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- Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)

STAFF PRESENT:
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- Michael McAdams (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT:
- Harold Love (NMDOT)
- Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
- Marcy Eppler
- Laura Wagner
- Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:06 p.m.)
Flores: Okay, I’m going to call this meeting to order.

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

No member had a conflict of interest.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: Okay. So then we'll go on and proceed to public comment. Is there anyone in the public that would like to comment? Okay. Seeing none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Flores: We're going to move forward to the consent agenda.

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Pedroza: I have two questions about the minutes.

Flores: Okay.

Pedroza: And I think I may already know the explanation but I wanted to verify it, the record. I recall that at January’s meeting there was some mention of the amount of money that might be necessary to build a loop road around the City of Las Cruces and there was no mention of that in the minutes.

Flores: Okay.

Pedroza: I understand from Andrew that it’s possibly because it was considered part of the presentation that we got from, who did we get that from?

Murphy: Mr. McAdams.

Pedroza: Yeah, Mr. McAdams. Is that general, what, if, if it’s, it was a question, it was rather than, than you know part of his presentation so why is that not included in the …

Murphy: Madam Chair, Councillor Pedroza, we had, a couple years back we had stopped transcribing the staff presentation portions of the minutes under the belief, you know and, under the reason that they’re usually associated with PowerPoints and other, other handouts and that information was readily accessible. The purpose you know, you know the purpose to do that was because in our, the City’s Community Development Department which we’re housed and, and the secretarial staff that transcribed the minutes, we were trying to reduce their workload and by doing, by doing so this took several hours.

Pedroza: Less.
1  Murphy: Off it that they were able to concentrate on their other, you know able to
devote to their other duties, their other assignments. However, you know
right now we're contracting that, that function out so that it's, it's really not
a, it's not a problem anymore with taking up finite staff resources. We, we
pay for a service and then we can, we can pay extra for added service so
if the Committee, if the Committee desires we can, we can change that
back to where we transcribe every you know even the, even the staff
presentations but originally we had done it and, you know to conserve
staff time.

11
12  Pedroza: Okay. That, that makes sense but I, I found the, the amount which I think
13  if I recall correctly was $300 million.
14
15  Murphy: Well that ...
16
17  Pedroza: But that, I thought, I found that very, very persuasive. And then the
18  second, then ...
19
20  Garrett: And therefore an important piece of information.
21
22  Pedroza: And then, a very important piece. And also the second part of that was
23  that I recall that, and again this does not appear in the minutes that the
24  staff recommendation was to, to say no to, to that particular item of
25  expense and neither of those two appear, so I would think that they would
26  be important and that if we now have the possibility of, of including those
27  as part of the minutes I think that I would, I would recommend that we do
28  that.
29
30  Murphy: Staff can do that.
31
32  Flores: Can we just include that? Okay.
33
34  Murphy: And then ...
35
36  Flores: Does anybody have an objection to including that? I don't see any, okay.
37  All right.
38
39  Pedroza: Okay. Thank you. Well then what do we move, that the minutes be ...
40
41  Flores: We'll amend it.
42
43  Pedroza: It will be amended or what?
44
45  Flores: Do we move to amend the minutes to include those then? Is that the ...
Pedroza: That motion.

Flores: That you have to make, motion, I mean.

Murphy: I would, I would hesitate on this particular instance of the minutes because those were not transcribed.

Pedroza: Right.

Murphy: We didn’t pay, we didn’t pay for those pages and the transcriptionist you know basically jumped over the staff presentation part because it wasn’t a requirement to transcribe it.

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: We can make available the, the PowerPoint that staff did. I believe that, that is probably available online anyway already but we can find a way to link them to the minutes but I don’t ...

Pedroza: And ...

Murphy: Think we need to amend previous.

Pedroza: And will today’s minutes reflect that the amount was stated and was that correct, the ...

Murphy: Yes.

Pedroza: $300 million?

Murphy: Yes, we’re recording this discussion.

Pedroza: And will they also reflect that in January staff’s recommendation was going to be that that particular item not be approved?

Murphy: Yes, that'll ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: All be reflected provided you and I spoke clearly enough.

Pedroza: Okay, thank you very much.

Flores: It just occurred to me that I did not do a roll call. Should we do that now?

Murphy: Okay.
Flores: Okay. Go ahead.

