



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **January 14, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.** in the in the **Doña Ana County Commission Chambers**, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org).

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Mesilla Valley: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS** _____ **Chair**
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** _____ **Chair**
Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **CONSENT AGENDA*** _____ **Chair**
6. *** APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____
 - 6.1. *December 10, 2014 _____ **Chair**
7. **ACTION ITEMS** _____
 - 7.1. * Resolution 15-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2015 Calendar Year by the Mesilla Valley MPO _____ **MPO Staff**
8. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 8.1. Human Services Coordinated Plan Update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 8.2. Transport 2040 Update _____ **MPO Staff**
 - 8.3. El Paso MPO Coordination _____ **All**
9. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____ **Chair**
10. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
11. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

Publish January 4, 2015

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

3
4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held December 10, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.
6 in City Council Chambers at City of Las Cruces City Hall, 700 N. Main Street, Las
7 Cruces, New Mexico.

8
9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
10 Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
11 Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
12 Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
13 Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
14 Councillor Nathan Small (CLC) (arrived 1:19)
15 Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
16 Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC)
17 Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) (arrive 1:08, left 1:45)

18
19 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)

20
21 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
22 Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
23 Orlando Fierro (MPO staff)
24 Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)

25
26 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
27 Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

28
29 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

30
31 Meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.

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

34 **Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of**
35 **interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee Member may**
36 **recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they**
37 **can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of**
38 **the Committee.**

39
40 NO MEMBER HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

41
42 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT - No public comment**

43
44 Garrett: Do we have any members of the public who would like to speak to the
45 committee? Seeing none.

1 **4. CONSENT AGENDA ***

2
3 Garrett: We will move on to the consent agenda which is approval of the minutes
4 of October 8, 2014. Could I have a motion to approve the consent
5 agenda?
6

7 Hancock: So moved.
8

9 Pedroza: Second.
10

11 Garrett: The motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Commissioner
12 Hancock, seconded by Councillor Pedroza.
13

14 Murphy: Mr. Chair?
15

16 Garrett: Yes?
17

18 Murphy: If I may, the consent agenda also includes the calendar year 2015
19 meeting schedule.
20

21 Garrett: Thank you very much. I missed the second asterisk. Would anyone like
22 to have either of the items on the consent agenda polled for discussion?
23 In that case, would you poll the committee? Those in favor say "yes,"
24 those opposed, "no."
25

26 Murphy: Trustee Flores.
27

28 Flores: Yes.
29

30 Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.
31

32 Doolittle: Yes.
33

34 Murphy: Councillor Pedroza.
35

36 Pedroza: Yes.
37

38 Murphy: Councillor Sorg.
39

40 Sorg: Yes.
41

42 Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.
43

44 Benavidez: Yes.
45

46 Murphy: Commissioner Hancock.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Hancock: Yes.

Murphy: And Mr. Chair.

Garrett: Yes. Very good, thank you. The consent agenda is passed unanimously.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *October 8, 2014 - minutes approved under the Consent Agenda vote.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 * Resolution 14-15: A Resolution Adopting the 2015 Mesilla Valley MPO Meeting Calendar - approved under the consent agenda vote.

6.2 Resolution 14-16: A Resolution Adopting the 2014 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects

Garrett: We will move, now move on to Item 6.2: A resolution adopting the 2014 annual listing of obligated projects.

Wray: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Andrew Wray gave his presentation.

Garrett: Are there any questions? Yes, Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Project #97, the construction of Dripping Springs Road and Baylor Canyon Road, by approving this can you tell me what it means?

Wray: The Policy Committee at this time doesn't, can't make any sort of changes to the numbers. This is merely an adoption that the Policy Committee adopts this list as the annual list for fiscal year 2014. There isn't any action that the Committee can take at this time to modify or change these numbers. They are kind of what they are. If I'm answering your question.

Sorg: Well that's part of it. I still find it, I can't understand why we have these resolutions like this when there are no amendments that can be made to them, they're set in stone already. We just have to rubber-stamp them. Is, am I getting the understanding of what we're doing here today with this resolution?

1 Wray: I wouldn't categorize it as a rubber-stamp, but it is an adoption that the
2 Policy Committee is approving, that this is the list from Mesilla Valley for
3 this year.
4

5 Sorg: Does it mean, I guess the question more to the point, does it mean that
6 we're approving the pavement of Baylor Canyon Road with this?
7

8 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councillor Sorg, what, what the action by the Committee does
9 is, is we are acknowledging what has been spent or what has been
10 obligated by federal funds along these public projects and we have this
11 Committee adopt the resolution so that we can make this information you
12 know public so that when we put it out to the public we can say that the
13 information has gone before your eyes, but it represents what has already
14 occurred. So it's basically submitting an accounting report.
15

16 Sorg: That's the way I, I thought I understood it. Okay thank you Mr. Chairman.
17

18 Garrett: Thank you. Let me ask just a follow-up on that. Since this is a, essentially
19 a summary of obligated projects from the, basically the end, we're at the
20 end of the, the calendar year and this is on a calendar year basis, correct,
21 or not?
22

23 Wray: Mr. Chair no, this is a fiscal year basis. This should have appeared on the
24 November agenda for approval but since we were not able to have that
25 meeting it had to move to December.
26

27 Garrett: Okay. And so, this was, all right, I don't know, it, I'm always a bit
28 confused. I think it's confusing to almost anybody who doesn't know the
29 particulars when it just says 2014 because that's normally from January to
30 December. So, if we want to say FY 2014 and this is on the federal
31 correct, not the state, which is another ...
32

33 Wray: Yes, that is correct. We can amend the heading to say Federal Fiscal
34 Year 2014 if that would be ...
35

36 Garrett: I think that would be helpful, yeah. The, the other, the other point that I
37 want to make is that ... has the Board been involved in actions to approve
38 acceptance of funds or at least action to initiate some of these projects? I
39 seem to recall that we've been involved in almost all of them.
40

41 Wray: The, the role that the Board takes is through the TIP process, the approval
42 of the TIP projects. These projects are all on the TIP, but this is sort of
43 the, the "this is what happened" whereas the TIP is a more forward-
44 looking document.
45

