chair**
7. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
 - 7.1. Local Projects update _____ **CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff**
 - 7.2. NMDOT Projects update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
9. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory
5 Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held
6 October 16, 2012 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government
7 Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
10 Sean Higgins (Dona Ana County Rep)
11 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT rep)
12 David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)
13 Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)
14 Jerry Cordova (City of Las Cruces Rep)
15 Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)
16 Eric Liefeld (Town of Mesilla Citizens Rep)
17 Willie Roman (City of Las Cruces Rep)
18

19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Albert Casillas (Dona Ana County Citizen Rep)
20 Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)
21

22 **STAFF PRESENT:** Andy Hume (MPO staff)
23 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
24

25 **1. CALL TO ORDER**
26

27 Meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m.
28

29 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
30

31 David Shearer motioned to approve the agenda.
32 Sean Higgins seconded the motion.
33 All in favor, motion passes.
34

35 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No public comment
36

37 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
38

39 **4.1. October 18, 2011**
40

41 Andy stated that staff completed an audit of the MPO minutes and staff did find that the
42 October 18th minutes had not been acted upon and that is why they have been brought
43 forward to this meeting but the audit did reveal that all the other meeting minutes were
44 caught up on.
45

46 Jerry Cordova motioned to approve the minutes of October 18, 2011.

1 Mark Leisher seconded the motion.

2 All in favor, motion passes (6-0-1 absention)

3 Someone (name not given) abstained from voting because he was not present at the
4 October 18, 2011 meeting.

5
6 **4.2. May 15, 2012**

7
8 Sean Higgins motioned to approve the minutes of May 15, 2012.

9 Jolene Herrera seconded the motion.

10 All in favor, motion passes (7-0)

11
12 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

13
14 **5.1. 2013 MPO Meeting Calendar**

15
16 This is a request to recommend adoption of the 2013 MPO Meeting Schedule and the 2013-
17 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Schedule to the Policy
18 Committee. The BPAC is scheduled to meet on a bimonthly basis. Additional meetings are
19 proposed for April and July in case TIP amendments are requested by the New Mexico DOT,
20 per the proposed TIP Amendment Schedule.

21
22 The 2013 MPO Meeting Schedule should be adequate to accomplish MPO business in 2013.

23
24 Andy gave a brief presentation.

25
26 Mark Leisher motioned to approve the schedule of meetings.

27 David Shearer seconded the motion.

28 All in favor, motion passes (7-0)

29
30 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

31
32 Andy welcomed Leslie Kryder to the BPAC. Leslie is filling the position that Chris Brown
33 vacated a few months ago. She was appointed by the Policy Committee at their August
34 meeting. Andy stated that staff is working on getting the Pedestrian Community
35 Representative filled that Caren Gioannini vacated. A call for interest was sent out and staff
36 will bring forward to the Policy Committee in November.

37
38 Andy stated that there is still one vacancy which is the Town of Mesilla staff representative.

39
40 **6.1. Proposed Bicycle Laws**

41
42 In 2009, a group of citizens and City staff began meeting as the Bicycle Friendly Community
43 Task Force (BFC). Since that time, the City has moved forward with a "Share the Road"
44 campaign and, in 2011, achieved Bronze status as a Bicycle Friendly Community from the
45 League of American Bicyclists.

46 One of the tasks that the BFC has undertaken is a review of the City of Las Cruces bicycle

1 laws. The Enforcement work group, consisting of Officer Wallace Downs, George Pearson,
2 and Mark Courtney, gathered bicycle laws from several Gold and Platinum level cities and
3 states and compared them to those of Las Cruces. After a thorough review of the existing laws
4 and development of recommendations, the proposed laws were refined with the assistance of
5 Deputy Chief Chris Miller and Attorney Harry "Pete" Connelly from the City of Las Cruces.

6 Here are highlights of the attached draft of recommendations:

- 7 • Overall: Simpler, clearer language
- 8 • New definitions, including "electrical-assisted bicycle," "pedicab," and "vulnerable user of a
9 public way"
- 10 • Include bicycle lane and multi-use path in list of prohibited parking places
- 11 • New section outlining passing distances and threats to vulnerable users
- 12 • Clarification of sidewalk riding
- 13 • Removal of bicycle registration requirements
- 14 • New language regarding impaired bicyclists
- 15 • Updated hand signal laws
- 16 • New language matching New Mexico's helmet laws

17
18 Andy stated that yesterday at the City Council meeting, Council brought forward the Ordinance.
19 This Ordinance will be actual law and there are two steps to the Ordinance, one is what is
20 called first read which gives everybody an opportunity to recognize that there is an ordinance
21 that is being proposed, action cannot be taken at this meeting. First read happened yesterday,
22 Council can either decide to bring it forward or to postpone it, Council decided to bring it
23 forward. It is going before Council on November 5, 2012; they can take action at this meeting.
24 Andy will be making a very brief presentation and answering whatever questions they may
25 have. Andy asked that anybody who can attend and support this Ordinance, please do so.

26
27 Someone (didn't state name) asked if November 5 would be the final step to make it officially an
28 ordinance.

29
30 Andy responded that if the Council approves it, yes and the way it is written is that it would be
31 go into effect on January 1, 2013.

32
33 George stated that on the list of changes it is explicitly listed that if you are out riding a bicycle
34 on the sidewalk, which is allowed, if you get to a roadway, to a crosswalk that you need to
35 dismount and become a pedestrian. He stated that is probably something that the public
36 should be educated on.

37
38 Jolene Herrera asked what time was Council meeting on November 5th.

39
40 Andy stated at 1:00 p.m.

1 David Shearer stated that the only reference to penalties was related to failure of a parent to
2 have their child wear a helmet, is that correct?

3
4 Andy stated that was correct.

5
6 Hume: One of the things in reviewing this in the context of the entire traffic ordinance
7 was that there were already quite a lot of, depending on the type of infraction,
8 either criminal or misdemeanor penalties that would cover what we we're doing
9 here so that is in another section and LCPD felt comfortable that whatever was
10 going in here could be covered by those. Just to let everyone know, we went
11 through virtually every single section of the traffic ordinance so even if it was a
12 section on, I don't know, freight trucks, we went through it. Obviously, we paid
13 more attention to sections that would be more applicable but actually when you
14 look at the way the resolution is worded for City Council we're actually repealing
15 and replacing sections, I think, of about three or four articles within the ordinance
16 so it's not just changes that affect the bicycle laws but they are changes that
17 affect definitions. For example, we're adding the definition for petty cab, those
18 type of things that we didn't have before and then we're also making changes to
19 other parts like we're adding bike lanes to the no parking list, kind of crazy but
20 they are not there, now they will be, so we made a lot of different changes that
21 are sort of peppered throughout but of course the bulk of them is in the chapter
22 on bicycles.

23
24 Shearer: Can I ask a further question, passing a vulnerable user and three feet if the
25 operator's vehicle is a passenger car, light truck, or bicycle, so you are saying
26 that's already in the statutes for penalties?

27
28 Hume: Yes.

29
30 Shearer: for just defining three feet or is it already defined as three feet?