Murphy: All right. I'll, starting on your right. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Here.

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Here.

Murphy: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Here.

Murphy: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Here.

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez.

Benavidez: Here.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Here.

Murphy: And Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Here.

Murphy: And Trustee Flores.

Flores: And here and so now we're ready for the consent agenda. Do I have a motion?

Hancock: So moved.

Garrett: Second.

Flores: Okay. So all in favor, can we do an all in favor without a roll call? Yeah.

Murphy: Chair's discretion.

Flores: All in favor?
ALL: Aye.
Flores: Anybody opposed? Okay. Seeing none, it’s been approved.
MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5.  * APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes approved under Consent Agenda vote.

5.1  *January 14, 2015

6.  ACTION ITEMS

6.1  Resolution 15-02: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program
Flores: Moving on to six, action items, Resolution 6.1, a resolution amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program. So do we have any questions or discussion on that?
Sorg: Madam, we made a motion to approve it.
Flores: Oh. Okay. We have a motion?
Sorg: I’ll move to approve it.
Barraza: Second.
Flores: Any discussion? Okay.
Wray: Madam Chair, just to give a brief rundown ...
Flores: Okay.
Wray: Of the items. LC00150 is an additional $1.1 million for a paving project on I-10. Item 1100620 is again a pavement preservation project; this one is changing the end mile point to be the exact Texas state line on I-10. The last one is LC00130 which is part of the El Paseo improvement, overall improvement project and there’s a design decrease of $22,000 and construction increase of $71,300.
Flores: And there was, was that the one that had the e-mail with the $25,000?
Wray: Yes.
Flores: Could you explain that?
Wray: I have to defer to NMDOT staff for the explanation on that.

Flores: Okay. Can you have Jolene come up to the mic, or close to the mic?

Herrera: Okay. What happened on the e-mail is that we had already obligated $27,000 of design funding for the City and then when they came back with a new estimate of $5,000, that’s where I guess the difference came in. It was a little bit confusing in the e-mail but the bottom line totals still match up.

Flores: Okay.

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Olga Pedroza.

Pedroza: I just have a question and it’s just for information I suspect and Councillor Sorg has the same question. We both spent three or four days in San Diego last week and it was all around the El Paseo USA Grant which stands for urban sustainability something or other.

Sorg: Accelerator.

Pedroza: Accelerator. Thank you. So my question is how well-coordinated are, are the plans that the MPO might have for El Paseo and the City’s urban sustainability ...

Sorg: Blueprint.

Pedroza: Blueprint. That’s not an A, that’s a B.

Sorg: No, no, it’s I mean it’s ...

Pedroza: Accelerator. So that you know we can, I can see that we’re not working at cross purposes or duplicating stuff or ...

Murphy: Madam Chair, Councillor Pedroza, I, I sit on the, on the team for doing the El Paseo project ...

Pedroza: Right. Right.
Murphy: I traveled to Portland with, with I guess the first, the first group who’ve traveled on that. We reflect, we intend to reflect that on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: That we were working on the, the El Paseo corridor and then of course we’ll defer to whatever documents get you know adopted out of that as far as what the MPO supports.

Pedroza: Okay.

Flores: Very good.

Sorg: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Sorg: To continue, these improvements that are listed under this particular project do they, I’ll put it this way; is there any way they would conflict with the possibility of putting roundabouts at these intersections that are on El Paseo?

Murphy: I am unsure on that answer. I do know that, that the NMSU team that’s doing some of the design, design center drawings for it, are planning to present those at the end of, end of this month and I haven’t seen anything yet. They may or may not include roundabouts so ...

Sorg: Okay. Well we happen to see their presentation there in San Diego and just for the rest of the Committee’s information they do recommend roundabouts. We saw streets with roundabouts that are similar, not the same but similar to El Paseo and there is certainly a very strong should we say argument to putting roundabouts on El Paseo, especially for the businesses, to benefit the businesses along the street there but also key and most important probably is safety. And they have a lot of information about just those two things, or, or, or those two things and more of course. Safety number one and, and then also to benefit the, the businesses along the street so I’m just worried that we aren’t spending money that would conflict with the possibility of putting roundabouts at the intersections all the way from Main Street to University.

Murphy: Nothing that we are doing that would conflict with that.