1 Garrett: So, I, I just want to, I, I think that, that the question that Councillor Sorg is,
2 is asking or, or the, the drift that I'm getting from your comment is that it's
3 very important for us to be clear about when we're actually in a position to
4 influence a project moving forward and in what way. And, and, and in a
5 sense this one is a summary of, of our actions to a large degree and I
6 think we, we simply need to say, "That's what we've done," and then we
7 need to, to really be mindful and intentional as we go through and look at
8 any other actions as we move during the year which we, we did for
9 example with the proposal on, on the West Mesa road. That was a
10 specific action that changed what would be reported in terms of 2015 and
11 that was because of an action that we took. So we do have a place to, to
12 be in control and I think it's a meaningful one, so just, this is ...
13

14 Sorg: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15

16 Garrett: Right. And I think, I'm just going to add one other thought, and that, that is
17 that really what is happening here is that rather than staff just saying,
18 "Well, this is what was done," this is them coming to us as the Policy
19 Committee and saying, "Will you approve what we can say was done?"
20 and I think that's an important distinction as well because we're the ones
21 who have the responsibility and the authority. Okay, any other questions
22 or comments? Commissioner Benavidez?
23

24 Benavidez: Yes. I just, on the Dripping Springs and Baylor Canyon Road, it says here
25 the state, the state portion. What is the expected amount of the state
26 portion? Is it going to be available for, for this project?
27

28 Wray: Mr. Chair, excuse me, Commissioner Barraza, I don't, or not Barraza,
29 Benavidez. I don't know what the final numbers are going to be. I don't, I
30 would have to defer to DOT and I don't know if they even know what the
31 final numbers will be.
32

33 Herrera: Mr. Chair, members of the Committee, Jolene Herrera, NMDOT. The, I
34 guess the actual contributions aren't going to be coming from the state,
35 they'll be coming directly from Central Federal Lands which is a division of
36 the Federal Highway Administration. And the number that they have given
37 me previously is just over \$9.7 million for the full construction, so the funds
38 that you see here were for the design phases and that \$427,200 came
39 from the legislature. It didn't come out of NMDOT funds, but it funneled
40 through us.
41

42 Benavidez: Okay. How much was it from the legislature again?
43

44 Herrera: \$427,200.
45

46 Benavidez: Okay. All right. Thank you.

1
2 Herrera: Sure.
3
4 Garrett: And I would like to make sure that the record reflects that Mayor Barraza
5 has joined us. Thank you. I think we're at a point where we can entertain
6 a motion to approve resolution 14-16: A Resolution Adopting the Federal
7 FY 2014 List of Obligated Projects.
8
9 Sorg: Move to approve.
10
11 Garrett: Thank you.
12
13 Benavidez: Second.
14
15 Garrett: That was, motion was made by Councillor Sorg and seconded by
16 Commissioner Benavidez. Any further discussion? Yes?
17
18 Flores: Do we need to amend the title or to ...
19
20 Garrett: I already did.
21
22 Flores: You, so that was done, okay.
23
24 Garrett: That's the way I said it.
25
26 Flores: All right.
27
28 Garrett: Thank you for double-checking. Any further discussion about this item?
29 In that case, would you please poll the Board or the Committee?
30
31 Wray: Mayor Barraza.
32
33 Barraza: Yes.
34
35 Garrett: Those in favor say "yes."
36
37 Wray: Trustee Flores.
38
39 Flores: Yes.
40
41 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
42
43 Doolittle: Yes.
44
45 Wray: Councillor Pedroza.
46

1 Pedroza: Yes.
2
3 Wray: Councillor Sorg.
4
5 Sorg: Yes.
6
7 Wray: Commissioner Benavidez.
8
9 Benavidez: Yes.
10
11 Wray: Commissioner Hancock.
12
13 Hancock: Yes.
14
15 Wray: Mr. Chair.
16
17 Garrett: Yes. One of the things I've tried to do is to get consistent responses as
18 opposed to "ayes" and "yeyes" and occasionally I confuse the Commission
19 by tricking them and asking them to do an "aye" instead of a "yes" to see if
20 anyone's paying attention, so very good. So that resolution is passed
21 unanimously.
22

23 **7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

24
25 Garrett: And, let's go to staff comments next and then we'll go to Committee
26 comments.
27
28 Murphy: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Under staff comments I wanted to, to give
29 the Committee a brief update on where we are with the Metropolitan
30 Transportation Plan update. As you know, Transport 2040 is due for, to
31 be updated and adopted by this Board by July at, at the latest. We've had
32 several rounds of public involvement. We've had some stakeholder
33 outreach groups. Currently staff is in the process of rewriting the text, the
34 text for Transport 2040 and also updating the maps and we hope to get
35 that text finalized, formatted into a, you know into a publishable document
36 that we can bring back I'm hoping by your February meeting to show you,
37 which then will, we'll do our final round of public involvement in order to, in
38 order to make, make sure we got, we got what the public's desires are
39 correctly. Couple of, couple things just the, and we've also, we've also
40 read heavily on some of the, some of the products coming out of the Viva
41 Dona Ana! As you know, the, the MPO is one of the members of the
42 regional consortium and they too are having a very intensive public
43 involvement process that also touches along a lot of transportation issues,
44 so we're incorporating that input into our own process because we, we
45 believe that you know it represents the, we, it represents the popular will.
46 As far as the popular will, what we're seeing is the main points coming out

1 of, out of our interaction with the, the people want to have more
2 transportation options. All the meetings that, that MPO staff have been at,
3 there's been a lot of call for more transit options throughout the region.
4 We've also been hearing some calls for making bicycle and pedestrian
5 facilities better, and then also high on the list of people's concerns are the
6 condition of the roadways that they drive on on a daily basis. So what I
7 believe our document's really going to represent coming out of this is
8 we're going to have a, and this, and this, you know does touch back to the
9 federal, federal regulations but I think out of our document the number-one
10 priority's going to be fix it first and provide for the existing communities.
11 That said, the, another major, major point that we've been hearing from
12 some members of the public that don't, that doesn't jive with that is we've
13 been hearing a lot of call for construction of a loop road system within the
14 MPO. While the major thoroughfare plan has shown some sort of loop
15 road system probably going back at least 20 years as I, as I look back
16 through historical documents of the MPO, we've never gotten it up to the,
17 to the project where it, where it's taken to that, the level of study where it
18 will become imminent. The lone exception would be the Phase A that had
19 been done on what we term as the High Mesa Road and what the DOT
20 had termed as the West Mesa. Different names cause it goes, it, it exists
21 in two different MPO areas. But that was, that's the only portion of a loop
22 road system that's had any further study than just being represented on
23 the major thoroughfare plan. That said, I, I think staff is leaning towards
24 putting in the document that we do not, we're not going to support and of
25 course if we put it in the document and you approve it, you'll be saying this
26 so that's why I want to have this discussion here now, we'll be saying that
27 we don't support the expenditure of public funds on constructing a loop
28 road system in the period of this MTP which would be up to the period of
29 2020. We want to make our priorities in the next five years to be towards
30 maintenance, towards improving existing, existing facilities, making them
31 better for multimodal, multimodal trips whether they be automobile, transit,
32 bicycle, pedestrian, so I think that's where we're headed with the, with the,
33 where we're headed with the MTP.

