MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting to be held on October 15, 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 Mesilla Valley MPO website.

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 listed above. Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Las Cruces: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).

1. CALL TO ORDER ____________________________________________ Chair
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA ___________________________________ Chair
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES ____________________________________ Chair
   3.1. March 19, 2013 _________________________________________
   3.2. May 21, 2013 __________________________________________
   3.3. August 20, 2013 _________________________________________
4. PUBLIC COMMENT ________________________________________ Chair
5. ACTION ITEMS ______________________________________________
   5.1. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments __________ MPO Staff
   5.2. Recommendation to Policy Committee of Bike/Ped Contact Resolution __ MPO Staff
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS __________________________________________
   6.1. Asset Management Presentation ___________________________ Denise Weston, AICP
7. COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS _____________________________
   7.1. Local Projects update ________________________________ CLC, DAC, TOM, NMSU Staff
   7.2. NMDOT Projects update ________________________________ NMDOT Staff
8. PUBLIC COMMENT __________________________________________ Chair
9. ADJOURNMENT ____________________________________________ Chair
10. PARK RIDGE WORK SESSION ________________________________ Chair
The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held March 19, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)  
                   Sean Higgins (Dona Ana County Rep)  
                   Jolene Herrera (NMDOT rep)  
                   Jerry Cordova (City of Las Cruces Rep)  
                   David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)  
                   Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Community Rep)  
                   Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla)  

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Albert Casillas (Dona Ana County Citizen Rep)  
                  Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)  
                  Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)  
                  Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)  

STAFF PRESENT:  Andrew Wray (MPO staff)  
                Ezekiel Guza (MPO staff)  
                Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO staff)  

1. CALL TO ORDER  
Meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.  

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
David Shearer motioned to approve the agenda as is.  
Jerry Cordova seconded the motion.  
ALL IN FAVOR.  

3. PUBLIC COMMENT - none  

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
4.1. October 16, 2012 Minutes  
Jerry Cordova motioned to approve the minutes as is.  
Jolene Herrera seconded the motion.  
ALL IN FAVOR.  

5. ACTION ITEM  


5.1. 2014 – 2019 Transportation Improvement Program

Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.

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.

Jolene Herrera motioned to approve the recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Jerry Cordova seconded the motion.

ALL IN FAVOR

5.2. Urbanized Areas Boundary Adjustment

Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.

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.

George Pearson asked if the UZA was tied to the City limits.

Andrew Wray said it is purely a census tract.

George Pearson asked if the Centennial High School area was included.

Andrew Wray said the Centennial High School is included in the UZA.

George Pearson requested clarification regarding the use of the UZA.
Andrew Wray stated that it relates to funding that particular facilities can be eligible for. The distinction is between urban and rural funding and if it is within the Urban Boundary then it is eligible for urban funding, which seems to be a little bit more plentiful than the rural.

Sean Higgins asked if it included the Las Cruces Outfall Channel and the extension of the trail north of Picacho. After general discussion it was agreed that this area is not in the UZA.

Andrew Wray said that the entirety of Picacho already qualifies as an Urban Corridor so to include the Las Cruces Outfall Channel and the trail north of Picacho would not be necessary.

Jolene Herrera said the UZA map is specifically about roadways so it is important to get the corridors where it affects the transit funding.

George Pearson asked if the area was far enough south to impact with the Regional Transportation District.

Jolene Herrera said the El Paso MPO takes care of the planning of the transit funding for that section south of Las Cruces. Berino Road is the boundary of the two Districts. The two UZAs butt against each other so there’s no portion in between Las Cruces and El Paso headed south that’s left out of a UZA.

Someone (did not state name) asked why the Talavera area was not included.

Andrew Wray said the residents may want to keep the rural character of the community. He will forward the question to Tom Murphy.

Someone (did not state name) noted it is based on the census tract and due to the size of the tract it does not average out to 1,000 per square mile.

Jerry Cordova said we should include the area because the area around the Airport is already included and the Talavera area might help get more transit funding.

George Pearson said it might help impact spending on Dripping Springs, which is the feeder for that area.

Andrew will pass the questions to Tom Murphy for a response.

Jolene Herrera clarified Mr. Cordova’s comment about the Airport. Even though it doesn’t have the density it is a major employment center so those have to be included in the UZA Boundaries as well. Anything that generates a lot of traffic flowing into and out of the UZA is included.
Jerry Cordova noted that Talavera and Dripping Springs Road are high traffic generators as well.

David Shearer asked about the “dog leg” that goes westward south of the golf course then jogs back.

Andrew Wray said that was based on the census tracts. The NMSU Golf Course was included as a trip generator by the TAC.

Jolene Herrera noted that adjustments are made following roadways or major landmarks so that they’re easily identifiable for the Census Bureau. The line may look arbitrary but it probably followed something that they considered a landmark.

George Pearson requested a motion to send the item to the Policy Committee with comments attached.

Jerry Cordova made the motion to submit to the Policy Committee. Sean Higgins seconded the motion. ALL IN FAVOR.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1. BPAC Subcommittee

George Pearson said there will be a Subcommittee and the members are: George Pearson, Jolene Herrera, Jerry Cordova and Sean Higgins

David Shearer asked for clarification on the purpose of the Subcommittee.

George Pearson said there are two goals: one is to make a recommendation for best practices for lane markings at intersections and the other is to identify some problem intersections that we have in the MPO area for future consideration as projects come up. The idea is that the Subcommittee will submit those areas as the appendices to the Transportation Plan. Information will be passed to the Policy Committee for consideration.

David Shearer asked to be included in the Subcommittee.

Andrew Wray suggested setting up a work session for the Subcommittee.

George Pearson suggested using the regular April 15th meeting as the work session.

Jolene Herrera said the DOT will be providing safety funding to each one of the MPOs to program so these are the types of projects that would be a good thing to find with that safety money. So it is important that the Subcommittee move quickly and come up with the list of projects so that we are ready to spend the money when it comes.
7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

George Pearson noted that the Town of Mesilla Citizen Representative is open.

Andrew Wray said that Mayor Barraza has sent out feelers to find a new representative.

George Pearson asked about the Transportation Alternatives Program funding which was allocated to the MPO, how would it be programmed and how will projects be identified to use the available funds.

Jolene Herrera said it was discussed at the MPO Quarterly meeting. Fifty percent of the TAP money has to be allocated by population per Map 21. The other fifty percent is what will be flexible and given to the MPOs and RPOs based on some other funding formula. There are still a couple of scenarios about how much money each of the MPOs are going to receive. As far as the process for selecting projects, there will be one process for the entire state so each of the MPOs and RPOs will all use the same process. The State is charged with coming up with that process. It is still in draft form and we have to keep in mind that Map 21 requires performance measures to be included so we are trying to figure out how to include performance measures when we still don’t have what the national performance measures will be. If it changes at the national level then we will have to go back and make some changes.

George Pearson said there are still previous projects hanging out there.

Jolene Herrera said the performance measures are critical and they are trying to figure out how to give them values or, as an example, rate environmental justice versus another performance measure and how to make them quantitative instead of qualitative. Although the MPOs and RPOs throughout the state are vastly different they will all have to use the same ranking process. She provided a draft of what the ranking form would look like to be available to the Subcommittee. She requested feedback and comments.

Jolene Herrera noted that the way the program is set up through Map 21 it is to find shovel-ready projects but we can’t limit it to projects that need design money. There is confirmation that each of the MPOs will be receiving money.

David Shearer said NMSU is moving forward toward a bike friendly campus and gave a brief update of improvements. He provided a presentation. Pedestrian issues are also being addressed by lowering speed limits on some of the streets and adding signage, flashing lights at crosswalks.

Jerry Cordova recommended that Mr. Shearer work with Lisa Murphy at the city of Las Cruces Transportation Department. He recommended that mast arms be used to put indicators over the roadway instead of just on the side.

Jolene Herrera provided information on the APA Conference October 2-5, 2013 in Farmington.
She discussed the Open Container and Repeat Offender fines and why the Legislators do not support the funding going to the DOT. The Legislators do not understand that the money ($15M) does go to the DOT and instead specify how the funds are to be spent in programs. Both laws failed this year because of the confusion on how the monies are allocated.

7.1. Local Projects Update –

Carlos Coontz gave an update on the Outfall Channel Multi-use Trail. During a meeting with many members of the bicycling community earlier in the month it was demonstrated that the bollards used at the entrances to the Multi-use path are too narrow for the bicycles to get through the configuration. The engineers came up with the most reasonable configuration to keep motorized vehicles from getting on the pathway. After seeing the demonstration from the bicyclers, the second row of bollards and then there will be a minimum of at least 36 inches between the bollards that remain.

7.2. NMDOT Projects Update

Jolene Herrera gave a brief update.

- Motel Blvd. should be completed by the first week of March.

George Pearson asked if the NMDOT Design Committee would be meeting. Jolene said they had not met yet and she would forward information to him.

Andrew Wray introduced Chowdhury Siddiqui, the new MPO Associate Planner and Ezekiel Guza, the new MPO Planning Technician.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Jerry Cordova motioned to adjourn.

Jolene Herrera seconded the motion.