31
32 Hume: No, we're defining three feet. We're also defining what a vulnerable user is but if
33 you are in a crash there are already penalties for being in a crash. Yeah,
34 whether they are criminal or misdemeanor charges there are already penalties
35 elsewhere that would handle this. All we're saying is kind of like we were just
36 talking about with trails, there is sort of a hierarchy of vulnerability when you're on
37 the road, at the top of the list are pedestrian and we've all heard of crashes
38 involving bikes and pedestrians where the pedestrian was severely injured
39 because the cyclist was going through it 15 mph, 18 mph, so we're just setting
40 up....this actually sort of addresses the pedestrian part of the BPAC that we do.
41 Pedestrians are vulnerable users and then you look at cyclists they are
42 vulnerable when compared to an automobile user and so on and so we're sort of
43 setting up this hierarchy of vulnerable users as well as saying give about three
44 feet, it's something you can eyeball pretty well, you know what you are way too
45 close but it gives something that the officers can actually write a ticket on.

1 Pearson: Now if there is a crash it is defined as less than three feet because you actually
2 hit.
3

4 Hume: You better believe it.
5

6 Leisher: Question, Mr. Chair, how did you guys arrive at three feet? Was it just a number
7 that you guys felt was appropriate? I'm just the question I'm getting it is did you
8 look at the distances that were in the other statutes for other cities.
9

10 Hume: Yeah, Mark, that is correct, that's exactly what we did. You'll notice that there is
11 actually two different measurements depending on what type of vehicle you have
12 so a larger vehicle obviously creates a larger wake, a larger air wake. It also has
13 a tendency to freak people out a little bit more when it passes closer, but in
14 general three feet was about what a lot of people had. Some had five feet for
15 everybody, some said well only really the bigger vehicles need five feet or the
16 other consideration too is if you are on a two lane road especially in a no passing
17 zone, where do we draw, I mean five feet, that means somebody has to get into
18 the other lane in a no passing zone or they can be cited, well is that really fair.
19 Well, not if it's cyclist passing somebody walking on the road or a sort of standard
20 size automobile passing a bicyclists on the road, that's not really necessary, but
21 a larger vehicle, it is more necessary. We wanted to make an enforceable law
22 about but also not be too restrictive on the different types of roads that we have
23 in the area. I hope that makes sense.
24

25 Pearson: And as far as the penalties, the reason the bounty is laid out for the helmet part is
26 because State law specifies that which is a different penalty then the general
27 municipal penalty which I believe now is \$500, 90 days in jail maximum for a
28 misdemeanor.
29

30 Hume: Something like that, I don't recall the numbers, but thank you for making that
31 clarification.
32

33 Kryder: Thought the State statute was five feet generally but I guess that's not correct.
34

35 Hume: My understanding, I don't believe the State has a statute at this point. I know
36 that's been under consideration. By the way, since we do have some new
37 people, if you wouldn't mind stating your name for the record, that way so we can
38 transcribe it but don't mean to pick on you. We were working off the current
39 traffic ordinance, uniform traffic ordinance, which is adopted by the State and
40 then cities like Las Cruces being a home rule city, we can add to it things that are
41 applicable for a municipal area. The current UTO does not have any mention of
42 any passing distance, so for us it would be creating a law which we can do under
43 our home rule status. Albuquerque has one. El Paso recently passed one, I
44 think about a year or two ago, so it's fairly consistent with those.
45
46

6.2. Recommendations for Bicycle Facility Treatments at Intersections

At the October 18, 2011 BPAC meeting, the Committee discussed ideas to address how bicycle lanes should be integrated into intersection striping designs. This is particularly an issue when there is not enough room to bring the bicycle lane completely up to the intersection or when the intersection contains a through-right combo lane.

In July, the BPAC Chair and Vice-Chair met with Dan Soriano, City of Las Cruces Traffic Operations Administrator, and me to discuss the above issues and formulate recommendations. Upon further refinement, the recommendations (See Attachment: Recommendations regarding Bike lanes at intersections) were forwarded to City of Las Cruces Assistant City Manager Brian Denmark.

- Excerpts from 2009 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
- Excerpts from 2012 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- Email from Andy Hume: Bicycle Facility treatments @ intersections
- Recommendations regarding Bike lanes at intersections
- Cost Estimate for Rinconada Median project

Andy gave a brief presentation.

Pearson: So there are some recommendations like one was to do the diagrams of all the intersections, is the City likely to follow through on that?

Hume: I submitted that as a recommendation. I have not heard whether that is going to be taken up or not but it is a recommendation that we talked about a little bit with the previous transportation engineer, traffic engineer, Mr. Soriano and he was involved in the discussion this and this was just prior to him leaving, retiring. It is something that has come up in conversation with the new traffic engineer, sitting a few rows back there, Mr. Willie Roman. It is just a matter of prioritizing this into the work load and Mr. Roman has a couple of important projects that Dan wasn't able to finish up so he is taking command of those, but yes, you are correct, it was strongly recommended that take place and from a striping perspective it also would help too because we don't have to worry about wow, did the striping company really mess this up or I mean we can basically say this is the intersection we are resurfacing, here is the striping drag and follow this.

Pearson: And we'll have it in plenty of time, it's already available way before the project is even decided on probably then.

Hume: And it would also give staff an opportunity when we're, because we still meet on a quarterly basis, the Bicycle Friendly Task Force and the engineering sub-group meets together on a regular basis, on a quarterly basis to review upcoming rehabilitation and reconstruction projects, other types of maintenance projects for the roadways to see how we can integrate bicycle facilities. It would really help us when looking at these things to take a look at the intersections at the same

1 time and make a decision at that point and say based on this information our
2 understanding of this, this is how the bicycle facility, maybe you have a bike lane
3 but we don't have enough room for the bike lane so here is how we transition and
4 we can have a complete understanding because as we all know intersections as
5 you pointed out earlier, Mr. Chair, are far more complex than the segments
6 between them so we want to make sure that they do in fact get striped properly
7 and that they function well within the entire system.
8

9 Liefeld: I'm glad to see this referenced as well as it is and I think in the context of your
10 recommendations that is really the vital piece of this. It's fine to simplify this stuff
11 but we'll need to make sure that we aren't making stuff up and calling outside the
12 lines too much, from a legal standpoint the more we can lean on MUTC and
13 AASHTO and hopefully be consistent with both of them, they aren't always
14 completely but I think that's really important. I'm glad to see it and if you could
15 give a probability for stuff actually happening with the Rinconada/Northrise
16 intersection. I saw Jerry's cost breakdown. Do you have a quarter?
17

18 Hume: I have absolutely no clue.
19

20 Liefeld: Okay.
21

22 Hume: The one thing I will say and this by no means tying anybody down to doing
23 anything, the next budget cycle is coming up, we're halfway through October, is
24 coming up in about a month, month and a half, projects like this it is very
25 important if you want to see projects like this done, approach your City councillor
26 and say this is an important project and here we already have a cost estimate
27 and it's going to provide these benefits, make the pitch now because when you
28 are looking at those, I mean from a staff perspective Jerry and I can say hey
29 when we're looking at the, I mean this is only, I say only "only \$40,000", you
30 know in the scheme of a several million dollar budget it doesn't seem like a whole
31 lot but prices can change very quickly but when we're looking at the budget for
32 next year can we figure out a way to fund a \$40,000 project to fix this issue so
33 we're not left with something that's incomplete because that little stretch
34 connects Rinconada to Baton Memorial, it's a very important little stretch there,
35 so just keep that in mind as things go forward. Obviously those of us who
36 represent City staff we can't do that, but particularly those who are members of
37 our citizen group can certainly do that.
38