34
35 Pedroza: May I interrupt Mr. Chairman? I just need a clarification on a ...

36
37 Garrett: Certainly.

38
39 Pedroza: On a word. Loop roads.

40
41 Murphy: Loop road, when I, I, I mean ...

42
43 Pedroza: Is it loop, l-o-o-p?

44
45 Murphy: Yes.

46

1 Pedroza: Okay.
2
3 Murphy: Does that clear it up?
4
5 Pedroza: No, I still don't know what that is.
6
7 Murphy: Okay. A loop road, generally seen as a, as a bypass around the, the
8 central freeway system be it the interstate or, or in our case US-70 going
9 out. It would, they would generally be limited access facilities that
10 connect, that connect from you know say a portion on North I-25 would
11 connect to a portion west of the area on I-10 or west of I-10 to south of
12 this, south of the area on I-10 or, or that east and basically make a loop
13 around the area.
14
15 Pedroza: What purpose does that serve?
16
17 Murphy: The, the, well, the, the, the opinions are mixed on what actually it would
18 serve. A lot of people feel that it would, it would relieve traffic congestion
19 on those, on those facilities as they go through the urban areas. Other
20 people believe that they, they serve, that they, they generate growth for
21 the, for the region. On the, on the other hand people say that they're not
22 really taking away the trips that you know that are causing congestion
23 within the center, and from a development standpoint they're spreading
24 out development that was going to occur in the region anyway so, you
25 know, it, it, rather than promote growth it would promote sprawl. And
26 there are different camps that have different opinions on, on that and you
27 know not wanting to play the referee on that particular issue, I, I, what staff
28 wants to take is really we do know that they would add a maintenance
29 obligation to the, to the taxpayer within the, within the region so at the
30 standpoint we are at now, we would be against constructing them at any
31 time in the near future.
32
33 Pedroza: That was very helpful. Thank you.
34
35 Murphy: I think that, that pretty much concluded my, my speaking points. I, I did, I,
36 I got sent, I, a short video from somebody who interviewed, who was,
37 anyway, he writes for Access Magazine.
38
39 Garrett: Would you just hang on for just a second?
40
41 Murphy: Sure.
42
43 Garrett: Did you have a question about the presentation that was just made?
44
45 Hancock: Thank, thank you, Mr. Chair. In keeping with the question about loops, the
46 other term that's been used lately is bypass, and bypass being used about

1 the Baylor Canyon Road and if, if I remember and, and we'll have, have to
2 clarify that, but I had heard that the Mesa Grande was going to be the
3 major thoroughfare between Highway 70 and Dripping Springs at some
4 point in time and if I remember correctly in the most recent Community
5 Development meeting for the City for the, for the East Mesa there is a
6 4,000 home development in that area where Mesa Grande would be
7 actually completed and would end up being some major thoroughfare
8 going north-south. When, when an, when a structure is done like that, a
9 roadway is done like that and, and it becomes by default the byway, is that
10 classified differently from a loop?

11
12 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock, those, those are some excellent
13 questions. I'm glad you asked them. They, they kind of bring out some,
14 some points that I'm, we've been working into the text but I didn't, didn't
15 cover here. So a loop road bypasses and also beltways are, are generally
16 the terms that are used relatively interchangeably for those concepts. I
17 would, I would kind of specify that when we're using those terms and
18 those relations that they're, they're going to be constructed as limited
19 access facilities which they'd be freeway type similar to US-70 once you
20 get east of I-25. In the case of, in the case of Mesa Grande and what we
21 have shown on the Major Thoroughfare Plan and will continue to show
22 that alignment is it's being constructed as a principal arterial. That will,
23 that will have property, property access at, at major and multifamily and
24 commercial sites so according to the access management guide that, that
25 you all adopted as the MPO and as the City and/or County depending on
26 where it falls, their individual jurisdictions' thoroughfare design guidelines.
27 Also the, the point that made me especially glad that you brought it up is
28 that when it's being built by development, it's being constructed through
29 private dollars and it's not, not being, not being paid for with public dollars
30 which is where I kind of want to make the distinction in what the MPO plan
31 is saying, is that we'll still have the major thoroughfare plan to guide the
32 private development as it, as it occurs but we're not going, we're not going
33 to sign off on expenditure of public dollars for that, that construction.

34
35 Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair.

36
37 Garrett: Thank you. Commissioner?

38
39 Benavidez: Mister, I have, yes I have one more question, thank you. Regarding to the
40 loop again, you, you're saying that you're looking into connecting I-25 with
41 I-10? Is that ...