ALL IN FAVOR

__________________________

Chair
LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held May 21, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  George Pearson, Chair (City of Las Cruces Citizen Rep)
                    Jolene Herrera (NMDOT rep)
                    Jerry Cordova (City of Las Cruces Rep)
                    Leslie Kryder (Bicycle Rep)
                    David Shearer (NMSU – Environmental Health & Safety)
                    Carlos Coontz (Pedestrian Community Rep)
                    Jorge Castillo (proxy for Sean Higgins – Dona Ana County Rep)

MEMBERS ABSENT:   Karen Rishel (Las Cruces Community Bicycle Rep)
                  Sean Higgins (Dona Ana County Rep)
                  Lance Shepan (Town of Mesilla)
                  Mark Leisher (DAC Citizen Rep)

STAFF PRESENT:    Tom Murphy (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT:   Jack Valencia (SCRTD)
                  Griselda Velez (Zia Engineering)
                  Francisco Urueta (Zia Engineering)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m.  Quorum was present.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

David Shearer motioned to approve the agenda.
Leslie Kryder seconded the motion.
All in favor.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 January 15, 2013

Jolene Herrera motioned to approve the minutes of January 15, 2013.
Carlos Coontz seconded the motion.
All in favor.
4.2 March 19, 2013

Jerry Cordova motioned to approve the minutes of March 19, 2013.
David Shearer seconded the motion.

George Pearson stated that on page 5, line 8, there was reference to (inaudible); I think it said transportation, I don’t have the notes in front of me, artery and it should be alternatives.

All in favor, minutes for March 19, 2013 are accepted.

4.3 April 16, 2013

Jolene Herrera motioned to approve the minutes of April 16, 2013.
Jerry Cordova seconded the motion.

George Pearson stated that on page 7, line 5 and 6 stated that the Committee adjourned at 5:31 for a work session and that the work session adjourned at 6:23, he recalls that they actually came back to session for the last couple of items and then adjourned from there at 6:23 and the minutes don’t show any notation there.

Tom Murphy stated that he thought the transcribing staff stopped listening at that point. Tom said that the remaining items on the agenda could be tabled.

George Pearson stated that the items should be tabled. He asked for a motion to table.

Leslie Kryder motioned to table the April 16 minutes.
Jerry Cordova seconded the motion.
All in favor.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 Las Cruces Country Club Road Alignment

Tom Murphy stated that staff from Zia Engineering was present and they are working with the applicant for development in the property that is the former Las Cruces Club which is located at Main and Solano. It is 110 acre site and one of the items that Zia is looking to get discussion on from the BPAC is the road alignment.

Tom gave a brief presentation.

Griselda Velez, Planning Manager with Zia Engineering, gave a presentation.

Kryder: Mr. Chair, I have questions. A couple of things that I’m curious about, the main road going through here, the one that starts at Madrid at least in the original and goes up to Main Street, I guess it would come off of Solano; how many lanes wide is it and what would the speed limit be on that road?
Velez: We are proposing a speed limit of 35 mph; from Main Street here to the entrance to the hospital the fire department require that we have four lanes and so we have four lanes and a width of 100 feet from this point to the intersection with Main, just this section, after the roundabout or whatever means of intersection we have here we are going to go back to two lanes to discourage speeding.

Kryder: And there would be separate bicycle lanes on both sides all along that main route.

Velez: That is correct.

Kryder: And then the other questions I had, I didn’t see and maybe there are plans for this but coming out of this area as a cyclist I try to avoid the main routes as much as possible because of the traffic so for instance if I was coming through here from Main Street to Madrid and I wanted to stay off of that main one it would be good to have another way to get out of this development back to Madrid whether through that easement that you are talking about on the east side or some other way to get out and then to conveniently get across Madrid onto another side street, that’s the kind of thing I would be looking for as a cyclist. The same question goes getting across Solano to the west, so you have some roads that run across parallel to Solano there, the little piece of road, is there some way to create an exit there that a cyclist or pedestrian could use to get across Solano safely and then the same way north across Main Street and also east back across to the other subdivision.

Velez: Okay, let me just see if I understand correctly, so you are saying if people didn’t want to use this collector necessarily, can they get around through the development.

Kryder: Can they get out into and out of the development safely across the bigger streets.

Velez: Okay.

Urueta: My name is Francisco Urueta. I’m with Zia Engineering. Right now we don’t have the signed documents to specifically tell you exactly how we are going to address this issue, but right now if you are entering the side for instance here on Main on a bicycle and you would like to go to this development you will need to go through this road here so we would need to bring you through the internal streets through here and then through here. We mapped already like seven times with this group of owners and they don’t want any connectivity but pedestrian, probably we can tell that you advise us to connect some bicycles. I don’t see why not bicycle can mix with pedestrian so we can connect you through here. On the drainage issues, this is an existing outfall from all these runoffs that go through the existing pond here and we are going to use that as a pedestrian connectivity so we can do that right there, okay, that answers I believe your
question. The other question through Madrid, this is existing and this is going to remain. We're not going to touch it because of a lot of legal issues, okay; we're not going to disturb the existing park, baseball park, so you can’t connect through there. Eventually we’re going to have a connection between this road going here, you see it right there, and then the existing drive and if we can see that in, we’re going to have this connection. Of course, this conceptual right now but we’re going to have a connection that will guide you probably with your bicycle to Madrid. Right now, grade wise, topographic wise I don’t see an option of connecting other either cars, well we don’t know yet, we have a big differential in grade from this corner to the other corner on Main going north here, it is a huge grade differential so in order to bring somebody there it will create retaining walls, we’re not in the design process, we’ll take that consideration, we’ll let you know how we came out with that design but right now I believe you’re going to have three safe outs of that on your bicycle.

Velez: There is a light and that was one of the points that was mentioned during our staff meetings. Members of staff suggested that naming of the streets would have to be revisited so there is no confusion because right now it is confusing as it is because Madrid, east Madrid east of Solano and then we have east Madrid west of Solano and there is enough said between them and there is an intersection at both of them and so I think that is something that would be considered. At this very conceptual stage we were labeling these as Park Ridge Boulevard but that is subject to change if they think it is safer and more adequate to make it simpler and easier to understand.

Shearer: So this collector would be basically Madrid, right, the extension of Madrid as it crosses Solano. There is a light there now right?

Velez: There is a light and that was one of the points that was mentioned during our staff meetings. Members of staff suggested that naming of the streets would have to be revisited so there is no confusion because right now it is confusing as it is because Madrid, east Madrid east of Solano and then we have east Madrid west of Solano and there is enough said between them and there is an intersection at both of them and so I think that is something that would be considered. At this very conceptual stage we were labeling these as Park Ridge Boulevard but that is subject to change if they think it is safer and more adequate to make it simpler and easier to understand.

Shearer: Well I was not so concerned about what it was named. It was part of the question she asked about crossing Solano and that's a controlled intersection and you can continue on the collector straight across Solano with the light so there wouldn’t be any problem there. The problem I see is if you go to the other end to cross Main, it would be difficult because I don’t believe there is a light there now is there. There is an existing light there so there would be a way out of the development across those two major streets and through controlled intersections.

Velez: It is right and these intersections based on the increase of traffic that we are going to have because this vacant area that we’re now going to develop, this intersection may require some improvements and so that would give us an opportunity to account for pedestrian and bicycle crossing.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I’m going to piggyback on kind of what the other Committee members are saying, currently the DOT doesn’t recommend bicycles on that section of US 70/Main Street because the traffic volume is so high and the road is pretty narrow right there, the shoulder on some sections so I guess unless there are going to
be some major improvements to that intersection and you are talking about
maybe doing it all the way from the intersection with Solano to the intersection at
Camino del Rex, I don’t see how you are going to safely accommodate cyclists
going out of this development onto Main Street, so maybe if you could kind of
make that more clear when you submit show how you are planning on doing that.
Also, I wanted to just point out that the DOT has yet to receive an updated traffic
impact analysis so we have no idea what you guys are proposing for that
intersection. We saw the old one when it included Apodaca Park for a few hours
but we don’t have anything so it’s really hard to determine kind of anything until
we see that.

Velez: Yes, definitely I understand and I’m going to answer your second question first.
As I mentioned at the beginning we submitted a PUD and we were stopped in
our tracks because the City didn’t desire to do that realignment of Madrid and
relocation of Apodaca Park and so they asked us to stop our submittal until we
decided on a road alignment and the last meeting we had was on May 16 when
we finally got the blessing from the Parks and Recreation Board after meeting
with the Policy and Technical MPO Committees and so we are going to carry on
with our PUD after a meeting we are having with staff on the 23rd and we will
revise the PUD to reflect the new alignment and you are going to see details of
this intersection of course.

Urueta: And of course if we see that that intersection is not safe for bicycles we
understand that we will block that but I believe that this connection to the outfall
pedestrian is safe because it is on a small street and then it covers a city parcel
that the developer is willing to cooperate with the City to develop and make a
safe crossing for pedestrians and bicycles. Probably this will be a safer route for
everybody and we’ll promote that one.

Herrera: Right, thank you and I guess my concern is not so much about local cyclists but if
you get people traveling from out of town and they say okay well let’s take this
road and then you are throwing them out onto US 70 as head I guess east
towards I-25, it is really dangerous in there especially with the narrow bridge so
that would be my main concern about putting cyclists on 70. One other thing that
I wanted to just bring up, for I guess the record, is that the meeting with the
Technical Advisory Committee, they actually chose Option B, yeah so most of
the technical committee members to include the City traffic engineer chose
Option B. I don’t know if that was brought up at the Policy Committee meeting, I
don’t remember.

Murphy: We did state that to the Policy Committee.

Herrera: Okay, so I just wanted to let all of these committee members know that that was
the option that the Technical Committee chose, thank you.

Herrera:
Pearson: So the next phase is working on the intersection on Main, US 70 and the Madrid/Spruce area, is that plan that is underway is that going to have any impact on what they are doing?

Herrera: I don’t know, we haven’t seen (inaudible).

Pearson: So it’s something that needs to be considered.

Herrera: Certainly.

Pearson: It’s getting ready to go to bid or it’s as far along as projects go.