39 Liefeld: And what you're describing just to follow up about having in essence designs
40 kind of pre-thought out for intersections that may get reconstructive or restriped
41 or repaved or what have you and it's been one of our challenges historically is
42 that these things tend to creep up on us and just happen and once they have
43 happened it's too late for the next 10, 20 years whatever, I think that would be a
44 wonderful thing to have.
45

1 Hume: Appreciate that, yeah, you know it's one of those things that we, I feel
2 comfortable speaking for Jerry on this and you can let me know if I'm wrong on
3 this. Particularly over the past three years with the involvement of the Bicycle
4 Friendly Task Force and the involvement of the Engineering Sub-Committee, we
5 have taken what was beginning to become institutionalized and just in probably
6 about three short years just warped speed progress, so it's no longer "oh wow
7 why didn't we think of that," it's now how do we get this into the project and so I'm
8 really excited about that and so there are still a couple more steps like these
9 getting these stripping diagrams I think is going to be another step but you know
10 as far as the big elephant that we've been dealing with for many, many years, we
11 just taken a bite here and a bite there and we're getting there.

12
13 Liefeld: This is proactivity, if you can be proactive about thinking about an intersection
14 then when a project actually happens that involves that intersection you already
15 have a notion of what you want to do with it and the chances of the right stuff
16 happening is much higher.

17
18 Hume: Absolutely.

19
20 Pearson: And we are getting, this view is coming from the top down too. At City Council
21 this last session there was the El Molino project, which involves reconstruction at
22 Alameda and one of our City Councillors was, a couple of our City Councillor
23 spoke up and said well about bicycle facilities along there, so it's being brought to
24 the correct attention to be thought of which complies with the Complete Streets
25 Policy that the City has adopted.

26 27 **6.3. Bicycle Facility Subcommittee report**

28
29 During the January 2012 BPAC meeting, the Committee decided to organize a subcommittee
30 to discuss bicycle facilities. The subcommittee met on August 16, 2012.

31
32 Andy gave a brief presentation. Included in Committee member packets are the notes from
33 the subcommittee meeting.

34
35 Two goals and four strategies under each goal.

36 37 **GOAL 1: Development of Facility Best Practices**

38
39 **STRATEGY 1:** Early coordination with all agencies

40 **STRATEGY 2:** Sketching scenarios

41 **STRATEGY 3:** Education and encouragement to use best practices

42 **STRATEGY 4:** Amendment to Transport 2040 as Appendix

1 **GOAL 2: Identify Deficient Facilities**

2
3 **STRATEGY 1:** Early coordination with all agencies

4 **STRATEGY 2:** Identify deficiencies through data collection and analysis, to the extent
5 possible

6 **STRATEGY 3:** Categorize proposed improvements (projects)

7 **STRATEGY 4:** Offer as amendment to Transport 2040
8

9 Leisher: One question here is Strategy 3 under Goal 1 Education and encouragement to
10 use best practices, is that an inter-agency process, is that what you had in mind
11 or does that include the public as well.
12

13 Herrera: I think we were talking more about inter-agency if I remember the discussion, it's
14 been a few months but I think once we kind of came up with the best practices it
15 was going to be to maybe educate the City, the County and the Town of Mesilla,
16 the agencies that are involved in projects. Is that what you remember, George.
17

18 Pearson: I think so because I think what the goal would be to set up the best practices so
19 that we could even add to the transportation plan as an appendix.
20

21 Herrera: Right.
22

23 Hume: Yeah, my recollection of this is that these two goals are more focused on the
24 member agencies of the MPO in providing a means by which there is a
25 discussion and I would include the DOT on the list even though they are not
26 official MPO participating member, you know what I mean, who deals with
27 transportation issues so that we have at least a basis to get together and discuss
28 these things and then we can report back to this Committee and the Policy Board
29 and the Technical Advisory Committee as well and say this is what we ought to
30 be doing, how can we implement this. It's more inward focused rather than to the
31 public because it's more technical based, not instructing people how important it
32 is to wear a helmet.
33

34 Kryder: Mr. Chair, since I'm new, is the group that has been meeting I think like on a
35 Friday afternoon at 1:00?
36

37 Pearson: We only met once.
38

39 Kryder: Oh, okay, (inaudible).
40

41 Hume: Just to let everybody know, if you are not familiar, we have obviously this group,
42 but the City has a bicycle friendly community task force and we call it a task force
43 because we have too many committees and we actually need to get stuff done,
44 so the task force meets on an as needed basis. We don't have a regular
45 schedule and the only sub-group that does is the engineering sub-group, we
46 meet on a quarterly basis. We try to sync that up with upcoming budget cycles

1 and so on. If you know anybody or if you yourself are interested, the BFC Task
2 Force handles a lot more of the implementation stuff. This Committee is more
3 concerned with policy and planning and those types of things, so each group has
4 a very important role to serve. I'm not familiar with the Friday at 1:00 p.m.
5 meeting but.....
6
7 Kryder: I don't remember the exact dates and times but there was some emails I got in
8 the last month or so for other meetings and since I'm working I can't go to them
9 but so this particular committee is a sub-committee of this group, is that correct.
10
11 Hume: The BFC Task Force, no.
12
13 Kryder: The BPAC.
14
15 Hume: Oh, yes, yes, it is. I'm sorry I misunderstood your question, yes.
16
17 Hume: And we only have two people in the sub-committee, so if there a third or a fourth,
18 I mean we don't want to make it too big.
19
20 Pearson: We have Jerry.
21
22 Hume: Oh, you have Jerry, okay.
23
24 Pearson: And Eric was supposed to show.
25
26 Liefeld: We just didn't come and Mr. Chair, I do have a and I apologize for not being
27 there. My recollection for part of the impetus for having this sub-committee was
28 to focus on a little more agile basis on specific facility issues. I just wanted to see
29 if that is still what we think it's for? There seems to be a perception that this
30 Committee was largely about planning, largely about policy and that there
31 needed to be a more agile way to address individual facilities discussion around
32 things that were developing. Hopefully, there is less need for this going forward
33 with some of the proactivity you are inserting. This still looks like a planning
34 committee to me and I'm just curious about how you see its role as compared to
35 the role of this Committee.
36
37 Pearson: The recommendations are kind of broken into two halves that we're kind of
38 working on, the best practices like defining how the intersection should look, that
39 kind of work and then the bottom half that would be a list of well this is what
40 we've got now and this is the problems that should be enumerated and pulled out
41 so that the member agencies can address them when possible, so yes.
42
43 Liefeld: Okay.
44
45 Pearson: Probably about equal weight for both of those things.
46