42
43 Murphy: I, let me, let me pull, pull up our Major Thoroughfare Plan. That might be
44 too big. Okay. So, really in the, in the southeast portion of the urbanized
45 area we had designated future Weisner Road to be what would be the
46 loop road for that quadrant, and it connects up at US, US-70 the existing

1 Weisner interchange and then it travels, travels south down to, goes into
2 the inset and it connects into the Mesquite, into interchange eventually.
3 This is the long-range plan so thinking about it within the 20-year, you
4 know the 20-year time frame. In the southwest quadrant we have the
5 High Mesa Road which kind of undecided whether it would be at the
6 Airport interchange or the Jackrabbit interchange and then it would go
7 down to south, down to Santa Teresa and it would finish its connection
8 outside the MPO area via probably a, another limited access facility in the
9 vicinity of New Mexico 404 through, through Anthony and it would connect
10 I-10 to, I-10 to I-10 basically that way. In the north, just do you see the
11 dashed line north of the airport and we need to work with BLM and the,
12 and the new national monument as whether this alignment is still valid but
13 it would, would be an extension of Engler Road to I-10 west of the airport
14 and it would be an, and it would be an interchange at the, at the new
15 underpass at Engler-Kennedy on I-25. And then we also have Arroyo
16 Road going into the Dona Ana interchange connecting east to Weisner
17 and then down south, down south to US-70. So those series of facilities
18 produces a loop around the Las Cruces urbanized area and it would allow
19 through traffic to avoid having to go through the center of the urbanized
20 area. And then there was a, a third one that was suggested to us which
21 would essentially go from Weisner Road across the new interchange that
22 the GRIP I-10 documents called out as a future Brazitos interchange and
23 then ultimately connect over into the High Mesa Road, so kind of an inner
24 southern loop from that regard. All of those, all of those loops are
25 currently discussed in the, or they're discussed in the current version of
26 Transport 2040, and when I talk about, when I mention loop roads that's
27 really the system that, that I am referencing.

28
29 Benavidez: And what's the time limit or the time plan on these roads?

30
31 Murphy: Really we, we are not, we are not programming them. We're not
32 identifying funding for them. They're just really showing the vision of the,
33 what, what we envision our future transportation system to look like.

34
35 Benavidez: Okay.

36
37 Murphy: And in all previous updates to the MTP that I've been involved with,
38 there's really been a, a small but vocal or small and adamant subsection
39 of the, of the population that feel that once Las Cruces becomes a, a real
40 city that we'll have a loop road system, so ...

41
42 Benavidez: Okay.

43
44 Murphy: Whether, whether we agree or not with that, the main purpose for having it
45 on the transportation, the Major Thoroughfare Plan is to really preserve
46 the, the right, the corridors so that if it does become needed in the future

1 it's not precluded by, by development that has, that has happened in the,
2 in the way of it.
3
4 Benavidez: Right. Right. Thank you. No more questions.
5
6 Sorg: Mr. Chairman?
7
8 Garrett: Thank you. Yes, Councillor Sorg?
9
10 Sorg: May I ask a question about this loop road system ...
11
12 Garrett: Certainly.
13
14 Sorg: That you've showed here. It has, it deals with the Engler Road that
15 connects or would connect up I-25 to I-10, and especially the part that
16 goes past to the Picacho Hills residential area. Have you ever heard any
17 comments from the public that oppose that road, that part of the road past
18 Picacho Hills?
19
20 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councillor Sorg, yes, yes I have.
21
22 Sorg: Okay.
23
24 Murphy: I've heard comments on both sides. That's why ...
25
26 Sorg: You have?
27
28 Murphy: At some point I'm going to ask ...
29
30 Sorg: Okay.
31
32 Murphy: All of you to, to be the referee and make a, a ...
33
34 Sorg: Well, in a general sense I, I think we can put these different segments of
35 the loop road into priorities and perhaps we may decide that that part of
36 the loop road may not be near the top. I'm just saying.
37
38 Murphy: In Transport 2040 we, we kind of identified that, that High Mesa would be
39 a priority. All of the others are, are not yet in the foreseeable future.
40
41 Sorg: Okay.
42
43 Murphy: But we could, we could go down all five segments and assign a priority to
44 them as well.
45
46 Sorg: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1
2 Garrett: Thank you. Councillor Pedroza?
3
4 Pedroza: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just going to be very brief. If a, a loop road
5 is something similar to what I have traveled in San Antonio several times,
6 we need to stay away from it. San Antonio, you start on one part and the
7 numbers are going east and west and then it does indeed loop but now
8 their numbers are totally different. I, I've been there several times and it's
9 the most confusing piece of road that, that I've ever been on. Thank you.
10
11 Garrett: If I could make a suggestion just based on the discussion here, we need
12 to block out a significant amount of time, is it February that you're thinking
13 about having this conversation?
14
15 Murphy: Yes, I think that, or ...
16
17 Garrett: Okay.
18
19 Murphy: Or, or January or ...
20
21 Garrett: Yeah.
22
23 Murphy: Every time until we ...
24
25 Garrett: Might want to split it a little bit. I, I think that there are a couple of, of
26 things that we might want to do as we work through here. One is that it's
27 really important for this Committee to understand what the intent is behind
28 the, the plan and, and so forth, the maps, I, I personally, I mean, I, I agree
29 and understand about setting priorities. I'm not sure how critical that is if
30 it's simply shown as a dotted line at this point and we're not actually
31 moving forward in that sense. On the other hand, if it's something we
32 have real reservations about, I think that that's, the question is then how
33 do you indicate that there's real reservation about this and this is
34 something that might need some additional study? So one is just making
35 sure we're all clear on what the purpose of this document is and how it will
36 be used. I think the life frame, the frame of reference is really critical for
37 that. The second thing is that there's going to be a, a major concern that
38 has to do with understanding the loop road. That's probably the most, sort
39 of a representative of a different kind of development pattern or strategy
40 and I don't think that that's at this point terribly consistent with what we're
41 doing in Viva Dona Ana! In terms of trying to protect opportunity or
42 diversity of development by actually increasing density in certain areas
43 and protecting density in other areas. So understanding the loop road and
44 how, how it could affect values and other goals that we have. And I think
45 the other thing is we don't want to let the loop road overpower all other
46 considerations that are in the document because that's not the only thing

1 that's, that's important. And so, there might be like at least three major
2 topics. There might be others. Trent you in particular might have some
3 other thoughts in terms of important things for us to recognize as, as far as
4 policy kinds of issues that are going to affect the next five to ten years.
5 And so I just think we, this is really an important document. We need to
6 be able to explain it to the public. We need to be comfortable with it. And,
7 I appreciate the work that you're doing Tom to, to, and that you're
8 sensitive to the input that we're getting from the public, and that's not
9 prejudging what we're going to do here but I think you're, you're identifying
10 a, a, at least a reasonable alternative for us to consider. So with that said,
11 are we okay with the idea that we're going to really pick this up in terms of
12 some discussion in January and February? Any suggestions for other,
13 other major topics that we might want to focus on?
14