Herrera: The north main, I think the project that you are referring to is from the intersection of Solano all the way to now it’s going to be the intersection with Picacho and Main Street so that section of roadway will probably out to bid later this fall. The intersection improvements that will realign that funky intersection with Spitz, Spruce and Three Crosses will be done in 2016, so we’re definitely going to need to coordinate whatever roadway improvements you all have planned.

Urueta: We already had a coordination meeting with Wilson Engineers about this. We met with them several times, we have their plans. The design for this road goes up to here and the construction because funding was stopped here to the south we understand the design on this portion or system will be analyzed in this intersection as per the requirements of Willie Roman, the City of Las Cruces traffic engineer, also this intersection will be analyzed, in our original TIA this was not considered. We had a lot of commercial area in this area that is removed now, definitely this development will impact less and will generate less traffic and we will address this issue as soon as we have the go ahead to (inaudible) to resubmit.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, if I could add to some of the routing conversation. I do believe that that portion of Main Street is currently designated as State Bike Route 7 from Madrid where it intersects Main Street then turns up Main Street takes it to Triviz and then directs you to the crossing under the interstate at the north Triviz path and I do know that the State Bicycle Coordinator is revisiting that precise alignment because of some of the concerns that Ms. Herrera has raised. I just kind of (inaudible) Option A would probably lend to that rerouting, you could continue Bike Route 7 up Madrid all the way to Solano utilize Park Ridge Place, that collector take it onto Camino del Rex, which is that local street immediately adjacent to Main Street till you can get to the outfall channel and then Triviz path and then the Interstate 25 crossing, so that would be one additional benefit to Option A that I see.

Cordova: Mr. Chair, I had a question, maybe a couple of observations, you said you were only going to put a sidewalk on one side is that correct?
Velez: At this point we have proposed a sidewalk on one of the sides and a multi-use trail on the other side.

Cordova: Are you considering maybe a five or six foot sidewalk?

Velez: Original submittal is proposed four feet sidewalk with three feet parkway and it was one of the comments. We got through the first round of comments and that's when we were stopped and one of the comments from MPO was precisely to provide five feet sidewalks and that is something the developer is willing to do, so our next submittal will include five feet sidewalks instead throughout.

Cordova: Good, I was going to recommend that also.

Pearson: So in-road bicycle plus a wide sidewalk and no side path.

UNKNOWN: You did say there would be a multi-use path on one side also.

Velez: Yes, sir.

Pearson: So it has a multi-use.

Velez: Yes, so we will have, the section would be a sidewalk, parkway, driving lane, I'm sorry bike lane, driving lane, median, driving lane, bike lane and then we'll have a multi-use trail on the other side.

Pearson: I wonder if having sidewalks on both sides would be better than multi-use with the in-road facilities there because people can use the sidewalks then, if it's a wide enough sidewalk they can use it for the bicycle if they need to because most of the bicycles especially on the collector, the transportation bicyclist will be in the roadway and so it's used and then other people that aren't really comfortable being in the roadway would be on your multi-use path but that's probably more appropriate as a sidewalk unless of course it's connecting to the outfall channel but it doesn't seem that this one that would connect.

Velez: The reason and Mr. Chair, let me go back to the site plan and so again referring to our original submittal where the Apodaca Park was going to be relocated to this area, we had the intention of creating continuity between a multi-use trail that was going to travel through these linear park across this park extension coming through here and then connecting to the east side of Park Ridge Boulevard, so it made sense because it was a continuous multi-use trail. I really appreciate your feedback because with the new road alignment we have to revisit that design and see if it is worth having it as a multi-use trail or just a wider sidewalk, maybe we can instead of having one trail wide on one side we can have wider sidewalks on both sides since we are already providing bike lanes on eastbound, so we'll take that into consideration within our design.
Pearson: Okay, another thing I noticed on the alignment on the Plan A picture it wasn’t clear and maybe you explained a little more now, right now it’s a bicycle facility along Madrid that connects from Main Street to Triviz and so any bicyclist that is going through there goes through the park and with this picture it wasn’t obvious that that connectivity was still available there, but that is a bicycle facility and that is how I get from point A to point B.

Velez: Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly, this is Solano and this is Madrid, if people were traveling on a bicycle through Madrid they will still have the ability to come through this internal Apodaca Park Road and connect into this collector, so it the geometry of it might change based on the specific design but the connectivity would still be there.

Pearson: Right so that’s essential and it wasn’t obvious from the plan so for the bicycles so that’s……………

Velez: Okay and we’ll make sure we incorporate that; it’s important, thank you for the input.

Cordova: Mr. Chair, the other observation that I had and it’s at this intersection, I’m glad you have this up and I’m sure you are not done with your design and you have to look at this but it looks like there is a pretty good skew angle between Madrid on one side and the proposed new roadway, you may need to swing that out more to get that to line up better.

Urueta: The through lane coming on this boulevard through the intersection has enough area to go through here. The other one will be the right lane here and this will be the right lane in………………

UNKNOWN: But it looks like it is kind of, they are not aligning………………

Urueta: That is an angle, yes, this is an existing angle, this will be as much as we can align it and this is an existing skew angle, yes sir. We will need to coordinate this, we will need to do – on the final design (inaudible), a final survey, drawn survey of all this area but we believe based on aerial photos that we can have the two lane safe movement.

Pearson: And maybe during your design or maybe with, I don’t know who is responsible for the intersection, make sure that bicycles can be detected as they come through there because that is a problem in that intersection, that might be for the City traffic engineer.

Urueta: Mr. Chair, the good thing about these is that in this portion from here to here everything is a good level. We don’t have great differential and as you can see this is an open space. We’ll be sure that we have site angles in this intersection. This is an open space, the bicycles are going to have a safe………………
Pearson: Right now there is a lane there for going straight through that intersection but there is not good traffic detection, I don't know maybe a (inaudible) camera system for traffic detection and that will be solved with that, I don't know how much of a redesign of that intersection of the traffic signal lights you need to do for that.

Urueta: Mr. Chair, these traffic signals will be improved per City of Las Cruces traffic engineer requirements and we are already talking to him so we will bring this into consideration, we'll tell him your concern. Also, the other one if we decide that it is a safe cross on I-70 we will need to do probably the same. We don't know yet but we'll talk to Willie about it.

Pearson: The one thing to remember is that bicycles are allowed on all the roadways so you can't, except for some NMDOT roads, but interior roadways I don't think even that piece of name you could prohibit bicycles.

Herrera: No, we can't prohibit them but we strongly don't recommend them.

Pearson: Right, but if there is a recommendation local cyclists are going to figure out what is safest but like you say people traveling through need that extra guidance which hopefully working with the bike/ped coordinator at the State level maybe we can realign that whole bike lane through downtown Las Cruces and through this which might be other efforts of this Committee even in the future.

Herrera: Right and that's a conversation that we've had. Tom, I just wanted to go back to something that you said, Mr. Chair, if you don't mind. I actually don't think that that portion of 70 is the designated bike route. I'll have to go double check my map but if memory serves me correctly it does go down Madrid at some point.

Pearson: I know it turns off at Triviz off of Main.

Murphy: I believe it's on Madrid from Alameda to Main Street. At least that was the original alignment, if it's been changed since in the last six months I'm unaware of it.

Herrera: Okay, I'll have to go back and double check that because that's not safe.

Velez: Mr. Chairman, if you allow me to add, I appreciate the feedback of Ms. Herrera. We understand that although you cannot prohibit the traffic, you want to encourage safer routes and so once we get past this preliminary stage, of course, all the proper engineering studies have to be conducted to be sure that this works from an engineering standpoint and we'll also analyze what's available in terms of bicycle facilities around this site and the find the best way to connect to them in a logical way so that we at least enforce safer routes.
Pearson: Good and it sounds like you are following the Complete Street principles, which we have complete street policy in the City.

Velez: Well, we’re trying and I know the developer really wants to create a nice development. This is an upscale development that we really think is needed in this area of Las Cruces. It’s a very big development that could really encourage economic activity of the area and he is always open to input. He is, like Mr. Urueta mentioned, he has held about seven meetings with neighbors before the public meetings are required through the process and so I think he would be very happy to come back here before you when we have a more detailed plan if that is something that you would like to see and receive your feedback.

Pearson: I think we’d always enjoy seeing things before they happen because we’ve often had cases where things happen and then it’s too late to fix so a look ahead of time would be helpful.

Velez: Thank you Mr. Chair. We’re trying to avoid that too.

Valencia: Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, Jack Valencia with the South Central Regional Transit District. I hadn’t anticipated on coming up here but seeing this presentation raises a few questions that as you said that you would like to get on the front side instead of on the back side. In one of your earlier pictures you showed the bus stops that you identified within the area, has there been communication with ROADrunner Transit? Has there been contact with ROADrunner Transit to date to kind of understand what the flow of what your activity is going to be in there in order to determine what their accessibility is going to be and then secondly, is the developer or has the developer provided easements and right-of-way in order for bus cutaways and bus stops that would be located within that development?

Velez: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, Mr. Valencia, at this point we have not met particularly with the traffic authority. We will do so when we have the road alignment and I know the developer is willing to accommodate right-of-way for a bus stop if it is necessary within the development. He wants to bring people into the development and he wants to make it accessible and so that is something that would be addressed.

Pearson: Yeah, right, the Complete Streets would cover all users, vehicles, transit, pedestrian, bicycle.

Velez: Yes and that’s what we’re trying to move toward.

Pearson: And the transit is just as important as the others.

Velez: Yes.
Valencia: Thank you Mr. Chairman and I have some other questions and you can deem them out of order and I’ll go back and sit and then wait till they finish their conversation but road width under PUD, is this under City standards or is there a decreased road width requirement in the development?