Sorg: Okay.
Murphy: We, we, again I guess it, it’ll ultimately depend upon this Committee’s approval of the final plan that staff is developing but we, we intend to put the recommendations from that plan in, into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Sorg: Okay. Okay. And, and as a final comment on that, their, their arguments for roundabouts are very compelling. Very compelling. And we saw it actually in practice shall we say.

Pedroza: In action, yeah for at least an hour ...

Sorg: In, in La, in La, La Joya.

Pedroza: Watching the street.

Sorg: California. If you know where La Joya is, okay.

Flores: Yeah. I, I used to live there.

Sorg: Okay. They actually have done it there and it’s working, working well.

Flores: And it ...

Barraza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: My question is, are there ...

Flores: Statistics.

Barraza: Statistical, sheesh, data that supports the roundabouts? Especially like going down El Paseo. I guess that my concern is we invest all this money what we think is going on then five, ten years from now a new idea pops up and then we have all this money invested in the roundabouts or whatever direction we want to go so I’m just thinking where’s the data for that, that supports the roundabouts?

Sorg: The university students have studied it. They’re Ph.D. Engineering students and they have it all and they’re ...

Barraza: Here at NMSU?

Pedroza: Yes.

Sorg: NMSU, right. Yeah. I’m sorry. NMSU.
Barraza: Okay. But, and I, I kind of would like to see that study just because so much money is being invested in the roundabouts and I just want to make sure that the data is there to support it.

Sorg: Yeah.

Flores: In addition to that I think it’s been two years since we received one of our, you know how we get the little packets every once in a while with information from MPOs and I don’t remember who did the study, maybe you can help me out, but we had a section on roundabouts talking about how they’re better for you know you’re not having to stall so it’s better for the environment and better for moving traffic and can you, do you ...

Pedroza: (inaudible) safety.

Flores: Do you remember who put that out because it was in one of our packets that we receive periodically with information?

Murphy: Madam Chair I, I think you’re referring to the NMDOT Transparency Report which is an annual report they do on, on safety. A couple years ago they may, you know they may have had a real expanded section on, on roundabouts. I don’t recall if the latest iteration also has that as well but we can look for that and send that out.

Flores: Okay.

Murphy: Additionally FHWA has published numerous studies on the benefits of roundabouts. You know they, they reduce the more severe types of crashes, the T-bones and, and head-ons and so, and you know I think the findings are initially there’s an uptick in, in crashes at an intersection but those are all minor side to ...

Sorg: Fender-benders.

Flores: Fender-benders.

Murphy: Fender-benders so to say at lower speeds and then as people get used to them even those go away but there’s a drastic reduction in, in fatal crashes and in severe injury crashes and Mr. Doolittle had, District 1 has implemented roundabouts in several locations within our, within our area and you know he may want to expand upon what we’ve seen from those.

Flores: Do you want to?
Doolittle: That's right. I tend to agree with what Tom shared with you all. We've had really good success with our roundabouts. We're actually putting the two at the Vado interchange.

Flores: Seen them.

Doolittle: To, to deal with you know not only local traffic but also the heavy commercial vehicles. I, I didn't, I, I'm not aware of what you guys observed in La Joya but one concern that I would have with roundabouts on El Paseo would be right-of-way. Typically when you start putting in roundabouts you start having to buy corner properties and so your, your, your costs to get to that point tend to go up but we've had a lot of success with roundabouts. They help with not only congestion they're, they're a traffic calming device, they help with emissions because you're not having to stop. We've had a lot of good success and we'll continue to implement them.

Sorg: I could add to that what we observed there in California was that traffic still flowed at the same rate from one end of the street to the other, the same time I should say, the rates differed of course but it's a nonstop situation and it's not like if you, well they were saying that that particular street there would be speeds of about 45 miles an hour with traffic lights and, and four lanes too. They reduced it down to two lanes and then with the roundabouts they found out people travel through it at the same time, same amount of time.

Benavidez: Madam Chair, I have a question.

Flores: Yes, Commissioner.

Benavidez: Thank you. When you observed the roundabouts in California, did you observe any emergency vehicles, how are they going to go emergency pass throughs?

Sorg: No emergency vehicles, no there was not.