15 Hancock: I think it'd be really important to, to do an overlay to this, to this as it
16 relates to transportation plans in the future. I think that'd be an extremely
17 important thing to do because that has a lot to do within the planning of
18 the types of roads that we, that we put into particular areas and, and how
19 they relate to intermodal and so forth.
20

21 Garrett: Right.

22
23 Hancock: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 Garrett: Good, good point. Anything else? Okey-doke, if you've got any other
26 suggestions, my suggestion is you let Tom know. Okay, and if you want
27 to copy me that would be great. So you have a video for us.
28

29 Murphy: I, I did have the video and, and I'm really glad about the, some of the
30 comments you made about development strategy. This individual writes
31 for Access Magazine which is a publication put out by the Transportation
32 Center at the University of California-Berkeley. They publish a quarterly
33 newsletter where they, where they transition from academic research to a,
34 to a more general consumable format and this gentleman was interviewed
35 on the latest article that he wrote that really has to do with, you know really
36 the, the basis for traffic projections and how they've come and, and how
37 they have been done in the past may not be the correct way of doing it
38 and I'll go ahead and let him, let him speak for himself and, and if you like
39 I can, I will then send you the article.
40

41 A VIDEO WAS STARTED.

42
43 Garrett: Tom, the sounds are real, really off.

44
45 Murphy: I'm not sure if I can fix it. Can you hear, are, is, you're not hearing it at all?
46

1 Sorg: Oh, that turns it up.
2
3 THE VIDEO OF ADAM MILLARD-BALL, APPROXIMATELY. 6 MINUTES
4
5 Murphy: I, I hope you found that interesting. I, I know that you also wear hats
6 approving developments and I thought it'd be a nice perspective to have,
7 and it kind of blends into some of the issues we're touching on in the MTP
8 about you know we're seeing declining, we're just seeing declining VMT in
9 our region and it's happening nationwide and do we really want to build
10 added infrastructure in association with that. So that concludes what I
11 wanted to, to put out to this committee this afternoon.
12
13 Garrett: Great. Could you send us the link?
14
15 Murphy: Yes sir. Absolutely.
16
17 Garrett: Just in case folks want to look at that again.
18
19 Sorg: Thank you Mr. Chairman. That's what I was going to ask.
20
21 Garrett: We're now ready to go to Committee comments and I'll just start on my far
22 right. Councillor Small anything? Trustee Flores?
23
24 Flores: None here except I would like to invite everybody to the Plaza when we
25 have our tree lighting which is, now I'm, Friday I believe and then for
26 Christmas Eve, so ...
27
28 Garrett: Great. Thank you. Trent?
29
30 Doolittle: Mr. Chair, if you'll allow I'll provide my monthly quick update on
31 construction project status.
32 Avenida de Mesilla project, we're still working on a few punch list
33 items but for the most part we are finished. I have not forgotten about the
34 request to have a public, I mean a ribbon cutting ceremony, but ultimately
35 there's a few things we'd like for them to get cleaned up, just to clean up
36 the area a little bit before we do that. So more than likely we'll schedule
37 that sometime after the first of the year, get through the holidays but we
38 are, we're making progress to get that one closed out.
39 Upcoming project that we have is the Missouri bridge. Andrew
40 mentioned it a little bit earlier. We have a preconstruction conference
41 scheduled for January 14th. That project has a 60-day ramp-up time to
42 allow the contractor to get his materials on place and mobilize, so we're
43 looking at probably starting actual construction sometime towards the
44 middle of March. That project has a one-year contract time, so we'll see
45 how that one goes.

1 North Main project, that's the one with Sandoval Construction just,
2 just right down the road. They're currently working on the median in the
3 Madrid area. Just so you know, we sent out a public notice starting
4 tonight they're going to set up traffic control that will eliminate all through
5 traffic on Madrid while we start doing utility construction with the City and
6 building the concrete intersection. So we'll start to see some impacts
7 there. We do have a detour set up in place and again the public notice
8 went out but hopefully we're not impacting too much traffic on the through
9 lanes.

10
11 Garrett: Councillor Sorg?

12
13 Sorg: Mr. Chairman, on that project especially, I read the public information
14 notices. Will there be traffic allowed to cross Madrid on Mesquite for
15 example, Mesquite?

16
17 Doolittle: To cross Madrid on Mesquite. The only, the only impacts will be the
18 through traffic across North Main.

19
20 Sorg: Okay. Thank you.

21
22 Doolittle: So we will be working in the intersection right there at Burger King.

23
24 Sorg: Yeah. Okay.

25
26 Doolittle: But all of the side streets, well actually part of the reason that it took us a
27 little while to get the, the notice out is we worked with the City to, to
28 determine where we could put traffic, so the City reviewed our traffic
29 control plan before we moved forward with approval with our district office.
30 So the only impacts will be at Madrid and North Main itself.

31
32 Sorg: Okay. So the utilities are under North Main as they cross Madrid then?

33
34 Doolittle: Yes.

35
36 Sorg: Okay. Not the utilities on Madrid.

37
38 Doolittle: Not being completed as part of this project, no.

39
40 Sorg: Okay. Thank you.

41
42 Garrett: Councillor Pedroza?

43
44 Pedroza: Thank you very much. Trent, about how long will the, the traffic on Madrid
45 be, be interfered with?
46

1 Doolittle: I will have to find out. He did not provide me details on that closure, but I'll
2 find, I'll find out and send an e-mail out.
3

4 Pedroza: Okay, thank you. I do send that information out to all my constituents and
5 I'm sure they're, they wanted to know how long it's going to last. Thank
6 you.
7

8 Doolittle: Just, what I'll try to do is get a complete schedule for that intersection
9 because the first phase will ultimately be to close the through lanes and
10 then we'll have to work on the other quadrants of that intersection to
11 complete it, so there'll be substantial movements there while we build the
12 intersection itself. So I'll try to get you schedules for each separate
13 quadrant.
14

15 Pedroza: That'd be very good, thank you.
16

17 Flores: Starting tonight?
18

19 Doolittle: Yes. That will start tonight. They're going to start doing that, it's my
20 understanding they're coming in late at night, after the rush hour so that
21 they can set up the traffic control without, with minimal traffic so that we
22 don't have those conflicts with the, with the setup.
23