Velez: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, Mr. Valencia, we are proposing a variance in the road width in our first submittal. The width that we’re proposing when we have four lanes is a 100 feet and then we’re going out to 76 feet.

Valencia: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I have some other questions and I’ll just hit them real quick. What is the zoning and dwellings, is that R3, R2?

Velez: The current zoning of the property is R1a. We would request a PUD zoning with underlying uses so PUD would be the required zoning.

Valencia: And so how many units are you with total build-up?

Velez: We are considering about 400 apartment units and probably less than 50 townhome units at this point.

Valencia: One last question with regard to the power line that you showed there and it’s a low hanging power line, are you going to underground that or is that going to be raised?

Velez: That easement belongs to Tri-State Electrical. We’ve had coordination with them. I visited the site with them in the last month, based on the requirements they are looking at acquiring a little bit more width but as it is the easement is safe. They even required making the lines higher or making them underground. The placement of the buildings is far enough from the easement so they are not worried about that. We also discussed the proposed uses under the line which as I mentioned earlier would be that of a linear park with a trail, they didn’t see a problem with that as long as their maintenance trucks have access at any time. The power poles are very separated. We have about 600 feet in between posts so that allows us to use the area and keep the grades around the existing structures to not damage them and make it safe.

Cordova: Mr. Chair, are we going to have an opportunity to see Option B just as a basis of comparison? I’m interested to see what it has that this option doesn’t and that the Technical Advisory Committee why they choose that option.

Velez: Of course, Option B as I said during the staff meetings they suggested we explore a couple of routes, the one being Option A, the other one going behind the existing ball park. There is an existing girl scout camp right behind the park which would be taken over by the road basically and this was basically the alignment and we also have this is a more detailed view of the intersection. As you can see there is a challenge in terms of existing intersection distance which
would make full movements complicated. This is an existing storage unit site
and this is less than 150 feet distance from center line to center line. We also
have a list of pros and cons we went by and I just want to say that......

Urueta: Mr. Chairman, one of the technical challenges that we will face here and
probably is the most difficult is Saxton Street, we want to prohibit left here
definitely, right in/right out only. We will need to put a barrier, physical barrier, in
some length of this street to prohibit left turns inclusive the left turn on the
existing Mall Park because the distance is so close. When you have continuous
right here, the through here, this left will be a dangerous movement so it will
correct a lot problems through the community traffic wise.

Pearson: So even from the bicycle perspective that would be more difficult than Option A
because to connect from West Madrid to East Madrid.

Urueta: Mr. Chairman, yes especially we need to raise a physical barrier here. It will
prohibit the bicycle to, we don’t know yet if we will prohibit the left but based on
the preliminary studies this left also needs to be prohibited so we’re not going to
have left anywhere so if I’m driving eastbound on my bicycle and I want to go
north I will need to go more streets and then come back through the existing
development and then go through this housing but it is not only with the bicycles
it will be also with the vehicles, with everything, we’ll correct a lot of problems.

Velez: Well, some of the benefits we looked at is it would provide, of course it depends
on the perspective of each person but it would provide the connectivity between
Main Street and Madrid Avenue as originally planned on the MPO Thoroughfare
Plan. It would (inaudible) traffic out of Madrid to Park Ridge development. It
wouldn’t impact Apodaca Park at all. The placement of the multi-family
residential development adjacent to the park would provide land use capability
without the road being in the middle. It would be consistent with the MPO
Thoroughfare Plan and as Francisco said some of the challenges especially the
technical would be the proximity of the intersection with Saxton which would
result in prohibiting most left turns in the area. It could negatively impact the
surrounding businesses because the storage unit has a driveway very close to
the corner that would probably become useless. It increases the number of
signalized intersections in the area because we would have this one and then the
one at Solano and Madrid east, west of Solano and then the one at Solano and
Madrid east, east of Solano. This would be more costly in terms of transportation
and traffic costs and it would impact more city area, not Apodaca Park but still go
through that existing pond and behind the ball park.

Kryder: Mr. Chairman, just a question for her if that’s alright. I’m just curious on this
Option B, what was the constraint that caused this thoroughfare road to have to
be here and that it couldn’t be further east. In other words, the intersection
where it comes out at Madrid, I see there are some buildings there but I thought
those were going away or something.
Velez: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is private property currently. There is a daycare and I think there is an academy so they don’t belong to our developer that is the reason why.

Pearson: Okay, well thank you for coming and telling us this because there was very useful information and we look forward to hearing more details as you get closer as is appropriate.

Velez: We thank you for the opportunity Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee and I understand it can be a little confusing with all the processes that we have ongoing but we appreciate your patience and your input will be taken into account and hopefully we’ll have a very successful development for all of us.

Urueta: Thank you very much and if you have any questions please direct your questions to Tom right now and then we will address your comments, your questions as I mentioned but Griselda will meet with City staff now to define final definition of this approach and we're expecting to resubmit the PUD information as soon as possible. The traffic impact analysis will be part of it and street sections at that time we will like to schedule another meeting with them and show them the final street sections, connectivity or even if it’s a conceptual but still it will have more detail than what we have presented right now. Thank you very much for your time.

5.2 Walk and Roll to School Day SRTS Update

During May 7 – May 10, 2013, nine schools within the MPO area participated in National Bike to School Day. The events included kids, parents, teachers, and community leaders walking, biking and rolling to schools from a remote drop off site. All of these schools saw an enthusiastic turn out and Safe Routes to School program hopes to continue building upon the momentum generated by these events.

Walk and Roll to School attendance:

- Jornada Elementary: 195 participating students
- Alameda Elementary: 140 participating students
- Mesilla Park Elementary: 13 participating students
- Highland Elementary: 30 participating students
- MacArthur Elementary: 267 participating students
- Mesilla Elementary: 30 participating students

Devashree Desai gave a brief presentation.

DIDN’T STATE NAME: Mr. Chair, I have a question, I know that I attended one of the Safe Routes to School committee meetings and there was talk about inviting some of the school districts from Hatch and Gadsden to the event. Is there a status on that?
Desai: We actually tried setting up a meeting along with the County but somehow that has been cancelled repeatedly so no more updates on that one from my side.

UNKNOWN: Well, hopefully in the future we can kind of coordinate, maybe we'll help you with what we can as well to try to just encourage some, we're particularly interested in Hatch but also in Gadsden because there are lot of different types of activities that are going on in that part of the County that are promoting pedestrian and healthy active lifestyles so we want to incorporate them where we can. Thank you.

Pearson: So the next event will be in October which is the Walk School Day so we'll have more opportunities maybe.

Desai: Yes, I hope that we do more schools than last time because last time I think we did really nice but we could have some more schools this year.

Pearson: So we have the champions hired now?

Desai: The job postings are still up because as you know we hired three but one person dropped even before joining because she had another, she got admitted to NMSU or something like that and the other person she has some family emergencies and she is away right now so we are thinking of (interrupted).

Pearson: So she is still hired but she'll take over presumably in the fall.

Desai: Yeah, when she gets back to Las Cruces but the job posting is still so if anybody is interested we are really encouraging them to apply.

Pearson: Okay and we've gotten some good publicity in the paper in the past, much more so than previous times.

Desai: Yes and also on the radio.

Pearson: Thank you for this update. I'd like if we could to forward this information to the Policy Committee so that they are aware that our Safe Routes to School activities are going forward well and getting some good response.

Desai: Yes, actually no just on that day but Alameda, Jornada and MacArthur Elementary, which the new Safe Routes to School champion is overlooking, they have continuing their walking or rolling to school each week and they are getting almost the similar numbers every week so that's a good sign, so let's hope for the best for next school year. Thank you.
5.3 TAP funds update

Jolene Herrera gave a presentation.

Tom Murphy stated that he has issued the call of projects to the executives of the governments – the school district and transit agencies. He set an application deadline to return applications to the MPO by August 12, 2013 so that the BPAC could review at the August 20th meeting and then the TAC would review at their September 5th meeting and the Policy Committee can have final approval over the list at their September 11th meeting and make the October 1 deadline to the TAP coordinator.

Tom stated that staff would be assigning the initial score and then have it verified or adjusted through the Committee process.

Someone (didn’t state name) stated that planning and design was mentioned as an eligible activity and would the match for that be a cash match or for planning specifically or for planning and design is that an in-kind match.

Jolene Herrera replied that it could probably include an incline match but she would need to verify that.

Someone (didn’t state name) asked if the timeline was a federal schedule? Does the El Paso MPO have a similar timeline that Jolene had outlined in her presentation.

Jolene replied yes that all of the MPO’s in the State – Las Cruces and El Paso – will be using this timeline for the New Mexico portion.

Jerry Cordova stated that if he understood things correctly then an entity would have to get approval from their council prior to submitting the application.

Jolene asked Jerry if he was talking about the resolution. She stated that she had talked to Rosa and as long as they have the resolution by the time the final application is submitted or by October 1.

Jerry asked if an entity was limited to one application for a project or one application per department.

Tom stated that there has not been any discussion regarding limiting applications, so he said he will say there is no limit.

George Pearson asked if it was known if any of the entities were prepared to make applications.

Tom stated that he is aware of one project that the City has inquired about its eligibility and that was finishing the last connection of the Outfall Channel Trail.
George Pearson asked about the Safe Routes to School planning position. The funding is only good for another year or two so when would they have to start thinking to apply for those funds to continue that planning position.

Jolene stated that funding is up through 2014 so it will take it all the way through September 30, 2014, so for fiscal year 2015 the MPO should probably look at somehow funding that position. Jolene stated that there is basically a year on the contract on Devashree’s position that’s funded through the DOT.

George asked if the process should be started now in order to make sure it is funded.

Jolene replied yes.