1 Liefeld: Okay, thank you.
2
3 Hume: And just to toss in my two cents on this. In the discussion I felt that there was,
4 you know when you're talking about facility best practices you are talking about
5 technical issues really not as much planning. The same thing with looking at
6 deficient facilities you're looking at more at the technical and implementation
7 aspects rather than planning, which that is the role of this larger Committee is to
8 deal with planning and policy recommendations and so on but we didn't want end
9 up with a whole heap of goals. We want to keep it streamlined but also flexible
10 enough that if there was something it could maybe fit under one of these two
11 categories. If we need a third goal by all means let's suggest one but at the
12 same time we wanted to keep it manageable because this is going to be a sub-
13 committee and I agree with your earlier statement, Eric, keeping it agile, you get
14 too bogged down with too many things it's not agile.
15
16 Liefeld: You want an ad hoc, you want to be able to meet on short notice, you want to get
17 it together without having all of the stuff that comes along with this larger....
18
19 Hume: And we're glad to have Jerry involved in that because of issues like maintenance,
20 rehabilitation of roadways, we now have a really great link if we identify deficient
21 facilities to work with Jerry, same with working Jolene from the DOT, if we
22 identify something we have direct links through the sub-committee, so I'm really
23 excited about the possibilities of the sub-committee.
24
25 Liefeld: For what it's worth I'm happy to participate in the future.
26
27 Pearson: Something we left open at the Committee meeting was the next time the sub-
28 committee would meet with staff changes coming up, which you'll talk to us about
29 shortly, maybe we could design that as something for the new staff to pull us
30 together and continue the work of this committee then.
31
32 Hume: I think one of the things, Mr. Chair, coming up, you know we're halfway through
33 October, we have essentially three months' worth of holidays coming up, maybe
34 a good thing to do is start fresh in January 2013; hopefully by then staffing issues
35 will be worked out and certain things will be transitioned over and we can talk
36 about more of those things in just a little bit, but with the bike laws coming up and
37 I'm still heading up the work on the development standards, which is going
38 include an almost complete rewrite of the roadways and everything, we're still
39 working on that. We've got a lot going on that we'll keep everybody informed on
40 already so to add this on top of all of that, maybe it might be best to pick it up
41 fresh in January.
42
43 Pearson: That sounds good.
44
45
46

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Hume: Mr. Chair, staff has just a couple of comments. First of all, one thing I failed to note in the calendar is that we will continue to meet here unless there is anything that comes open. This seems to be a consistently, aside from this evening I guess we had a little bit of difficulties getting in, but it seems to be a good location for everybody, I think for the most part. If there are any problems we'll let you all know ahead of time and then this is my last BPAC meeting. I say that with a little note of sadness. It's been an excellent 11 years working with you all. We've had our ups and downs and we've had our bumps in the road, hahaha, pun intended, but just last week I started my new position as senior planner, heading up the housing and family services section over at Community Development. I'm not far away; I'm just a couple rows over. I'm still helping with MPO because we don't even have the two positions posted yet. It's already been six weeks but hopefully it will happen soon. Sorry for editorializing. So I'm going to be around. What I imagine is going to take place is sometime between now and the end of the year the positions will be filled and I'll help the new people get comfortable with you all. Be nice to them, okay, let's all of you be nice to them, but it's been a pleasure working with you all and I'll still be around and still be promoting bicycling and walking so thank you very much. Does everybody know Andrew? Okay, Andrew is doing a fantastic job. I mean we lost Duane. Actually Duane and I submitted our two week notices on the same day within about less than an hour of each other and it came as quite a large shock to some people but that's it, Duane is in Alaska now with the Alaska DOT and I'm over at Community Development and Andrew is doing a fantastic job doing the best he can trying to learn a lot of the things that we did and help with the transition and stuff, so if you need some direct, my email is still my email so please continue and I'm still working on TIP stuff so I'm still the contact for TIP stuff and still the contact for bike/ped stuff. My phone number has changed; I am now 3048, no longer 3047, believe me it's one digit but once I'm out of the MPO it will be significant but you all know where I'm at so stop on by and see my new digs and that's pretty much everything that we have.

Pearson: Okay, I have a couple of questions or comments also. Going through the last minutes there was a comment about the \$200,000 that would be available for an MPO project of some sort and I think the asset management was looked at, is that going to happen.

Hume: Yeah, Mr. Chair, members of the Committee, actually that number has increased since we last spoke, not quite sure how it all happened but additional funding was found in Santa Fe, additional PL funds, oh I remember how it happened. Typically we get our PL funds one year in arrears so we're actually being paid out of last year's PL funds. The DOT decided they are not going to do that, they are going to release them as soon as they are available, so we will get all of, no, I'm sorry, we've been working off of 2011 funds so moving into 2013 we'll be working off of 2012 funds, everybody with me. I'm confusing myself, I'm sorry. Well,

1 what the DOT is going to do is give us our 2012 funds but also give us our 2013
2 funds that we'll still be working off of, so we'll essentially get a whole year of
3 funding in one shot. We're actually looking at trying to fund the asset and safety
4 management plan, there was another plan that we were looking at, it's escaping
5 my thoughts and then a couple of corridor studies, so we're actually looking at
6 funding all three or four of them.

7
8 Pearson: So that's going to come through the Policy Committee, the approval.

9
10 Hume: Absolutely.

11
12 Pearson: Okay.

13
14 Herrera: And Andy just to clarify so that the additional PL funds won't be I think officially
15 obligated until January but the MPO does have quite a bit of rollover funding too,
16 so there is lots of money. So again to clarify, none of those funds can be used
17 for projects, it's all just for planning, no construction projects.

18
19 Pearson: Okay and the Policy Committee has had some work sessions, maybe you could
20 talk about that briefly.

21
22 Hume: The Policy Committee actually held two work sessions in September. They were
23 actually very excellent work sessions. One, they were talking about the joint
24 powers agreement and then the most recent one we had at the end of
25 September, we were talking about better, more comprehensive inter-
26 governmental cooperation particularly looking at El Paso, Ciudad Juarez, the
27 projects going on in Sunland Park, Santa Teresa, all of those. We've got a lot of
28 stuff going on down here. If you're not aware, I know most of you are but if you
29 aren't, there is a lot of really exciting development that's going on and a lot of
30 opportunities for a great deal of economic development in southern New Mexico,
31 particular in Dona Ana County, and so the other thing that was talked about was
32 funding and just sort of for the Policy Committee and for everybody attending just
33 trying to lay it out as clearly as we can with MAP21 we are not going to get any
34 money. Our TIP unfunded list, it's just a list. There is no way at all any of those
35 projects are going to get funded. For two reasons, 1) the DOT took on a lot of
36 debt service. They did a lot of bonding and so they are paying off the bonds now
37 and the DOT is in maintenance mode with the rest of it and we can see that
38 maintenance going on with all the work on I-10, new bridges, new pavement, just
39 keeping pavement up to speed and stuff. So what we put forward to the Policy
40 Committee is if you want projects in your area and we know we need projects in
41 our area, we need to come up with a regionally based way of funding them,
42 prioritizing them and getting them done. So we talked quite a bit about that and
43 then it sort of evolved from there into what I mentioned early, the comprehensive
44 look at planning and making sure that projects that dovetail with each other are
45 well coordinated and we make best use of taxpayer dollars and so on and so
46 forth. What we have scheduled on November 7th and everyone here should have

1 received an invitation to that work session on November 7th, if you didn't let me
2 know because I invited all the Committee members. We're going to take up
3 more of that discussion. I haven't finalized the agenda yet, but what I have done
4 is invited several key people from across the border including the South Central
5 GOG, El Paso MPO, Border Planning, Homer will be there. I got a confirmation
6 from the DOT that he'll be there to talk about a lot of border planning and things
7 like that.