24 Garrett: Thank you, Mr. Doolittle. You can continue.
25

26 Doolittle: Currently that project is scheduled to be completed in June of 2015.
27

28 Sorg: That's all of North Main
29

30 Garrett: That's all, the, the entire North Main.
31

32 Doolittle: That's the entire project, correct. Another one Mr. Chair that you, you
33 specifically had some interest in is our Vado-Mesquite project. Since we
34 switched sides, that project is actually moving along very quickly. They
35 placed the deck on the other half of the bridge about a week and a half
36 ago. They're working on all of their ramps. We should have the entire
37 interchange opened up we're hoping by the middle of next week, but the,
38 specifically the eastbound off-ramp in front of Landmark Mercantile should
39 be opened up by Friday. We were having some issues, originally we had
40 some issues with the guardrail end-treatments being pulled off the Federal
41 Highway Administration's approved products list. When they did that it
42 sent the entire nation into a frenzy trying to find replacements for that
43 device, and then because of temperatures we're not able to put the seal
44 coat on the roadway. Ultimately we made the decision to temporarily
45 stripe it and then when we get to the end of the project we'll, we'll do the
46 seal coat rather than delaying it any longer now. So we'll get that opened

1 up, but they're moving along very well now that we got switched over and
2 we should be completely finished with that project, they were showing
3 March, but again we may have about a month delay while we finish all of
4 the seal coat after the rest of the project's completed, so March or April
5 we'll be finished with that one.
6
7 Garrett: And you have a meeting at Del Cerro tonight?
8
9 Doolittle: Correct. I'm sorry, I forgot.
10
11 Garrett: Six o'clock.
12
13 Doolittle: That is correct. I won't be there, but we will have either our construction
14 engineer or our project manager to, and then of course our, our project
15 management team will be there but yes, you're correct. And just so you
16 know, Mr. Chair, I actually was in contact directly with the owners of the
17 Landmark Mercantile, I know our project manager had been but she's
18 called me twice so I gave her a call. She was appreciative of the
19 information but we're, we're doing what we can to get it open.
20
21 Garrett: I appreciate that. Thank you.
22
23 Doolittle: The other one that we have in the area, we've got a drainage project down
24 in Anthony. That's one that we completed the roundabout and the
25 pavement preservation some, about a year and a half or two years ago
26 and we've had some drainage issues so we're addressing all those
27 drainage problems and then we should be finished with that area in, in
28 Anthony for, for a while. And then we've got some, some bridge
29 preservation projects just in town, nothing, nothing real big, no closures.
30 You may see some lane closures or shifts but we're not going to be
31 closing any bridges themselves. That's just some pavement, some bridge
32 preservation work. Mr. Chair, I, that's all the updates I have for this month
33 unless anybody has any questions.
34
35 Garrett: Could I just ask you a follow-up in terms of the, the Vado interchange?
36 Will that get started immediately upon completion of the Mesquite
37 interchange?
38
39 Doolittle: That's correct. One of the things that we worked with the contractor to do
40 is not close both interchanges at the same time, so as soon as they get
41 that Mesquite open we'll switch over to Vado.
42
43 Garrett: And will that involve similar kinds of constraints in terms of traffic on I-10?
44 Is that mostly going to be the up above on the exits or the entrance and
45 exits and the, the roundabouts?
46

1 Doolittle: That's correct. At Vado we're not doing any bridge work, that's all
2 construction of the off-ramps, realignment of the frontage roads, and then
3 ultimately the building of the, the construction of the two big roundabouts
4 on either side of the bridge but no bridge work. So ultimately I don't
5 expect any major delays or shifts in traffic on the interstate itself.
6

7 Garrett: But it will require at some point some closures in terms of being able to
8 actually get on and off?
9

10 Doolittle: I think they have scheduled minimal closures, but the plan at that
11 interchange because of the truck stops and the dairies was to try to keep it
12 open all the time.
13

14 Garrett: Okay.
15

16 Doolittle: If you've noticed they've done a little bit of dirt work outside of, outside of
17 the existing ramps, then they'll start working on the new alignments, get
18 those opened up and then we'll start working in the vicinity of the old
19 alignments, but I don't expect any long-term closures of that interchange
20 like we did at Mesquite.
21

22 Garrett: Very good. Thank you very much. Councillor Pedroza?
23

24 Pedroza: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last night I had occasion to go to Anthony and
25 the, the traffic was still you know you haven't taken those barrels out and
26 everything, but the bridge itself is gorgeous. So I, I, I look forward to when
27 you do get the barrels out and traffic can flow freely. It's going to be very
28 very nice. My only other question is and I don't know, maybe it's to you
29 Chairman, what are we going to be doing about the folks that we had
30 invited, was it last month and, and then we, we couldn't, we met but it
31 wasn't a formal meeting. How are we going to reschedule that or what are
32 we going to do?
33

34 Garrett: Mr. Murphy would you like to respond?
35

36 Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councillor Pedroza, I guess we hadn't, or we hadn't yet planned
37 a, a, a repeat of last month's agenda. I don't, you know we, some of the
38 things that we, we discussed with Mr. Medina you know in, in person you
39 know we'll be moving forward with those, have, have staff you know
40 meeting on a monthly basis, things of that nature but I think I was going to
41 wait until, until this Board asked me or Mr. Medina found out from his
42 Board members that they would like to, like to come back and then we
43 would, would extend invitations at that point.
44

45 Pedroza: Thank you Tom. I know we didn't discuss this at the time but did you or
46 Andrew or anybody take notes from the, from the little talk that we had?

1
2 Murphy: I did not take ...
3
4 Pedroza: No?
5
6 Murphy: I did not take any notes.
7
8 Pedroza: Okay. Okay.
9
10 Murphy: I, since it wasn't a formal meeting ...
11
12 Pedroza: Right.
13
14 Murphy: I, I didn't want to have any notes.
15
16 Pedroza: Okay, sure. Okay then I would suggest that maybe for next time we
17 discuss the follow-up on that, okay.
18
19 Garrett: Could you put that on the agenda, a follow-up?
20
21 Murphy: Okay.
22
23 Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. That's all.
24
25 Garrett: Very good. And Councillor Small, did you have a question or a comment?
26
27 Small: Thank you, Mr., Mr. Chair. Just a brief comment to thank Mr. Doolittle
28 and, and everybody with NMDOT. The Valley Drive project, although
29 that's out quite a ways, I attended the first public meeting and the
30 valleydrive.net and the fully interactive kind of way of, of offering
31 information and soliciting feedback and comment is really a huge step
32 ahead and although there were some difficulties, I just think it's massively
33 impressive to find many more ways and interactive ways for folks to
34 participate in a very important project, so I did want to say that for the
35 record. Thank you.
36
37 Garrett: Yes Mr. Doolittle.
38
39 Doolittle: Mr. Chair that's the first time, my understanding, that's the first time that
40 that method has ever actually been used in the state of New Mexico.
41 Molzen Corbin has utilized those in some of the bigger cities on bigger
42 projects. I too, I wasn't able to participate in the meeting but I too watched
43 it from the house and it was, I was actually texting the guy sitting in the
44 room back and forth to see how it was going on their end. Short of getting
45 started a little bit late, it was very productive and I appreciate the
46 comments.