Pedroza: We were there for about an hour and you know talking to one of the businessmen who was just absolutely enthusiastic about the effect that the roundabouts, with the consequent lowering of speeds people do not just “shoomm” drive by all the businesses without even seeing them. They said, “Oh. We didn't know you were there.” And, and so all the businesses have actually profited and benefited from the slower speeds but it's a constant speed.

Benavidez: Right.
Pedroza: So from one end of, of the street whatever it was to the other the, the traffic just continues to flow, continues to flow. If they need to make a left turn they are not interrupted except by maybe a yield but everybody now knows. I think that the most important thing that stands in the way of roundabouts would be a real good education at different forum, different to, to show people why in fact for safety, for the environment, for the businesses, etc. roundabouts can be really, really beneficial.

Sorg: If you’re interested I got a picture of one.

Garrett: Just, since we’re talking about this, when you’re talking about the roundabouts on El Paseo you’re talking about one at Main and El Paseo? So that whole big interchange including the, the drain that runs down the middle of it?

Sorg: Well maybe not you know.

Garrett: Okay.

Sorg: They’re proposing roundabouts anywhere in the, anywhere they can make it work.

Garrett: There, so it’d be there, Idaho, Boutz, and University would be the big ones?

Pedroza: Yeah.

Sorg: Yeah.

Garrett: And well I guess the other one would be ...

Pedroza: Wyatt.

Sorg: Farney.

Garrett: Farney. Yeah. Yeah. So that’s a bunch of them. Yeah. And in some cases there’s some clear space around but in other cases it’s not.

Sorg: Yeah.

Garrett: Interesting.
Flores: Yes, I believe the ...

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: One other comment that I would like to make is it also eliminates signals.

Pedroza: That was my question.

Doolittle: That’s you know your, your $500,000 or $600,000 or $700,000 per signal. You don’t have to maintain the, the power to those signals. You don’t have to worry about upgrades based on you know technology advancement so ultimately it eliminates, you may have some initial right-of-way costs but ultimately it reduces your long-term maintenance just because of the technology that you eliminate.

Flores: And isn’t that part of what we’re putting in right now as part of the, part of what we’re funding now is signals?

Sorg: That’s what I was asking Mr. Murphy here.

Flores: So ...

Sorg: And he says no.

Flores: Okay. I thought, I thought signals were included so that’s fine.

Barraza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Barraza: One question. Especially on El Paseo and Idaho, well even down further by the high school there’s a lot of pedestrian traffic. So how do the roundabouts address the pedestrian crossing?

Sorg: Safer. Much safer. This particular street that we were observing divides or separates the, the, the ocean front views, an oceanfront, people were out there surfing. We watched them surf there when we were there and ...

Pedroza: Safely.

Sorg: And it, safely, yeah. And there’s a couple blocks of neighborhoods beyond this particular street here. Do you remember the name of the street? Doesn’t matter. And the people on the other side of the street
always wanted to go down to the ocean but they were afraid to cross this particular street.

Pedroza: Boulevard.

Sorg: A street not, not unlike El Paseo. Now they feel very safe. Traffic is slower. They have special crosswalks that you can take to get from one side to the other especially with the slower traffic.

Barraza: Interesting.

Flores: Okay.

Hancock: Madam Chair, they also have a law against running down pedestrians.

Barraza: That’s the number one rule, right?

Murphy: Never fly here.

Flores: So do you have any more discussion now?

Barraza: We’re probably way off track anyway. I’m (inaudible) that.

Flores: So, so can I ...

Garrett: We’ll you’ve got a motion and ...

Barraza: And a second.

Garrett: And a second.

Flores: So I’m, I’m going to go ahead and call the question so.

Murphy: I’ll take the roll call or ...

Flores: I can do this by ...

Murphy: However you want it.

Flores: Okay so those in favor?

ALL: Aye:

Flores: Anybody opposed? Okay so that’s passed.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Human Services Coordinated Plan Update

Flores: Next item on the agenda is discussion items. So 7.1 human services coordinated plan update.

Wray: Thank you Madam Chair. I would like to turn my seat over at this time to Ms. Marcy Eppler from NMDOT who’s going to speak to you.

Flores: Okay.