George asked if it was reasonable that an application include the Safe Routes to School Coordinator in this cycle.

Jolene replied yes, because the MPO is going to be programming funding for FY 14 and FY 15 now, so submit the applications for both fiscal years.

George stated that because of the restraint against the MPO applying then we are going to have find a sponsoring agency for that position, so is there any way to find out if there is a sponsoring agency for that position.

Tom stated that he has spoken with the City’s Community Development Director and that would probably come forward out of that office.

George asked if they could expect an application for that funding.

Tom stated he thought so.

Jack Valencia, South Central Regional Transit District, stated they are planning on being an applicant for some of the TAP monies. He stated for clarification that he understands the monies have been provided to the discretion of the MPO’s and RPO’s in the State and asked if there was an allocation per each MPO and RPO, and when they make the prioritization do they go to the DOT and that approving form as to redistribute or modify the priorities as they compete on a State-wide basis or are they left up to the prioritization of the local MPO and RPO.

Jolene responded that they are left up to the discretion of the MPO. They will be scored based on the guidelines and each MPO and RPO is allocated its own pot of money so there is no State-wide competition at all.

Jack asked what was the dollar amount.
Jolene responded that in rural areas and small urban clusters the MPO has $38,769. In large urban clusters and small UZA’s - $172,872, and then in flexible (kind of anywhere) $211,322, so in total the MPO has approximately $423,000.

5.4 Trail Priorities

George Pearson stated that one of the goals of the Committee has been to try to establish some of the trail priorities. He didn’t know if the trail priority plan had been updated since recent events have happened such as the Outfall Channel, etc.

Tom responded that the plan had not been updated.

George asked if the first order of business should be to update the trail priority plan to reflect the current realities and maybe prioritize good connection links. George stated that with the Outfall Channel he noticed that connecting from Motel Boulevard to the Outfall Channel Trail might be a good spot. There is discussion with the project at Main and Picacho, the drug store that is going in there and using some of the EBID right-of-way that is in that area to connect the trail that is behind into the downtown area and there are probably other priority areas that need to be connected.

Tom stated that Transport 2040 listed about five or six projects that should be pursued with the Outfall Channel being one of those projects. The last two CIP cycles for the City, the Public Works Director requested a list of what the priorities were from Tom, so Tom used the list from Transport 2040 and ordered it by whether they were Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3 facilities on the bicycle implementation map and submitted that as the priorities. He recognizes that the implementation of the Outfall Channel has probably changed some things. Tom stated that staff would like the BPAC to come forward and update that list.

George Pearson asked if that should be a discussion item for the Committee. Should they hold a work session?

Tom stated that staff doesn’t have anything ready at this time.

George stated that for future meeting that a list of priorities be ready and maps brought so that the Committee can identify problem areas.

Tom stated that he will put it on the next meeting agenda with the list and provide the maps. He encouraged the Committee members to look at both the in-road facility map and the trail plan to really decide what the priority projects would be.

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

George Pearson stated that the League of American Bicycles does an annual ranking of bicycle friendly states and New Mexico has fallen from 45 to 44 and now is at 48 ahead of Alabama and North Dakota. Las Cruces is a bicycle friendly community and it was noted that we just reached 100,000 population boundary which makes us a Class 1 city. One of the
recommendations for the Leagues while they look at bicycle friendly communities is that they have one bike program staff member for every 77,000 citizens, well we reached 100,000 citizens and as far as he knows there is not a dedicated bicycle/pedestrian staff member of any type at either the County or the City level. He wanted to know the consensus of the Board about looking toward creating a resolution to present to the Policy Committee where they can recommend to the entities that the entities designate a staff member as a bike/ped coordinator or some such designation.

Jolene Herrera said it sounded like a good idea to her. It always good to have one point of contact when you have issues with bicycles and pedestrians just because there is so much history and if you have one point of contact they pretty well know all the players and know what’s been done. It works well for the State.

George stated that the MPO has kind of taken that lead in the past but his understanding is that with the previous audit from the FHWA that staff has been more or less directed not to take that lead position. He asked Tom if that was a fair statement.

Tom stated that there is greater scrutiny from the FHWA level on what are appropriate expenditures of grant funds and whether there is a line between an MPO function and a local function, so staff has been more conscious of that in the last few years.

George stated that if there is a consensus from the Board then he would like to move forward with that idea. He had an email from Shawn Higgins that prompted him with this idea.

Someone (didn’t state name) wanted to add that in the resolution he would encourage looking for some of the initiatives that are on-going in some of the peer cities like Tucson or local.

George stated that Albuquerque is larger and they have a number of staff positions.

6.1 Local Projects update

Jerry Cordova stated that they were successful in their grant application for safety funds on El Paseo Road between University and Alameda. The scope of work on the project includes some safety upgrades to some of the signals along that corridor as well as some ADA improvements and geometric improvements to some of the intersections for controlled access for pedestrian safety, bicycle safety, and increased safety to vehicles as well. He believes the amount of the grant was $330,000 and if he remembers correctly there is no match requirement. Jerry thanked Jolene and the DOT who helped by writing a letter of support for the project and Tom and his staff also helped with the application.

David Shearer announced that NMSU has received the bronze Bike Friendly status. They are waiting to hear back if they have any comments or recommendations. He stated that they should get the plaque sometime in June.

6.2 NMDOT Projects update
Jolene gave the project updates.

- The railroad that has Picacho closed – it is not the DOT. There is not a whole lot the DOT can do about it when the railroad decides they want to do something then they do it and the DOT helps them do it.
- The cable barrier project is well ahead of schedule. They will be done paving as of the end of this week and most of the posting cable barrier is up for most of that corridor going up to NASA on US 70. The second phase of that project is going to be from where the cable barrier stops all the way to the interchange of I-25 on US 70 and that will be a concrete wall barrier project. They were successful in getting safety funding for that and that is a $3M project that is now in design. They are hoping to let it this December or as quickly as they can after the start of federal fiscal year 2014.
- The Avenida de Mesilla bridge project. The notice to proceed was issued to the contractor on April 24. They have a 60 day ramp up time so they are looking at starting construction around the end of June. It will be similar to what happened at Motel and they have approximately 330 calendar days for that project, so it’s going to be a long one, traffic is going to be similar to Motel.
- The project on North Main Street – the project limits have been increased, so for some reason the original project went from the intersection of Solano and Spitz to Chestnut leaving just a little portion between Chestnut and the intersection of Picacho so they have decided to go ahead and extend that project so that the entire corridor will be reconstructed. They are hoping to have that out for bid this fall, then construction would start, weather permitting, in the winter in the spring depending on what the contractor decides. There will probably be monthly construction meetings on that just because it is a very high traffic roadway. Jolene said she would be keeping Tom and the Committees up-to-date on when those are happening so if there is any input during construction on any concerns that the Committee might have please feel free to let her know or come to the public meetings and let them know.
- Picacho from the bridge – what Jolene has heard from her project manager is that all of the roadblocks should be lifted by the end of May, so traffic should be open by the end of May, then minor work will done with minor lane closures. Stripping is not finished yet. The next phase will be from the bridge headed up to the hill to Morton Lane. The plans are being turned into Santa Fe this week. She is hoping for a summer let for fall or spring construction and it will be similar to what happened on the section here through town.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.
Jolene Herrera motioned to adjourn.
David Shearer seconded the motion.

Chair
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STAFF PRESENT:  
Andrew Wray (MPO)  
Chowdhury Siddiqui (MPO)  
Tom Murphy (MPO)

1. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting was called to order at 5:08 p.m. Quorum was established.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Leslie Kryder motioned to approve the agenda.
Albert Casillas seconded the motion.
All in favor.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
3.1 July 16, 2013
Albert Casillas stated that Sean Higgins is no longer employed with the County and that he will be temporarily filling in as DAC representative until someone else can be appointed.
George Pearson stated that the March 19 and May 21 minutes are still outstanding for approval. George asked if those minutes would be on the next agenda.
Tom responded that they will work to get the minutes on the next agenda.
Mark Leisher motioned to approve the minutes as presented.
Carlos Coontz seconded the motion.
All in favor. Motion passes 6 – 0 (4 members absent)

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Public Participation Plan

The current MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) calls for an update every five years. The current PPP was passed in 2008 and is due for update. As part of this update MPO staff:

- Expanded the Environmental Justice Section with Title VI information and added a Title VI complaint process
- Added the Annual Listing of Obligated Projects
- Added a Social Media Section
- Added a Performance Evaluation Section

Andrew Wray gave a brief presentation.

George Pearson asked for a motion to approve the Public Participation Plan.
Jolene Herrera motioned to approve.
Mark Leisher seconded the motion.
All in favor. Motion passes 6 – 0 (4 members absent)

5.2 TAP Fund Ranking

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a new Federal program authorized under Section 1122 of the most recent Federal transportation funding act, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). Funding for TAP is derived from several programs and encompasses most of the activities previously funded under the Transportation Enhancements (TE), Recreational Trails Program (RTP), and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs of the previous Federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU.

Funding from this program is being allocated through the MPOs and RPOs in New Mexico. The MPO advisory committees will review staff scoring and make recommendation to the Policy Committee on project funding. Included in the packet are the applications received by the MPO. Reference material submitted by the applicants will be sent under a separate email due to size limitations.

Tom Murphy gave a presentation.

Pearson: I have one question about the Safe Routes to School applications. I noticed that on the first section on the scoring they are not applicable but still they are
counted toward the whole point structure so it looks like we’re looking at the old problem of comparing apples and oranges.