1
2 Small: Absolutely. Mr. Chair, if I may, absolutely and that, that information flow
3 was great. I, I did attend the meeting. It did, it took a while but it was, for
4 the folks who were there, it gave us the opportunity to, I think we made
5 progress even in that space and time. Again just very very impressive.
6
7 Garrett: Thank you. Councillor Sorg?
8
9 Sorg: No comment at this time, Mr. Chairman.
10
11 Garrett: Commissioner Benavidez?
12
13 Benavidez: No comment. I just want to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and Happy
14 Hanukkah. Thank you.
15
16 Garrett: Thank you. And Commissioner Hancock.
17
18 Hancock: Nothing at this time. I think we covered just about everything I had in
19 other comments. Thank you.
20
21 Garrett: Thank you. The first thing I want to do is apologize for the terrible mess-
22 up last month where our Commission meeting ran long and then went into
23 closed session, and I was focused on what was happening there and, and
24 so sorry about the lack of communication and just wanted to say I'm sorry
25 that that happened.
26 I also just want to let, let you all know that, was it last week, the
27 time is flying, that I did appear before the State Transportation
28 Commission that was meeting here and had an opportunity to both
29 welcome them and also to reemphasize the importance of highway
30 development in the south as it related to tying in with not only the border
31 activity and the relationship with the El Paso MPO and the whole
32 international scene, but also the connection in with, with Southern New
33 Mexico, Las Cruces, and then points north. And then I also talked with
34 them about the full vehicular access resolution that's been approved by
35 the Commission and the Council for access to Spaceport America.
36 I then had a chance to follow up with Secretary Church and with the
37 Chair of the State Transportation Commission and Mr. Doolittle was there
38 with us to talk more about that issue and we had some clarification in
39 terms of steps forward. At this point, I mean there's, there, there are a lot
40 of questions and the preeminent one relative to the spaceport is, is
41 whether it's a viable entity. The argument that, that I have made and that
42 at least has been supported so far by the Commission is that we're still
43 paying \$8 million a year in taxes in, everybody in the county who pays
44 GRT is paying for that facility and we will be for another 15 years. And so
45 rather than simply walking away from it the overall strategy has been to try
46 to figure out how we as a community can be more actively involved in

1 making that a productive economic asset. But you can't really do that if
2 you don't have access from Dona Ana County and so it's sort of finishing
3 the job. That's really what we're, what we're pushing forward and not
4 simply handouts, we're looking to see what we can do, what kinds of
5 possibilities are, are, are, are out there in terms of support financially for
6 this. Now were, Mr. Doolittle were you able to get that interchange on the
7 list that we had talked about or is there further action that's needed?
8

9 Doolittle: I did have a discussion on Friday with our, with the staff and ultimately it
10 was not added to the list. At this point in time I need to have a discussion
11 with the Secretary before I move forward ultimately. I mean, you heard his
12 comments and his concern about the amount of money it would take to
13 build that on the budget that we've got and ultimately if we put it in the
14 STIP it starts the process on some of those things although not an, an
15 initial cost that's real large. I, I need to have a discussion with the
16 executive staff to determine whether we put it on there if I don't, if I don't
17 have the support or understand fully where they're going to go with that
18 interchange because it's going to take their assistance. I, I, the District 1
19 office does not have the funding to build that interchange.
20

21 Garrett: Right. And, and that's always been understood. The problem is that if we
22 aren't able to get this thing sort of into some kind of system somewhere,
23 somehow, we are forever never going to be able to move forward, and so
24 I, I think your conversations with the Secretary and with the staff there, let
25 me know what is happening with that. At this point all we're wanting to do
26 is get on the list because there are opportunities in terms of both working
27 with the legislature as well as working with our federal delegation in terms
28 of looking for support. But I think it's something that really has come to
29 the fore for me this last year is the importance of infrastructure and in
30 particular of road, highway development, the limitations of money, we're
31 going to have to figure out what we choose not to do as well as what we
32 want to do and so that whole thing has become much more prominent in
33 my thinking, and I think if we talk about trying to improve what goes on in
34 Dona Ana County in the broadest sense and in support of, of what goes
35 on in this metro area here we've got a really, we've got a big job ahead of
36 us as part of the, you know, in terms of our responsibilities. Yes,
37 Councillor?
38

39 Sorg: Since you brought this topic up, I'm just reminding myself of the League of
40 Women Voters had a breakfast for the legislators last Saturday morning
41 and Senator John Arthur Smith was there and one of the last comments
42 he made is that he's going to propose in the State Legislature an increase
43 in taxes for roads. Of, and of course this would be on the fuels, and
44 obviously that hasn't flown very well in the past. However being that the
45 cost of gasoline is going down, the cost of petroleum is going down, he
46 probably has a little better chance now than he's had, than they've had in

1 the past but it's very obvious that our highways and bridges and roads
2 and, and so forth are in disrepair and there just isn't enough money to do it
3 all, case in point with the interchange. Thank you Mr. Chair.

4
5 Garrett: Right. Yes Mr. Doolittle did you have something?