8
9 So we're going to open with just sort of a quick, broad brush stroke what's
10 happening for everybody's benefit and then we're going to move from there into
11 sort of taking what has been started with the Camino Real project and making
12 sure that that is expanded to, that we sort of keep that whole idea of collaboration
13 going well beyond that project, not just in geographic scope but in temporal
14 scope and then I'm hoping that we have some time to talk about the funding
15 issue. Is anyone here familiar with the Regional Transit Districts, okay I see
16 some heads shaking and some heads nodding, okay.

17
18 Pearson: They are having a public meeting tomorrow, right, is that the one?

19
20 Hume: I believe so, yes, but let just give you a quick thing. Regional transit districts
21 were setup by the State. There was State enabling legislation to establish these
22 quasis legislative boards or entities. They also have taxation authority and so
23 now there was a one-time infusion of funding from the State to get them started
24 but then it was up to the regional transit district to locate other forms of funding to
25 keep themselves going and a great example is the RTD in the northern part of
26 the State, the Santa Fe/Los Alamos area, excellent example of how an RTD is
27 going along. Ours is progressing. It started off a little slowly but it's definitely
28 gaining speed but they have taxation authority. They can go and get on the
29 ballot of other counties and other municipalities for the citizens that tax
30 themselves to provide this regional transit so we're looking from Sierra County,
31 Dona Ana County, and the municipalities therein. One of the things that I put
32 forward to the Policy Committee is what would it take to do something similar for
33 MPO's. We already have the structure in place but let us become self-sufficient,
34 instead of getting sort of, I don't want to paint the State in a bad light for State
35 employees, but instead of, it's actually the legislature not State employees,
36 instead of the legislature slapping our hand every time we ask them for money
37 and reminding us that they don't have any money, make us self-sufficient. Give
38 us the opportunity to control our destiny and tax ourselves and improve our own
39 infrastructure here in our area. How do we do that and part of it is understanding
40 the scope of what is going on in our area, that's Step 1, and Step 2 is beyond
41 really anything that any of us can do, but the elected officials can then go take
42 that and talk about what policies, what legislation needs to go through at the
43 State level to make that happen, so I just condensed probably about 2 – 2 ½
44 hours of discussion into hopefully five minutes. There is a lot more detail. I'd be
45 more than willing to share more detail outside of this setting but at the November
46 7th meeting we're going to start drilling down into some of those details. So I

1 actually think it's going to be a really exciting conversation so if you can please
2 attend and participate. I think NMSU is going to be a huge player in all of this. Now
3 the work session is for the Policy Committee, so if the Chair decides that others
4 can participate, that is up to the Chair to decide but you're being present and
5 hearing the discussion, taking that information back to your member agencies is
6 crucial or as an advisory committee discussing things here and providing
7 recommendations to the Policy Committee is also very important. It is really
8 important that you all stayed involved and connected with this discussion
9 because it is absolutely crucial from today moving forward. There is going to be
10 a certain point where we're going to run out of bicycle lanes to do with
11 rehabilitation projects, so how do we fund projects like Roadrunner Parkway?
12 Anyway, that is a lot of information and probably then it whatever time is this
13 evening than you wanted to know but it's crucial stuff coming up.

14

15 Pearson: Okay, thank you Andy.

16

17 Hume: Please Jolene or Gabby, if you want to add in anything be my guest. My
18 understanding is still rather narrow on some of the stuff.

19

20 Herrera: I just wanted to add to what you said Andy, that last time at the last work session
21 the Policy Committee members that were there really did want a lot of feedback
22 from the people that were there so it's a good way to get them to listen to all of us
23 little people.

24

25 Pearson: And a couple of other quick kind of announcement things. The 2012 New Mexico
26 Bicycle Educators Summit is going to be up in Santa Fe this year, the weekend
27 of Saturday, October 26, I think.

28

29 Hume: I think the opening.....

30

31 Pearson: We have an informal get together on a Friday, October 25. The summit is on
32 Saturday. We're also having a bike ride on Sunday and Tim Rogers is going to
33 show us around Santa Fe and some facilities there, so everybody is certainly
34 invited. Jessica Griffin is going to have a session with us. We're going to Ashley
35 Curry talk about Safe Routes to School. We're also doing some training for Bike
36 1, 2, 3 and training for League cycling instructors, so if you haven't gotten my
37 email to know where to find out more information, let me know.

38

39 Also, our local bike educating group is working with Border (inaudible) Core and
40 Optimist Club to do an event at Community of Hope on November 3, the Ride
41 Right program, where we're going to put lights on bicycles and hopefully improve
42 safety so everybody is encourage to donate funds to support the project and
43 attend and help us out.

44

45 Leisher: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to mention that I was thumbing the League of American
46 Bicyclist Bike Friendly American Guide book and I was pleased to note that Las

1 Cruces and this was alluded to in, I think, agenda item 6.1, that Las Cruces
2 received Bronze, yet again now in 2012 or is it retrospectively for 2011.
3
4 Hume: One award for four years.
5
6 Leisher: So it's again mentioned but what's even more telling is that Las Cruces is cited
7 as having more female than male commuters per the 2010 Census, which if
8 anybody follows the statistics on these sorts of things men far outnumber women
9 for commuting so I think that's a pretty interesting.....
10
11 Pearson: I thought that was interesting but then one day I was riding home and I had two
12 women in front of me so proportions are not right then.
13
14 Hume: Mr. Chair, Dave, do you want to talk about the efforts at NMSU for Bicycle
15 Friendly University or is it too premature.
16
17 Shearer: We're still beginning to develop that so I'm meeting next week to sort of solidify
18 some of the efforts there but trying to move forward on that.
19
20 Hume: Just to let everybody know, last week, Wednesday I believe it was, I had the
21 privilege; I was invited to the Sustainability Council and talk a little bit.
22 Surprisingly enough I exceeded my time. Gee, Andy is never gabby, anyway so I
23 had the privilege of talking about bicycle issues and I'm really happy to see
24 NMSU move forward in this and I offered to them and I'll continue to offer any
25 assistance that I can give as far as from a tactical perspective or from reviewing
26 your application or whatever, just let me know.
27
28 Shearer: Okay, yeah we're getting a little impetus from the student group, their coming
29 along so they are encouraging us and working with the Sustainability Council has
30 been helpful. It's good for them if we move forward too.
31
32 Pearson: What is the application deadline?
33
34 Shearer: I think (inaudible) January.
35
36 Pearson: So you think you're going to make an application this round or you going to try.
37
38 Shearer: Yes, we want to, yes.
39
40 Leisher: Since we're nearing the end I just wanted to commend you on an extraordinary
41 level of service with this Committee over the last 11 years and I know you'll just
42 as sharp and useful for the new group that you are with. Thank you.
43
44 Liefeld: Hear, hear, Andy, you have profound difference not just with this Committee but
45 with the state of bike facilities overall, the state of how the whole tone of the

1 discussion was developed and a lot of this stuff just simply wouldn't have
2 happened without you.

3

4 Pearson: I think that also includes the Bicycle Friendly Community designation. A lot of the
5 credit for that goes towards Andy.

6

7 Liefeld: Absolutely.

8

9 Cordova: Just a couple of remarks along those same lines, I'd like to thank Andy also for
10 his great leadership. It's just been pleasure to work with you on this group and I
11 think you built a lot of momentum and I challenge this whole group to keep that
12 momentum with the new leadership that we're going to get. Thank you very
13 much for that.