Eppler: Thank you Madam Chair, Board members. Thank you Andrew for putting me on the, your agenda for today. As you know, I believe Delilah Garcia was here in the summer and talked about the, the Coordinated Plan Update. I’m pretty sure she, she was here so what I’m here to do today is just to answer any questions you may have. You have a, a survey in front of you if you could answer that. I’ve been going around the state and taking, really just updating the, the, each RPO, RTPO, MPOs and seeing if you have any questions. So if you could just fill out the survey for me and I will collect them and it’ll be part of the, the plan where this is the last meeting that we will be going to so five of the six plans have already been completed. We’re waiting for this and you should see it on, on our website in the next couple of months.

Flores: Okay.

Sorg: Could I ask a question?

Eppler: Absolutely.

Flores: Yes, that’s what I was...

Sorg: Starting with number one, when you’re saying special need populations are you talking about the same as ADA or is that different?

Eppler: Yes. This is all the disabled and the elderly.

Sorg: Okay.

Eppler: So it’s the 50, the Section 5310 Program...

Sorg: Okay.
Eppler: And it is a federal requirement that this get done so this afternoon I'll be in Sunland Park and going and getting some public comment from those folks down there.

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes?

Pedroza: On number five which is work with the South Central Regional Transit District to coordinate and share vehicles currently allocated and confined to only specific services and programs. Can you explain what that is?

Eppler: Well the South Central RTD has not, I mean we do have an RTD down here?

Pedroza: Yeah.

Eppler: Although it's not acting as an RTD hopefully in the near future they were to update or to complete their plan. I believe we're really close.

Barraza: You're looking at that?

Flores: I'm just disappointed with the last ...

Hancock: I'm not listening to you ...

(inaudible, many people talking at once)

Eppler: I think they're really close. That's my understanding. I did not start with this project. That, that was Greg White. Greg has since retired so I am the 5310 and 5311 coordinator so I'm just kind of filling in Greg's shoes but when he left in August he said this plan was really close to getting finished.

Barraza: It is.

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: I, I do have a question, Marcy. Number, number eight where it talks about increased service delivery in smaller rural areas. How do you define smaller? Just because Socorro is certainly a different size and a different
structure I guess as opposed to Chaparral so how did you define those or are those just specific examples?

Eppler: They were examples and that was done in the 2007 plan. These were outlined in here.

Doolittle: Okay.

Eppler: So obviously back in you know 2007 it could be, could’ve been a little different. I know there’s great needs in those, those towns, Santa Teresa and Sunland Park, Columbus, I know there’s lots of little towns that really need services.

Flores: Okay. Well thank you very much.

Eppler: Thank you.

Flores: So I, who are we to give these, we’re just going to leave these for, for Mr. Murphy?

Eppler: You, you can.

Flores: To collect ...

Murphy: Yes, give, give them to staff.

Flores: At the end of the, staff, and then we’ll have them put them to you?

Eppler: Thank you very much.

Hancock: You’re welcome.

Flores: Thank you for coming.

Garrett: Are you looking for input from other groups as well?

Eppler: Well I have gone around the whole state and I’ve, I’m doing, I have done public hearings and I’ve gone to all of the RTPOs throughout the state and other you know making agendas for just public comment. It is on, I believe it’s on some websites. There’s the RTPO website if you’re familiar with that. I’d asked some of the planners to put this, just this questionnaire ...

Garrett: Yeah.

Eppler: On the ...
Garrett: Cause there, there are a number of programs around the state that are part of the Place Matters Program.

Eppler: Okay.

Garrett: And I think there’re four of those in different counties and they’d be, you know they’re, they’re basically looking at health. Sorry I, I didn’t ask your permission to speak.

Flores: It’s fine.

Garrett: Thank you. Somehow sitting around the table makes it more informal. But I just thought it’d be good to reach out to those groups because they are looking at the relationship between how we modify the environment and health in particular.

Eppler: That’s awesome. I will give you my card and I certainly can extend this. We do have a consulting agency working on putting this together. It’s not the, the DOT, it’s a consulting, consulting firm. So sure, I’d love to give you my card and we can open it up, more public.

Garrett: Okay.

Flores: Thank you very much.

Eppler: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Hancock: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Hancock: The, the meeting this afternoon in Sunland Park, is that more of this same, it was billed as rural transportation?

Eppler: It, it is. It’s the FDA Section 5310 Program.

Hancock: Okay.

Eppler: And it’s, I worked with the MPO planner down in El Paso and it was, and Jolene, we, we said “Where should I go?”

Hancock: Yeah.