6
7 Doolittle: I just, I know, Mr. Chair you and I have discussed this and I just want to
8 be, I, I just want the rest of the Board to understand, if we include this in
9 the STIP, we currently have a six-year STIP and the first four years are
10 fiscally constrained. The last two years are typically projects that we put in
11 there, there is no financial constraint to it but we put in there to begin this
12 process of either environmental or right-of-way studies or traffic analysis
13 or those types of things is the reason we put it in there. The thing I want
14 to be clear of is if we put it in, does not necessarily mean a commitment
15 from the Department or the District to move forward with construction. It's
16 to have it in there so that if, if money falls from the sky or an opportunity
17 comes up to do a study then we're not behind the eight-ball, we're more,
18 more ahead of. And so I only bring that up just because it starts showing
19 up in our STIP, please don't take that to mean that there's a commitment
20 from the Department to fund the Upham interchange. Perfect example of
21 that, we have a \$40 million project for NM-136 in our planning STIP.
22 Ultimately it's to try to begin the process. You know we're moving forward
23 with the Tiger Grant on 136 to, to study the Santa Teresa port of entry
24 specifically. We also have another planning study for that area itself and
25 the only reason that we're able to do that is because we have a control
26 number. So keep that in mind, if we do get it in the, the fifth or sixth year
27 of the planning STIP, it's not financially constrained. There is no
28 established construction for it. It's basically to allow us to move forward
29 with processes if the opportunity arises, okay.

30
31 Garrett: Right.

32
33 Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair.

34
35 Garrett: And you know ideally this all would have been done in 2008 and we would
36 have been in a position where we were actually getting ready to cut a
37 ribbon because these are very long projects and quite honestly the
38 Authority, the Spaceport Authority blew it. And for those of you that don't
39 know, we're paying 96% of the taxes to pay off the bonds for construction
40 of the spaceport, the, the bonds that are for, for the construction. So until
41 I'm convinced that there is no economically viable alternative in terms of
42 actually getting money back into Dona Ana County I think it's, the only
43 responsible thing to do is to keep working on the business development
44 and finishing the project. So that's just, there's different points of view on
45 that but I wanted to let you know what I was doing and why. And also to
46 say that, that the priorities that have come out of the Viva Dona Ana!

1 project which include seven projects that are basically south of Las Cruces
2 that connect Las Cruces to the El Paso metro area as well as around the
3 Santa Teresa, the border area and into Chaparral and then to the
4 southern road and the, the Upham interchange, those nine projects have
5 been identified as priorities for, for transportation and I presented those to
6 the, the people who are working on the statewide long-range multimodal
7 transportation plan. So we're, we're continuing to, to say "This is
8 important to us," and I think that that's an important step, but it, it is very
9 important that as Mr. Doolittle said putting it on a list doesn't guarantee
10 anything. There are all kinds of other pieces that need to be done and I
11 think that public involvement resolving some of these issues is an
12 important function that this Committee if nothing else can support, and so
13 all in all I just want to say it's been a very good year. I think in January we
14 change Chairs, right? So let me just say it's been a pleasure. I'll, I'll
15 convene the meeting next time but then we'll change hats, change Chairs,
16 but it's been my pleasure to serve as your Chair for the year and it's a
17 great Committee that we've got here and I think we're doing good work.
18

19 **8. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

20
21 Garrett: So with that we always have public comment twice. Does anyone from
22 the public wish to speak? Anybody in the audience want to say anything?
23 Okay.
24

25 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

26
27 Garrett: I'm going to say, everybody have a safe holiday and we will get back
28 together in January, and without objection we are adjourned.
29

30 Meeting adjourned at 2:12 p.m.
31
32
33
34

35 _____
36 Chairperson
37

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF January 14, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:

7.1 Resolution No. 15-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2014 Calendar Year by the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and adoption of Resolution 15-01 (Open Meetings Resolution)

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

1. Copy of Resolution 15-01

DISCUSSION:

Annually, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is required to adopt an Open Meetings Resolution pursuant to the State of New Mexico's Open Meetings Act (NMSA 1978, Article 10, Chapter 15). This resolution affirms the Policy Committees intent to follow the Open Meetings Act. The Open Meetings Act specifies how meetings that formulate and adopt public policy are to be conducted. In addition, it also identifies the notice requirements of regular meetings, special meetings, and emergency meetings.

OPTIONS:

1. Vote "yes" to approve Resolution 15-01 approving the 2014 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Open Meetings Resolution.
2. Vote "yes" to approve Resolution 15-01 with additional amendments or modifications.
3. Vote "no" and do not approve Resolution 15-01 as presented. This action would result in the Open Meetings Resolution being denied by the Policy Committee and would result in the MPO's committees being in violation of the State's Open Meetings Act.

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 15-01

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETINGS ACT FOR THE 2015 CALENDAR YEAR BY THE MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION.

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

WHEREAS, Section 10-15-1(B) of the Open Meetings Act (NMSA 1978, Sections 10-15-1 to 4) states that, except as may be otherwise provided in the Constitution or the provisions for the Open Meetings Act, all meets of a quorum of members of any board, council, commission or other policy-making body of a state or local public agency held for the purpose of formulating public policy, discussing public business or for the purpose of taking any action within the authority of, or the delegated authority, of such body, are declared to be public meetings open to the public at all times; and

WHEREAS, meetings subject to the Open Meetings Act at which the discussion or adoption of a proposed resolution, rule, regulation, or formal action occurs and shall be held only after reasonable notice to the public; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-15-1(C) of the Open Meetings Act requires the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to determine annually what constitutes reasonable notice of its public meetings; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution certifying compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2015 calendar year for all MPO Committees to be approved.

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

(I)

THAT all meetings of the Committees of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization shall be held in accordance with the Open Meetings Act

and with the provisions contained in the MPO Bylaws and the Public Participation Plan, as amended.

(II)

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

DONE and **APPROVED** this 14th day of January , 2015.

APPROVED:

Chair

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

ATTEST:
FORM:

APPROVED AS TO

Recording Secretary

City Attorney

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF January 14, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:

8.1 Human Services Coordinated Plan Update

ACTION REQUESTED:

None

SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

New Mexico Department of Transportation Staff will give a presentation regarding the Human Services Coordinated Plan Update.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF January 14, 2015**

AGENDA ITEM:

8.2 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

The Mesilla Valley MPO is currently in the process of updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan, known as Transport 2040. MPO Staff will give a presentation regarding this process.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

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

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

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

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF January 14, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:

8.3 El Paso MPO Coordination

ACTION REQUESTED:

None

SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

None

DISCUSSION:

This item is to discuss ongoing coordination efforts with the El Paso MPO.