14

15 Also a little update, a lot of you have probably noticed the resurfacing that we
16 have going on around town, probably have gotten caught in some of our traffic
17 control, but just some updates. El Paseo will be now getting shared lanes from
18 Alameda to Boutz; we're going to have the shared lanes in there. They are
19 already there. In fact Willie's group has striped that. Thank you very much Willie
20 great job. Telshor from about the Home Depot to Spruce will be getting bike
21 lanes. That hasn't been striped yet but the resurfacing is complete. We're either
22 come in with the stripers next week so you'll be seeing the bike lanes on Telshor.
23 Also, Del Rey from US 70 to the north will tie into the bike lanes that exist there
24 are Mars, so that will be a continuous bike lane section once we get done with
25 that in a couple of weeks and then Jornada Road, we resurface Jornada Road
26 from US 70 to the north to Engler and we're not actually going to put bike lanes
27 but we're going to stripe it with shoulder stripes so that will be available for the
28 bicyclists to use as well. So just some more indication of how we're working
29 together with Willie's group and our group in Public Works and of course, with
30 Andy and the task force in implementing some of these new bike facilities and
31 there is plenty more to come in the future.

32

33 Also, I did sit on the SAC Committee for the Asset Management & Safety Plan
34 and I believe we're moving forward with that even though we only and one
35 proposer, Bohanon Huston but they are very qualified so we're going to proceed
36 with negotiations and get that going, so that should be taking shape here pretty
37 soon.

38

39 Hume: Yeah, I believe we're going to go, thank you for mentioning that Jerry, we're
40 going to be bringing forward the proposal to the Policy Committee in November
41 even though they don't make the final decision on it. We are using the City's bid
42 and contracting processes so ultimately it's City Council that makes that decision.
43 The Policy Committee obviously has three City Councillors on it that will have
44 input put on that. The final contract will get approved by City Council but we're
45 going to bring it to Policy Committee first and have that discussion that you

1 brought up earlier, Mr. Chair, about we have this pot of funds and here is how we
2 see dividing that up for that project as well as others.
3

4 Liefeld: Mr. Chair, just one final note, not to just kind of go along with the band but this is
5 most likely going to be last BPAC meeting as well after 15, 16 years at this. I
6 want to make sure the Town of Mesilla has an ability to keep some kind of
7 continuity going along with it but I'm kind of out of time with some other activities
8 and things and I just want to say I really enjoyed working with all of you, in
9 particular, Andy and Jerry. I think you guys have done huge things to bring this
10 organization along in the time that you have been here. I'm thrilled to death to
11 see DOT not only serving on the Committee but also showing up to the meetings,
12 to see the transportation officer coming to the meetings. This is phenomenal, to
13 see this kind of real integration and real communication between groups is
14 something that we only dreamed of, 15 years ago it was a very different
15 environment to say the least. George can remember some of that I think. I
16 intend to stay involved in bike advocacy. I intend to stay involved specifically in
17 facilities related things. That's something that I've always thought of facilities as
18 perhaps the best way to kind of impact behavior, good behavior ideally. I'd be
19 delighted to serve on the sub-committee if you decide that that is something that
20 a non-committee member can do and I'd be delighted to work with anyone else in
21 the community, if it's facilities related, anyway it's been a pleasure and I may still
22 come to the next meeting if there is no replacement for me so we'll see how that
23 goes.
24

25 Hume: Well, thank you very much Eric. I appreciate working with you over the last 11
26 years and I've always appreciated your institutional knowledge and your
27 perspective on sort of where we've been and how we've progressed and also in
28 many ways keeping us on task when talking about facilities because this is the
29 BP facilities advisory committee so I've always appreciated that very much.
30 From a logistical perspective, Mr. Chair, if this is in fact your last meeting if you
31 could send to me an email stating such and then we can get the wheels in motion
32 and I can meet with Mayor Barraza and certainly with your input please on who
33 you think would be well suited to fill that role.
34

35 Liefeld: Sure, I'm going to give her a little heads up and give her the opportunity to make
36 sure that she can find somebody that she's happy with. I know that the staff
37 position hasn't been filled for a while and I'm especially concerned that this group
38 still has quorum and can operate.
39

40 Hume: Actually we have changed that in the bylaws now, so it's a majority of field
41 positions so that shouldn't be an issue.
42

43 Liefeld: Awesome.
44

45 Hume: But thank you very much for all your service, Eric.
46

1 Leisher: I'd like to just add, we really appreciate the persistence and the continuity that
2 you brought to this, that also made a big difference.

3
4 Liefeld: I'm not sure Andy always appreciated the persistence but

5
6 Leisher: Oh, I didn't say anything about appreciation, well at least on their part (laughter).

7
8 Hume: It's always very helpful to have citizens back you up because otherwise you're
9 just some weirdo staff person with a lone voice, which is how it ends up
10 happening for me anyway, but still it's good to have staff or citizens rather.

11 12 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

13
14 Leisher: I have one last comment. I would like to welcome Willie to our traffic engineer
15 position.

16
17 Pearson: Could you just come up and introduce yourself a little bit and give us a little short
18 resume or something.

19
20 Roman: I thought it might happen. Mr. Chair, my name is Willie Roman. I'm a
21 professional engineer, recently hired as the traffic engineer for the City of Las
22 Cruces. I spent a few years with the State Engineer's Office when I first
23 graduated. I graduated from NMSU with my bachelor's and my master's in civil
24 engineering and I consulted for about 12 years in the private sector. I focused on
25 transportation, hydrology and hydraulics and land planning. I'm happy to be with
26 the City and be involved with this organization, thank you.

27 28 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

29
30 Eric Liefeld motioned to adjourn.
31 Mark Leisher seconded the motion.
32 All in favor.

33
34 Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

35
36
37
38 _____
39 Chair
40
41
42
43
44
45
46



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF March 19, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommendation to Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program

DISCUSSION:

Every two years, the Las Cruces MPO is required to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP outlines the 6-year program for funding of various transportation projects that receive federal or selected state funds for their completion. Through the TIP process, the MPO can also request federal funding for transportation construction projects.

CN: TL00010

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

18

NMDOT Dist.: 1 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: City of Las Cruces

Fed ID: TL00010

Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces

Length: 0 Miles

RT: Proj: RoadRUNNER Transit Operations

Est. Proj. Cost: \$2,583,406

Fr:

To:

Est. Letting:

Category: Transit

TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Project Desc.: Operating Assistance

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☒ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category									TIP Informational Years				
FUND SOURCE	2014		2015		2016		2017		4 Yr. TOTALS	2018		2019	
State Match	\$0		\$0		\$0				\$0				
Local Match	\$1,763,138		\$1,763,138		\$440,785				\$3,967,061				
FTA 5307 (Urban)	\$1,763,138	23	\$1,763,138	23	\$1,763,138	23			\$5,289,414				
Totals	\$3,526,276		\$3,526,276		\$2,203,923				\$9,256,475				

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:	TL00011	Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	20	NMDOT Dist.: 1	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:	TL00011			Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces	
RT:	Proj: RoadRUNNER Transit Fr: To:					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$361,446 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? ■
Category: Transit						
Project Desc.: Buses and Bus-related Facilities						
Project Phases: <input type="checkbox"/> Environ. Document <input type="checkbox"/> Prel. Engr. <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other						
Work Zone:						
Remarks:						

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match	\$0				\$0		
Local Match	\$56,950				\$56,950		
FTA 5309 (Bus/Facil)	\$278,050	23			\$278,050		
Totals	\$335,000				\$335,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: TL00013

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

21

NMDOT Dist.: 1 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: City of Las Cruces

Fed ID: TL00013

Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces

Length: 0 Miles

RT:

Proj: RoadRUNNER Transit

Est. Proj. Cost: \$106,286

Fr:

To:

Est. Letting:

Category: Transit

TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Project Desc.: Support Equipment and Facilities

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☒ Other

Work Zone: Reg. Sig.