Murphy: That is correct and that was a point of discussion when this process was being developed through meetings, teleconferences with all the MPO’s and RPO’s thru the State and DOT Planning Office in Santa Fe. The feeling was that there is really no one application that would score in everything so one application not scoring well in a particular area is not going to handicap it to well, that being said I do believe that there a remains a bias in this towards projects versus programs which is the difference between the Safe Routes to School and the trail programs. I do believe the MPO meaning the Policy Committee does have the latitude to separate the funding to award a certain amount to a specific application whether it be a project or a program regardless of how it’s scored we just have to justify it went through the competitive scoring process.

Pearson: Because if you look at the City’s Safe Routes to School if you take out and score it by the 55 points you can go against it gets an 85% rating which is higher than any of the other ratings.

Murphy: I think that’s something that you can recommend to the Policy Committee that they choose that based on that justification that it didn’t score in factors like right-of-way and design factors that it cannot compete with but if you look at the percentage of eligible points it does score strongly and I think that’s a strong basis for us to make the case of dividing funding that way.

Kryder: I had another question about this, so on page 43 we see five projects listed, are these all of the applications that have been received to this point? Is this all of the applications that will be received?

Murphy: Yes, these are all the applications that were received as of the deadline last week and we’ll probably update and get with the other RPO’s and MPO’s State-wide and update the process and we’ll have another call for projects in two-year’s time.

Kryder: And then the fiscal year 2014 target dollars at the bottom I’m not clear what the total amount available is and whether the totals of the projects exceed that.

Murphy: The totals come to $422,000 and some dollars.

Kryder: The bottom part (inaudible).

Murphy: All of them combined come up to $422,000. I do believe that both of the City’s trail projects do exceed that amount that is available to them for the urban area being that the City’s projects are not eligible for the rural monies so that’s $38,000 that is taken off that $422 so we would have to definitely check with the
City if they are willing to increase their minimum match amounts or amend the project in order to come within the financial constraints.

Kryder: And then the Safe Routes to School coordinator, I see there are two applications, are they half time? Would that end up being one person or is that two half-time people?

Murphy: From my understanding is it is two half-time persons at this point. I do have a meeting scheduled I think on Thursday to meet with the representatives from the City and the school district and talk with them about possibly combining that or how they want to proceed with it but since this was a very abbreviated process the Federal Highway Administration didn’t approve the process until I believe it was mid-May so we had to put out the call right away and there wasn’t a lot of time for coordination so we’re doing a lot of coordinating on the fly.

Kryder: So just to make sure I understand then the applications, the totals for the applications exceed let’s say just for FY14, that exceeds the funds available, so we’re being asked to choose among these five or can we approve less than the full application amount or how does that work?

Murphy: Essentially yes, we’re asking you to choose among the five based on the ranking process and certainly the MPO can award less than the total amount.

Pearson: We’re recommending to the Policy Committee and the Policy Committee makes the final decision. The under $5,000 monies, the $38,000 for the two fiscal years each, what projects would that money fit into?

Murphy: What that fits into is the Regional Transit District could if they decided to locate all their sign, shelters and benches they are asking for outside the urbanized area, they are eligible for that pot of money and the Safe Routes to School since the Las Cruces Public School district which both applications envision as their service one we get to apply a percentage of the MPO urban/rural population against that, I believe the MPO population is about 22% rural so we could use 22% of the Safe Routes to School programs from the rural pot.

Pearson: So about $6,000 of the 30, roughly $6 or $7,000 of that.

Murphy: Yes, in that neighborhood.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, if I could just maybe share a thought here. Would it affect you at all Tom if I didn’t vote on these? I kind of just don’t feel that it is appropriate being that I’m with the DOT and this is meant to be more of a local government process and I guess I just would like feedback on that if you’re okay with that Mr. Chair and then how MPO staff feels about that.
Pearson: Well, if your job description is to directly rate these processes as they come through then your reasoning is logical but just because you work for the DOT doesn't mean that you can't work on this.

Herrera: Okay, I just don’t want it to become a conflict of interest. I’ll certainly answer questions and offer input but as far as me actually scoring them I’m just not sure if that’s appropriate because I’m definitely not doing that for the RPO’s and the other MPO’s.

Pearson: So you would see all those other applications also and work on those as part of the process?

Herrera: I have seen those applications. I was there to answer questions but I was not directly involved in rating them.

Pearson: But you’re also not a member of those Boards.

Herrera: Right.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Ms. Herrera, from the MPO staff perspective we don’t see a conflict. I think she provides valuable insight and her scoring I trust will be professionally done, added to that the awarding Body is the MPO Board of which the DOT’s District Engineering is going to be a voting member, a voting member of......as is the three City Councillors who also have it so I would view Ms. Herrera’s participation on this really no different than City Councillors participation at the Policy Committee level.

Herrera: Okay, thank you, I’m fine with that I just wanted to kind of bring that up and see how everybody felt about it, thanks.

Pearson: So given the way that the pots of money are distributed, instead of going through all the ranking and everything can we just rank say we want these projects of higher priority, say for example, Safe Routes to School projects and then one of the trail’s projects and........

Murphy: Mr. Chair, I think that could be the BPAC’s recommendation, although for a, at least from a procedural standpoint I’d like to have some affirmation of the staff scoring of the objective criteria that we did, make sure that staff isn’t out of line in the scores that we awarded on those and if you all just wanted to, not individually, just kind of give them a quick go over or however the Committee is comfortable in doing because as it really turns out the highest, the projects do score highest because they get the most points and then the programs are not going to take all the pot of money so there’s depending on how things fall out you could recommend that to the Policy Committee and staff would be fine with that.
Pearson: So at this point all the projects are actually eligible for this money. There wouldn't be something that would disqualify any particular project?

Murphy: There is still some discussion about the eligibility of the Regional Transit District's monies although bus shelters, signs, benches are eligible there is a question that the District does not currently operate a transit route in the area and there is some controversy of whether that's eligible or not.

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I can share a little bit of insight. The South Central RTD also submitted TAP applications with the El Paso MPO and the South Central RPO because they span all three planning organizations. We and by we I mean the DOT, our TAP coordinator in Santa Fe, Rosa, determined that the RTD's application in the El Paso MPO was not eligible and a lot of that had to do with the fact that they don't have a service plan.......

Murphy: Service and Financial Plan in place.

Herrera: Right, it's not in place yet so we can't really see funding them if they don't have their core documents kind of in place yet and additionally with this particular TAP application I think we need more data. I mean where are they planning to put these bus shelters, whose right-of-way is it in, do they have support from those entities where they are going to put the shelters, there is a lot lacking I think.

Pearson: Is that RTD even offering services at all or are they still in the planning phase?

Herrera: As far as I know they are still in the planning phase. Our Transit and Rail Bureau has yet to see their operations plan so we can't really where they are at.

Pearson: So even the fiscal year 14 request might not even be appropriate to award and since we're doing both (inaudible) fiscal year 15 and then see what happens.

Murphy: I suppose you could offer denial of the FY 14 request and recommend a conditional approval based on the condition that the RTD adopts a Service and Financial Plan and has service operating within the corridor for FY 15.

Leisher: I think the conditional idea is pretty reasonable.

Pearson: Because they are still the only ones really eligible for that one pot of money.

Murphy: That is true except for about $6,000 that we could apply toward each of the Safe Routes to School projects.

Leisher: And maybe getting awarded the money will give them motivation to hurry the process up a little bit.
Pearson: Well, they have been working as diligently as they can in the process I believe to because part of their authority would even be to impose a tax, I don't know if it's a gross receipts or property, but they have some taxing authority to raise funds to support the RTD and they haven't even started the planning phase for that I don't believe.

Murphy: It is part of the planning phase for it. It's part of their intentions, they have the authority to put forth the question to the voters and I believe that is their intention so at one point they could have substantial services..............(interrupted)

Pearson: So this might be good practice for them to make the application but might be more realistic that they'll be funded in the 16/17 cycles.

Herrera: I would agree with that Mr. Chair and then I also just wanted to say that the TAP process was left up to the local governments but ultimately the final approval has to come from DOT, it's written into the law that way. We got interpretation from FHWA after we put this process out that final approval has to come from DOT, so once your list of projects is submitted to Rosa, our TAP coordinator, she'll be checking these applications again for eligibility and I'm guessing that based on what was determined in El Paso MPO is going to be the same for this application, so maybe your suggestion about 2016/17 might be better.

Leisher: What happens to the money if we don’t award it this time?

Murphy: If we don’t award the money it then reverts back to the State and if there are eligible projects in other areas of the State that can utilize the funding it will be applied towards that. If there are not, there is some provision that the money can be flexed over to highway improvements.

Herrera: To any of the other programs.

Murphy: To any of the other programs.

Herrera: Can I just say that the State, the DOT has kind of made a commitment to not do that. We don’t want to put this money in other programs so we’re definitely going to try to put it in other TAP projects in other areas of the State and I can tell you that El Paso MPO only received the one application from the RTD and it was not eligible so their money will be going back to the State. So there are all these little pots of money coming from other MPO’s and RPO’s which will be combined into more projects.

Pearson: Are the percentages for urban and rural still going to be applied for this redistribution of money or is that still up in the air?

Herrera: No, it will be applied.
Pearson: Okay, so if the El Paso, well the El Paso MPO qualifies for or do they have $200,000 plus monies then so we wouldn’t even qualify to get any of that money.

Herrera: No, you would qualify, they got funding in all three categories though, yeah so the other two pots – the small urban and then the rural – would still…………

Pearson: The possibility then that Sunland Park money, El Paso MPO money could be applied toward the City of Las Cruces trail projects?

Herrera: It could be and kind of what the suggestion has been from the State is when you submit these lists of approved projects, submit all of your projects. So say if these were the ones that were picked for funding at this amount but we also received these applications that way you’ve already got them ranked, we can just kind of go through what we have and say this project qualifies for this pot of money, let’s fund it.