Eppler: Because I don’t know this area at all. I work with RTPOs. I, this is like only the second MPO meeting that I’ve been to so I don’t know this area
very well. And that was the, kind of said “Hey, how about Sunland Park?”
that kind of thing.

Hancock: Okay.

Eppler: So that’s why we, we chose that venue.

Hancock: I see. And that’s with the El Paso MPO.

Eppler: It’s working with Ephraim, yes.

Hancock: Okay.

Eppler: With the El Paso MPO.

Hancock: Okay. Just trying to decide if I need to be at that meeting in two hours.

Eppler: It, it’s going to be, it’s yeah so it’s going to be the, the, the same thing.

Hancock: Oh, okay.

Eppler: Okay, I’m just going to hand that out, give a little brief, brief overview.

Hancock: Okay. Thank you.

Eppler: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

7.2 Transport 2040 Update

Flores: Okay. So moving along to 7.2 Transport 2040 Update so ...

Murphy: Okay. Thank you. I, I did have, I had a PowerPoint so I’ll try and remember. I’ll, I’ll send that along to everyone afterward. Essentially we included in the packets the text that we updated from, from current Transport 2040. Last fall we updated the Chapter 2 sections to more closely represent current, you know the most current statistics and, and trends. Primarily the, the big changes occur in Chapters 4 and 5 for this, for this plan as far as the, what used to be the, and get to my correct page here ...

Pedroza: (inaudible) page numbers.

Murphy: Right.

Sorg: Is that, these the parts that were highlighted in yellow on the digital copy?
Murphy: No, I think anything, was actually something that, that staff still needed to, to double-check on that.

Flores: Chapter 4 starts at 93.

Barraza: Ninety-three.

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: So beginning on, beginning on page 93 of your packet. Give everyone a second to get there. Chapter 4 was where we had our strategy toolboxes, what guided us in development of the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan, the Access Management Plan among others. This is where we intend to rule in the, the federally-required performance measures with the knowledge that FHWA and FTA have not completely ruled out everything that we were expecting to and so we'll need to remain flexible moving forward. We do intend to, to try and utilize what we've learned in the asset management portion to fully inform our, our performance measures. We want to you know the safety, safety goals have already been set out through FHWA. We're going to essentially use crash records and then a, in monitoring for an ongoing improvement, hopefully ongoing improvement in, in crash statistics as one of our performance measures.

We also wanted to look at implementing things such as pedestrian level of service. We have many, many, many poor spots in our region where there are incomplete sidewalks, substandard sidewalks. We want to do an inventory of those and start bringing, bringing the pedestrian aspects up to, up to the line. Same thing with the, with the bicycles. We'll look at the level of service there.

Moving onto page 94, this is a preliminary list kind of as, as I'm thinking it over talk, talking with Michael and Andrew on that we certainly want to keep crash records as an automobile measure. I think level of service might be something possibly want to maybe, if I can think of any more hedge words, we may move away from. Travel time becomes kind of more important. I think Councillor Sorg really, really gave a good explanation about describing the El Paseo corridor. It's not how fast you can, you can travel, it's how long it takes you to, to traverse the corridor and, and eliminating stops. You know you can, you can deal with a lot, you can deal with slower travel. I think we're probably further along with some transit performance measures. Roadrunner's recently put AVL onto their, onto their buses. They've given MPO staff access to pull down those records so we can start developing reports on their on-time performance. We're also looking at getting some equipment on a couple of the buses where we can chart passengers' ingress and egress.

Hancock: Madam Chair.
Flores: Commissioner.

Hancock: What’s, what’s AVL?

Murphy: Oh, I’m, I’m sorry. AVL is Automated Vehicle Locating system so ...

Hancock: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Murphy: Essentially it’s a, it’s a GPS that allows basically anybody with web access and the web address can tell where a particular bus is at a particular time and we can chart you know how long it gets from point A to point B, if it’s, it’s broken down somewhere, Transit staff can know that, dispatch mechanics and then also we think it’ll be very helpful for us to chart passenger trends as far as where to look you know locate improvements and invest our resources.

Freight, as you know we’ve been, we’ve been counting truck, heavy truck percentages with our Traffic Count Program of lately. I want, still working on refining how particularly to report that but we have a, basically a place marker in here and we want to have that moving forward. What we hope to do is to better, better format this document, get it released out to the public here very shortly.