Remarks: Admin Adjust

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category										TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014		2015		2016		2017		4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match	\$0		\$0		\$0				\$0		
Local Match	\$23,436		\$23,436		\$23,436				\$70,309		
FTA 5307 (Urban)	\$93,745	23	\$93,745	23	\$93,745	23			\$281,235		
Totals	\$117,181		\$117,181		\$117,181				\$351,544		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: TL00014

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

22

NMDOT Dist.: 1 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: City of Las Cruces

Fed ID: TL00014

Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces

Length: 0 Miles

RT:

Proj: RoadRUNNER Transit Facilities

Est. Proj. Cost: \$771,875

Fr:

To:

Est. Letting:

TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Category: Transit

Project Desc.: Maintenance and Operations Center Design

Project Phases: ☒ Environ. Document ☒ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone: Reg. Sig.

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match				\$0	\$0		
Local Match				\$840,000	\$840,000		
FTA 5309 (Bus/Facil)				\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000		
Totals				\$5,040,000	\$5,040,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: 1100830

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

26

NMDOT Dist.: 1 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: City of Las Cruces

Fed ID: 1100830

Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1

Length: 2 Miles

RT: I00010

Proj: Interstate 10 Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation

Est. Proj. Cost: \$7,000,000

Fr: MP 141

To: MP 143

Est. Letting:

Category: Highway & Bridge Preservation (4Rs)

TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Project Desc.: Bridge Replacement & Rehabilitation Project on I-10 Bridges: University Ave. 7264, 7265 (Ramp E, MP 141.82) & Union Ave 7266, 7267 (MP 142.11)

Project Phases: ☒ Environ. Document ☒ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☒ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks: CN Change from 3961; change in funding sources; additional funds: \$605,016; (9-12-12) New TIP Funding Sources; Moved from 2013 to 2014; (1-12-13) Admin Mod - Termini milepost change

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match		\$602,929			\$602,929		
Local Match		\$0			\$0		
NHPP MAP-21		\$6,489,447	11		\$6,489,447		
STP MAP-21		\$512,640	11		\$512,640		
Totals		\$7,605,016			\$7,605,016		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: **W100032**

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

7

NMDOT Dist.: 1 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: N/A not applicable

Fed ID: W100032

Lead Agency: Las Cruces MPO

Length: 0 Miles

RT:

Proj: Safe Routes to Schools Coordinator

Est. Proj. Cost: \$64,281

Fr:

To:

Est. Letting:

Category: Miscellaneous

TIP Amendment Pending? ■

Project Desc.: SRTS Coordinator position at Las Cruces MPO

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☒ Other

Work Zone: Routine

Remarks: (2-13-13) Add'l funding for FY 2013, 14

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category							TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS		2018	2019
State Match	\$0				\$0			
Local Match	\$0				\$0			
Safe Rts to Sch-Flex	\$64,281	44			\$64,281			
Totals	\$64,281				\$64,281			

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:	1100620	Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	70	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.
Fed ID: 1100620				Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1	Length: 0 Miles	
RT: I00010	Proj: I-10 Mill and Inlay Fr: MP 164 To: MP 146				Est. Proj. Cost: \$9,000,000	
Category: Hwy & Brg Pres						Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Project Desc.: Mill and Inlay						
 Project Phases: <input type="checkbox"/> Environ. Document <input type="checkbox"/> Prel. Engr. <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Other						
Remarks: New TIP Funding Sources						
Work Zone:						

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match		\$1,310,400			\$1,310,400		
Local Match		\$0			\$0		
STP MAP-21		\$7,689,600	05		\$7,689,600		
Totals		\$9,000,000			\$9,000,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:	LC00080	Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	71	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.
Fed ID:	LC00080	Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1			Length: 0 Miles	
RT: US0070	Proj: US70 Pavement Preservation Fr: NASA Rd To: Aguirre Springs Rd				Est. Proj. Cost: \$3,265,000	
Category: Hwy & Brg Pres						Est. Letting:
Project Desc.: Pavement Preservation						TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Project Phases: <input type="checkbox"/> Environ. Document <input type="checkbox"/> Prel. Engr. <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other						
Remarks: New TIP Funding Sources; Moved from 2015 to 2013						

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match				\$400,000	\$400,000		
Local Match				\$0	\$0		
NHPP MAP-21				\$3,600,000	\$3,600,000		
Totals				\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: LC00100

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

74

NMDOT Dist.: 3 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: City of Las Cruces

Fed ID: LC00100

Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1

Length: 0 Miles

RT: 000125

Proj: I-25/Missouri Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation

Est. Proj. Cost: \$0

Fr: Missouri Avenue

To:

Est. Letting:

Category: Hwy & Brg Pres

TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Project Desc.: Bridge Rehabilitation (Structure # 6825, 6826)

Project Phases: ☒ Environ. Document ☒ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☒ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks: New TIP Funding Sources; Admin Adjust - \$900,000 to Design (12-12-12)

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category							TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS		2018	2019
State Match	\$1,310,400				\$1,310,400			
Local Match	\$0				\$0			
NHPP MAP-21	\$7,689,600	14			\$7,689,600			
Totals	\$9,000,000				\$9,000,000			

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: LC00120

Las Cruces MPO - PIN:

81

NMDOT Dist.: 3 County: Dona Ana

Municipality: City of Las Cruces

Fed ID: LC00120

Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1

Length: 0 Miles

RT: 00US70

Proj: US 70 Intersection w/Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses

Est. Proj. Cost: \$5,200,000

Fr:

To:

Est. Letting:

TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

Category: Hwy & Brg Pres

Project Desc.: Redesigning the intersection of US 70 (Main Street), Spitz, Solano, and Three Crosses

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match			\$0		\$0		
Local Match			\$757,120		\$757,120		
NHPP MAP-21			\$4,442,880	00	\$4,442,880		
Totals			\$5,200,000		\$5,200,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: **Las Cruces MPO - PIN:** **NMDOT Dist.:** 3 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** Various Multiple Jurisd.
Fed ID: **Lead Agency:** Las Cruces MPO **Length:** 0 Miles
RT: **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$250,486
 To: **Est. Letting:**
Category: **TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐

Project Desc.: Ongoing MPO PL funds

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☒ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks: Ongoing distribution of PL Funds

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category										TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014		2015		2016		2017		4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Local Match	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Unassigned	\$250,486	00	\$250,486	00	\$250,486	00	\$250,486	00	\$1,001,944		
Totals	\$250,486		\$250,486		\$250,486		\$250,486		\$1,001,944		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: **Las Cruces MPO - PIN:** **NMDOT Dist.:** 3 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** Various Multiple Jurisd.
Fed ID: **Lead Agency:** Las Cruces MPO **Length:** 0 Miles
RT: **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$52,854
 To: **Est. Letting:**
Category: **TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐

Project Desc.: Ongoing distribution of 5303 Funds

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☒ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks: Ongiong distribution of 5303 funds

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category										TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014		2015		2016		2017		4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Local Match	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Unassigned	\$52,854	00	\$52,854	00	\$52,854	00	\$52,854	00	\$211,416		
Totals	\$52,854		\$52,854		\$52,854		\$52,854		\$211,416		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	84	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.
Fed ID:				Lead Agency: Las Cruces MPO		Length: 0 Miles
RT:	Proj: MPO TAP Funds Fr: Las Cruces MPO					Est. Proj. Cost: \$837,611
				To:		Est. Letting:
	Category:					TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>

Project Desc.: Ongoing distribution of MPO TAP funds

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks: Ongoing distribution of MPO TAP funds

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category										TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014		2015		2016		2017		4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Local Match	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		
Unassigned	\$837,611	00	\$837,611	00	\$837,611	00	\$837,611	00	\$3,350,444		
Totals	\$837,611		\$837,611		\$837,611		\$837,611		\$3,350,444		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	85	NMDOT Dist.: 1	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.
Fed ID: 110570				Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1	Length: 0 Miles	
RT:	Proj: US 70 Aguirre Springs Pavement Preservation Fr: MP 166.5 To: MP 177.8					Est. Proj. Cost: \$3,500,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category: Hwy & Brg Pres						
Project Desc.: US 70 Aguirre Springs to County Line MP 166.25 - 177.8 Pavement Preservation						
Project Phases: <input type="checkbox"/> Environ. Document <input type="checkbox"/> Prel. Engr. <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other						
Work Zone:						
Remarks:						

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match					\$0	\$0	
Local Match					\$0	\$509,600	
NHPP MAP-21					\$0	\$2,990,400	06
Totals					\$0	\$3,500,000	

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	49	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces		Length:	0 Miles
RT:	Proj: Fuel Farm Upgrade Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Est. Proj. Cost: \$370,000
	To:					Est. Letting:
	Category: Misc					TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Project Desc.: Fuel Farm Upgrade - Construction						

Project Phases:
 ☐ Environ. Document
 ☐ Prel. Engr.
 ☐ Design
 ☐ Right-of-way
 ☐ Construction
 ☐ Other
 Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category							TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS		2018	2019
State Match	\$0				\$0			
Local Match	\$500,000				\$500,000			
FAA	\$500,000	00			\$500,000			
Totals	\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000			

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: **Las Cruces MPO - PIN:** **NMDOT Dist.:** 3 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** City of Las Cruces
Fed ID: **Lead Agency:** City of Las Cruces **Length:** 0 Miles
RT: **Proj:** Terminal Apron C Rehab-Construction **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$7,000,000
Fr: Las Cruces International Airport **To:** **Est. Letting:**
Category: Misc **TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐
Project Desc.: Terminal Apron C East/West Rehab-Construction
Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other **Work Zone:**
Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match	\$0				\$0		
Local Match	\$87,500				\$87,500		
FAA	\$1,662,500	04			\$1,662,500		
Totals	\$1,750,000				\$1,750,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	58	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Security Fence Rehab Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$500,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category: Misc						
Project Desc.: Fence Rehabilitation and Gates						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match				\$0	\$0		
Local Match				\$25,000	\$25,000		
FAA				\$475,000 00	\$475,000		
Totals				\$500,000	\$500,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	59	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Airport Maintenance Equipment Facility Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$2,100,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category: Misc						
Project Desc.: Construction						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match				\$0	\$0		
Local Match				\$105,000	\$105,000		
FAA				\$1,995,000 01	\$1,995,000		
Totals				\$2,100,000	\$2,100,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	60	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Runway 8-26 Extension Phase I Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$500,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category: Misc						
Project Desc.: Runway 8-26 Extension Phase I Environmental Assessment						
Project Phases: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environ. Document <input type="checkbox"/> Prel. Engr. <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Other						
Remarks:						Work Zone:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match					\$0	\$0	
Local Match					\$0	\$25,000	
FAA					\$0	\$475,000	20
Totals					\$0	\$500,000	

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	61	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: City Hanger Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$300,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category: Misc						
Project Desc.: Design and Construction						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks: Per C. Rodriguez 3/7/13 removed from TIP

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
Local Non-Match		\$300,000 01			\$300,000		
Totals		\$300,000			\$300,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	64	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Runway 8-26 Extension Phase II Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$600,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
To:						
Category: Misc						
Project Desc.: Runway 8-26 Extension Phase II Design						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match					\$0		\$15,000
Local Match					\$0		\$15,000
FAA					\$0		\$570,000
Totals					\$0		\$600,000

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CN: **Las Cruces MPO - PIN:** **NMDOT Dist.:** 3 **County:** Dona Ana **Municipality:** City of Las Cruces
Fed ID: **Lead Agency:** City of Las Cruces **Length:** 0 Miles
RT: **Est. Proj. Cost:** \$1,250,000
 To: **Est. Letting:**
Category: Misc **TIP Amendment Pending?** ☐

Project Desc.: Design and Construction

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match				\$0	\$0		
Local Match				\$64,000	\$64,000		
FAA				\$1,216,000 01	\$1,216,000		
Totals				\$1,280,000	\$1,280,000		

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	67	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Runway 8-26 Extension Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$10,300,000 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category: Misc						
Project Desc.: Runway 8-26 Extension Construction						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match					\$0		\$267,750
Local Match					\$0		\$267,750
FAA					\$0		\$10,174,500
Totals					\$0		\$10,710,000

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	78	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Rehabilitate Runway 8-26 - Design Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$0 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category:						
Project Desc.: Design						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☒ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☐ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category							TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS		2018	2019
State Match			\$0		\$0			
Local Match			\$27,750		\$27,750			
FAA			\$527,250	06	\$527,250			
Totals			\$555,000		\$555,000			

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
--	--	---

CN:		Las Cruces MPO - PIN:	80	NMDOT Dist.: 3	County: Dona Ana	Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Fed ID:		Lead Agency:	City of Las Cruces			
RT:	Proj: Rehabilitate Runway 8-26 Construction Fr: Las Cruces International Airport					Length: 0 Miles Est. Proj. Cost: \$0 Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? <input type="checkbox"/>
Category:						
Project Desc.: Rehabilitation						

Project Phases: ☐ Environ. Document ☐ Prel. Engr. ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-way ☒ Construction ☐ Other

Work Zone:

Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category						TIP Informational Years	
FUND SOURCE	2014	2015	2016	2017	4 Yr. TOTALS	2018	2019
State Match		\$0			\$0		
Local Match		\$168,000			\$168,000		
FAA		\$3,192,000	00		\$3,192,000		
Totals		\$3,360,000			\$3,360,000		



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF March 19, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 Urbanized Area Boundary Adjustment

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommendation to the Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Maps to be shown at the meeting

DISCUSSION:

After each Census MPOs may adjust their Urbanized Area (UZA) based on projected conditions. In January TAC began the discussion of adjusting the UZA for the Las Cruces Urbanized Area. While the adjusted UZA is due to FHWA in June 2014, the NMDOT is undergoing a Functional Classification update and has requested that the MPO complete its adjustment by May 2013.

Proposals for adjusting the Las Cruces UZA include:

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

Legend

- RoadRUNNER Routes
- Existing LC UZA Boundary
- Proposed LC UZA Boundary (updated)