Pearson: Well previous under the SAFETEA-LU program, Safe Routes to School was a separate funding category and didn’t have to compete with anything. I think we’ve had great success with Safe Routes to School in the Las Cruces MPO area. I’d be supportive of assigning SRTS monies, those two projects, the City’s as first ranking, the school district as a second ranking and then we can discuss ranking the 12 projects and the RTD I think that one just falls off the end if it doesn’t qualify or we can still keep it on the list.

Leisher: I agree that we should go ahead and just rank the two SRTS things at the top and then discuss the remainder. What does everybody else think?

Coontz: I agree.

Pearson: I see head shakes the rest of the way around, so on the two trail projects to me the dam trail project is more important because it is a new project where the La Llorona, although the improvement will be nice it is still an existing project but they are in separate fiscal years too so they can just be ranked one, two…..so let’s the rank the dam project as the third priority, the La Llorona as the fourth priority and no recommendation I guess for the RTD but include it on the list.

Murphy: Mr. Chair, that’s sounds good. I would offer maybe swapping the dam and the La Llorona trail based on the fiscal year. I believe that the readiness for the City to proceed on the La Llorona trail is advanced ahead of the dam project.

Pearson: Okay and they are in separate fiscal years anyway so that makes……

Murphy: It could be a 3a and a 3b.

Pearson: Okay so I would like to hear a motion that affirms the staff rankings of the scoring for the projects and that our recommendation is to rank the City of Las Cruces
SRTS 1st, the LCPS SRTS project as 2nd, the City La Llorona project is 3rd, the
City dam trail project is 4th and leave the RTD as an unranked project.

Leisher: I so move.

Casillas: Just a comment, for the RTD can we just maybe include something in there
where if they do come up with a plan of attack then probably consider it a future
rating.

Murphy: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Casillas, I’ll have to check into that. I’m afraid I don’t have the
answer to that. I do believe that the money would revert back.

Kryder: Mr. Chair, I believe that you just said that you wanted to rank La Llorona as 3 and
Las Cruces dam trail as 4, does it make a difference if we were to take the staff
recommendation of the 3a and 3b?

Pearson: That’s fine, whoever makes the motion can change that.

Kryder: Alright, I move.

Pearson: Well, we have a motion on the floor, so since I presented it.

Murphy: I believe we need a second on the motion.

Pearson: Well, it hasn’t been seconded yet so we withdraw it and propose it as……

Leisher: I withdraw that motion.

Pearson: Okay, why don’t you present then since I did all the talking last time.

Kryder: I propose it with La Llorona phase as he said except the La Llorona Phase 2
would be 3a and Las Cruces dam trail improvement would be 3b and then bus
routes, shelters, the RTD should be just listed. Is that alright?

Pearson: Do we have second.

Casillas: Second.

Pearson: Any further discussion?

Herrera: Mr. Chair, I guess I just would like to know what the outcome of the meeting with
the schools and the City is about the SRTS coordinator because I kind of see
that as redundant a little bit. I mean if you’re paying for a SRTS coordinator for
the MPO the only school district within the MPO is well Gadsden right and then
Las Cruces Public Schools so why are we paying for two coordinator positions
for the same school district?
Murphy: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Herrera, I felt that as well, although somebody on the SRTS coalition did make a case to me that those positions can be done complimentary and I think I feel comfortable inviting you to the meeting as the DOT rep on there so that you can attend that and I do know that you will have an opportunity to hear this again with the Technical Advisory Committee and then prior to the Policy Committee so I certainly welcome your involvement in these discussions.

Pearson: Part of this is the short time line genesis where the City and the school district really didn’t have a chance to work out any of these details.

Murphy: Right, they didn’t, neither one of them knew that the other would be able to apply for it so they both applied and …..

Pearson: And in looking at the description of the projects the titles are the same but the descriptions it sounds like the City project is a planning position and the school district was described more as a SRTS champion project so I don’t know if they are describing the same position or ……. 

Murphy: Yes, Mr. Chair that was the case Ms. Curry had made to me was that the City’s would be more along the lines of the engineering and enforcement aspect of it, which when the MPO had the position we concentrated on those aspects, and the school’s position could concentrate more on the education and encouragement aspects, which is more of a trademark of the champion role.

Pearson: Well, I’m comfortable with the motion as it is because the Policy Committee will have more information by the time they are able to make their decision and with the information that we have I think we’re making a correct decision and emphasizing the SRTS is a valid project.

Herrera: And I think really it affects the funding so I mean whatever if that is a redundant position then the money that is left over from that I guess will just go towards one of the Las Cruces trail projects so that they would be more fully funded but I guess you will have that clarification by the time Policy Committee meets.

Pearson: Can you remind us of the time frame for the Policy Committee?

Murphy: The Policy Committee meets September 11 so less than a month away. The TAC I think that date is September 1 or 2 and it’s due up to Santa Fe by October 1st.

Wray: Mr. Chair, September 5 is the next TAC meeting.

Pearson: Any further discussion? So I’ll call for a vote for the motion as presented. All in favor?
All: Aye.

Pearson: Any opposed? No one opposed.

Motion passes, vote 6 – 0 (4 members absent)

6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

6.1 Local Projects update

Tom Murphy gave an update on the infra-red trail counters.

George Pearson commented that it looked like a good start to him and asked if there were any plans to purchase additional counters.

Tom Murphy responded yes, that he has some money the traffic count program and he plans on purchasing a minimum of four more. He can purchase off the same contract for approximately $450 each.

George asked if there was only count data and time of day. He asked if there was velocity or anything that could determine if it was a pedestrian or bicyclist.

Tom responded that was correct.

Tom stated that he found out that the Committee was not aware that staff was unable to replace Devashree. The decision was made from Santa Fe to not renew the work authorization even though the money for the SRTS position was in the TIP; therefore, the position was not filled. Meanwhile Mr. Coontz, who is the SRTS Champion at the school district, will be working to keep the coalition meetings moving forward.

6.2 NMDOT Projects update

Jolene Herrera gave the NMDOT project updates

- North Main project from the intersection of Picacho and Main Street all the way to the intersection of Solano and Spitz/Three Crosses. Scheduled to let in October, construction will likely begin in December 2013/January 2014 or as weather allows. There will be public meetings during construction just to keep everyone aware of what is going on.
- US 70 – the next section from the bridge headed towards I-10 up the hill to Morton Lane. It has been awarded – should start construction in November and bike lanes will be included in that section as well as the section that is still being worked on thru town up to Valley Drive.
- US 70 concrete wall barrier project from the interchange at I-25/US 70 to where the cable barrier currently stops, will likely begin construction in January 2014.
• US 70 where the cable barrier already exists they are going to add a second run on the other side of the road. Right now there is cable barrier on the north side of the road so another strand will be added to the south side. Construction will begin as soon as possible probably within the next couple of weeks – plan will be similar to the other project – hours of work will be between 9 a.m. & 3 p.m. and no scheduled time frames on weekends.

• Mesquite/Vado interchange projects should probably begin construction Fall of this year. Public meetings will be held.

George Pearson stated there have been a couple of unfortunate incidents with bicyclists in the past week. There was a fatality on Valley and a fatality on Pete Domenici Highway. The Valley Drive fatality was a hit and run. The fatality on Pete Domenici Highway possibly had partial paving condition issues. He asked about the condition of the roadway.

Jolene Herrera stated she did not know the condition of the road. She does know that they have recently completed one section of pavement preservation as well as the addition of a separate path for bicycles and pedestrians. They didn’t have funding to take it all the way down Pete Domenici. They will probably look at funding as they can in the future.

Albert Casillas gave updates: Memorandum of Agreement with EBID and the County to work on some trails along the EBID ditches is currently at County Legal and Risk Management. The intersection of El Camino Real and Dona Ana School Road roundabout at that intersection, Albert spoke with Robert Armijo and they looked at various options and it looked like having two T intersections will probably be the most feasible for that area.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Jolene Herrera motioned to adjourn.

Leslie Kryder seconded the motion.

All in favor.

___________________________
Chair
AGENDA ITEM:
5.1 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and recommendation for approval to the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
FFY 2014 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Reports
Email from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Urban and Regional Planner
Spreadsheet from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Urban and Regional Planner detailing TIP amendment requests

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W100032</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Coordinator</td>
<td>SRTS Operations</td>
<td>Deleted from the TIP to reflect the ending of this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100620</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10 – Las Cruces to TX State Line</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation Project</td>
<td>Moved from FY 2015 to FY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00100</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Missouri Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Reconstruction/Widening</td>
<td>$800K added for preliminary engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>El Camino Real and Dona Ana School Rd</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>Moved from FY 2013 per DAC Engineering, $42,750 left in FY 2013 for Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>Start-End Year</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Funding Amount</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00150</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>I-10/MP 133-143.2 Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>2014 &amp; 2017</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>NM 188 (Valley Drive)/Ave de Mesilla to Picacho, including intersections</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Project, $800K in FY 2014 for preliminary engineering, Construction in FY2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces Safe Routes to School TAP Project</td>
<td>SRTS Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Las Cruces Public Schools</td>
<td>Las Cruces Public Schools Safe Routes to School TAP Project</td>
<td>SRTS Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>Las Cruces Dam Trail</td>
<td>Improvements to the Las Cruces Dam Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td>La Llorona Trail</td>
<td>Improvements to the La Llorona Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>South Central Regional Transit District</td>
<td>Bus stop improvement project</td>
<td>Bus Signs, Shelters, and Benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CN</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td>MVMPO</td>
<td>Transportation Alternative Program Placeholder Project</td>
<td>Financial placeholder project for TAP Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.
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
Fr: To:
Category: Miscellaneous

Project Desc.: SRTS Coordinator position at Las Cruces MPO

Est. Proj. Cost: $64,281
Est. Letting:

Remarks: (2-13-13) Add'l funding for FY 2013, 14 (10-08-13) All funding removed at DOT request to reflect the ending of this program

TIP Amendment Pending? ■

Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Rts to Sch-Flex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Informational Years
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

Category: Hwy & Brg Pres
Project Desc.: Mill and Inlay
Remarks: New TIP Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,310,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,310,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>$4,272,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,025,280</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>$1,025,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Informational Years

Est. Proj. Cost: $9,000,000
Est. Letting:
TIP Amendment Pending? □

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

Thursday, September 26, 2013
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**  
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization  
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LC00100</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 74</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 3</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID: LC00100</td>
<td>Lead Agency: NMDOT D-1</td>
<td>Length: 0 Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT: 000I25</td>
<td>Proj: I-25/Missouri Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr: Missouri Avenue</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $9,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category:** Hwy & Brg Pres  
**Remarks:** New TIP Funding Sources; Admin Adjust - $900,000 to Design (12-12-12)

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

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

**Work Zone:**

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS** - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$1,426,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,426,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td>$7,689,600</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,689,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Wednesday, October 09, 2013*
**Las Cruces MPO** - **PIN:** 75

**Fed ID:** LC00110

**CN:** LC00110

**Lead Agency:** Dona Ana County

**Est. Letting:**

**Project Desc.:** Design and Construction for Intersection Realignment: El Camino Real Rd at Dona Ana School Rd

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $0

**Length:** 0 Miles

**Category:**

**Remarks:** Added to the TIP; New TIP Funding Sources; Admin Adjust: 10-25-12; Admin Adjust 08-21-13; has $42,750 obligated in FFY 2013

---

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS** - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$17,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (HSIP)</td>
<td>$224,420</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$224,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$242,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$242,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Work Zone:**

- Safety (HSIP)

---

**Project Phases:**

- Environ. Document
- Prel. Engr.
- Design
- Right-of-way
- Construction
- Other

---

**NMDOT Dist.:** 3

**County:** Dona Ana

**Municipality:** N/A not applicable

---

**RT:**

- Proj Intersection Realignment
- Fr: El Camino Real Rd at Dona Ana School Rd
- To:
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN:</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN:</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 3</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td>Las Cruces MPO</td>
<td>Lead Agency: Las Cruces MPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT:</td>
<td>Proj MPO PL Funds</td>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>Las Cruces MPO</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIP Amendment Pending?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Desc.:** Ongoing MPO Planning funds

**Remarks:** Ongoing distribution of Planning Funds

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$37,062</td>
<td>$148,249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$217,481</td>
<td>$869,924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$254,543</td>
<td>$1,018,173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

Tuesday, October 08, 2013
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN:</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 84</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.</th>
<th>Length: 0 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT:</td>
<td>Proj MPO TAP Funds</td>
<td>Fr: Las Cruces MPO</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost: $0</td>
<td>Est. Letting: TIP Amendment Pending? □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces MPO

**Project Desc.:** Ongoing distribution of MPO TAP funds

**Remarks:** Ongoing distribution of MPO TAP funds

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

**Work Zone:**

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thursday, October 10, 2013*
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**  
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization**  
**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN:</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN:</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.:</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
<th>City of Las Cruces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed ID:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency:</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT:</td>
<td>Proj</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces SRTS Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Letting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Proj. Cost:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td>City of Las Cruces Part Time Safe Routes to School Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Desc.:** Transportation Alternatives Program funding for a City of Las Cruces Safe Routes to School Position

**Project Phases:**
- □ Environ. Document
- □ Prel. Engr.
- □ Design
- □ Right-of-way
- □ Construction
- ■ Other

**Work Zone:**

**PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$5,777</td>
<td>$5,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$33,898</td>
<td>$33,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$39,675</td>
<td>$39,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Las Cruces Public Schools SRTS Position, TAP Funded**

**Lead Agency:** Las Cruces Public Schools  
**Est. Letting:**  
**Project Desc.:** Transportation Alternatives Program funding for a Las Cruces Public Schools Safe Routes to School Position  
**Length:** 0 Miles  
**Fed ID:** 91  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 3  
**County:** Dona Ana  
**Municipality:** City of Las Cruces  
**Est. Proj. Cost:** $0  
**TIP Amendment Pending?** □

**Remarks:** City of Las Cruces Part Time Safe Routes to School Position

---

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$5,112</td>
<td>$5,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$35,112</td>
<td>$35,112</td>
<td>$35,112</td>
<td>$35,112</td>
<td>$70,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Las Cruces Dam Trail

Transportation Alternative Program funding for improvements to the Las Cruces Dam Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$332,002</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$332,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$388,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$388,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CN: Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 93
Fed ID: NMDOT Dist.: 3 County: Dona Ana Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Lead Agency: City of Las Cruces Length: 0 Miles
RT: Proj Las Cruces La Llorona Trail
Fr: To:
Est. Letting:
Est. Proj. Cost: $0
TIP Amendment Pending? ☐

**Project Desc.:** Transportation Alternative Program funding for improvements to the Las Cruces La Llorona Trail

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

**Remarks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$332,002</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$332,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$388,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$388,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMED FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Amendment Pending?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area | Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization | Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

| Fed ID: | | | Lead Agency: | South Central Transit Dist. | | | Length: | 0 Miles |
| RT: | Proj | SCRTD Bus Signs, Shelters, and Benches | Fr: | To: |
| Est. Proj. Cost: | $0 | Est. Letting: | |
| Remarks: | | Amendment Pending? | □ |

Project Desc.: Transportation Alternative Program funds for the construction of bus signs, shelters, and benches

| Project Phases: | □ Environ. Documen | □ Prel. Engr | □ Design | □ Right-of-way | □ Construction | ■ Other |
| Work Zone: | |

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$4,260</td>
<td>$4,260</td>
<td>$8,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$58,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td>$8,521</td>
<td>$58,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wednesday, October 09, 2013
**Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area**  
*Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization*  
*Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN: LC00150</th>
<th>Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 95</th>
<th>NMDOT Dist.: 1</th>
<th>County: Dona Ana</th>
<th>Municipality: Various Multiple Jurisd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj</td>
<td>Fr: 133</td>
<td>To: 143.2</td>
<td>Length: 10.2 Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Hwy &amp; Brg Pres</td>
<td>Project Desc.: Pavement Preservation project on Interstate 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUND SOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$728,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$728,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,708,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Sm Urb</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,563,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,563,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP Informational Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Las Cruces MPO - PIN: 96
Fed ID: LC00160
NMDOT Dist.: 1  County: Dona Ana  Municipality: City of Las Cruces
Length: 1.5 Miles

RT: Proj NM 188 (Valley Drive) Roadway Reconstruction
Fr: Ave de Mesilla  To: Picacho

Category: Hwy & Brg Pres
Project Desc.: Valley Drive Reconstruction from Ave de Mesilla north to Picacho including the intersections

Est. Proj. Cost: $7,800,000
Est. Letting:


Remarks:

PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$116,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,019,200</td>
<td>$1,135,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP MAP-21</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Sm Urb</td>
<td>$683,520</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td>$2,990,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIP Informational Years

□ IP Amendment Pending?
From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 9:16 AM
To: Andrew Wray
Subject: FW: TIP Follow Up
Attachments: FY2014 TIP Amendment 1.xls

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 4:11 PM
To: ‘Andrew Wray’
Subject: RE: TIP Follow Up

Hi Andrew,

Please see the attached spreadsheet with the TIP Amendments that need to be made. Can you please put this on the BPAC, TAC, and PC agendas as an action item for October?

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N Solano Dr
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O: (575) 525-7338
C: (575) 202-4698

From: Andrew Wray [mailto:awray@las-cruces.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT
Subject: TIP Follow Up

Hi Jolene,

I just wanted to see if you had any feedback yet on the TIP bundle I sent last week.

Thanks.

Andrew Wray
Transportation Planner
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
P.O. Box 20000
Las Cruces, NM 88004
(575) 528-3070
(575) 528-3155 (fax)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Funds listed on TIP</th>
<th>Project total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W100032</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A (Safe Routes to School Coordinator)</td>
<td>$64,281</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Project deleted in new STIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100830</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$7,605,016</td>
<td>$7,605,016</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100620</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>Las Cruces to TX state line</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>Moved from FY2015 to FY2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00100</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Missouri Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruction/Widening</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
<td>Moved from FY2013 per DAC Engineering, $42,750 left in FY2013 for Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>El Camino Real Rd at Dona Ana School Rd</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$242,250</td>
<td>$800K added for preliminary engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00120</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>Intersection of Spitz/Solano/Main/intersection</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00130</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>El Paseo Rd</td>
<td>University to Main St</td>
<td>Safety Project</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>No Change, CLC project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100930</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>I-25 Interchange to Rinconada</td>
<td>Concrete Wall Barrier &amp; ITS installation</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>New HSIP project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00150</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>MP 133-143.2</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>New project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>2014/2017</td>
<td>NM 188 (Valley Drive)</td>
<td>City Limits to Avenida De Mesilla</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
<td>New project, $800K in FY2014 for preliminary engineering, Construction in FY2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 15, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Transportation Asset Management Presentation

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
None

DISCUSSION:
The BPAC will host a presentation regarding Asset Management by Denise Weston of Bohannan-Huston.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 15, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
10.0 Transportation Asset Management Presentation

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Map of Park Ridge Development Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths

DISCUSSION:
The BPAC will host a Work Session regarding the proposed Park Ridge Development.