Hancock: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner.

Hancock: Would you like to do the PowerPoint? We have staff available.

Murphy: Sure.

Flores: Okay. So how much is sunless, or would you rather finish your sun, sir, finish it before we ...

Murphy: Oh, okay. I’ll go ahead and finish up there then.

Flores: Okay. So we’re going to have a little short recess so that we can move and get a presentation, okay. About 3 minutes should be enough.

ABOUT FIVE MINUTES RECESS.

Sorg: We have to reconvene from recess there.

Flores: So I’ll reconvene from recess and we’re going to start at, continue with our 7.3 Transportation 2040 Update and presentation by Mr. Tom Murphy. Thank you. Go ahead.
Murphy: Okay. All right, so we moved it to Chapter 5 of the plan is where we have, where we set the MPO priorities and most familiar to people, how we set them out is by showing of our maps. Last, last meeting we discussed potential loop roads and the major you know the Major Thoroughfare Plan and we wanted to, there’s a, there’s a censor in the committee, we wanted to, to kind of get away, get away from that. So we've gone back and we, we developed a, a new flagship. I’ve been calling it a flagship. I, I hope that makes, makes sense and meaning to people but the flagship map for the MPO and we'll call it the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and essentially the base of that map is the existing functional classification database that we have and then to that we add publicly fund, or what we expect to be publicly funded projects over the life of the plan to the, to the horizon year 2040. And so it looks a lot less extensive than the previous Major Thoroughfare Plan. We also just so I can get Andrew to advance to the next couple of slides, we’ll, we'll retain, not yet.

Barraza: Didn’t think of that, show him what the cue is.

Murphy: Yeah. We, we forgot to come up with a code word. So we’ll continue to have a, a pedestrian system priorities plan, bicycle plan, functional classification map, travel system priorities. We’ve also discussing at the TAC level having a truck route map and all of, aspects of each of those plans go into this map to develop what is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for this MPO and if we’ll go ahead and go to the next slide.

Hancock: Madam Chair?

Flores: Yes, Commissioner.

Hancock: Does this include hazardous materials routes?

Murphy: The truck route we, I, I think it has, has the potential to expand into hazardous cargo routes. It’s been a while since I’ve looked into the issue but I think there’s some, there’s some state laws regarding what we can do and if we wanted to go down, if we want to go down that path there’d be some research about what we’re allowed to do but we are, I think we’re opening ourselves up the, the potential to do that but I can’t say with certainty at this point that we are going to do that.

Hancock: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Murphy: Okay and I just tried to, tried to get a little bit close-up of this map so it's easier to see on the screen. This is the, the plan that is rolled out on the, on the table there so you, if you, so after the meeting you can take a, a very close look at it and ask any of the staff questions about it. Next slide.
Okay. So each, you know each of the, the colored lines on that map represent a specific project. In the first five years of the plan we have the public projects listed of projects that are currently on our TIP and as you see they’re all, they’re all essentially existing facilities work and no, no expansion projects and they come to a total of you know just over, or almost $30.5, $37.5 million. Go up, move on, next, next slide.

Okay. And, and these are, these are some of the projects that we had, we’d learned about through one public process, meetings with the BPAC, meetings with the TAC of possible, possible, possible future projects that we may, may wish to entertain and we’ve, we’re started the process of trying to get some cost estimates for. Those are at, at this moment the staff’s best, best estimation of what those projects would ultimately, ultimately come to. This one, again, mainly circulation improvements. We do look at maybe possibly extending Lohman Avenue in that ten-year time frame, you know I think as we get to the, as we get to the next transportation update that answer would be more clear. We have, we have possible Missouri Avenue extension which I, I got, have a little announcement for later in staff comments. Next slide.

This continues that list. As you can see it’s a, it’s an extensive list. Again, circulation improvements up on the East Mesa. One of the, the next, the, the third and fourth on that are the City’s Transportation Department’s major initiative that they want to move forward with is, and it’s represented on the map as an ITS corridor. What that would be doing is some of the signals in our most heavily congested areas that we’d deploy an adaptive signal, lighting ...

Pedroza: ITS?

Murphy: Yes, this is a, ITS is Intelligent Transportation Systems and it’s using technology to help us better utilize existing roadways that we have so that we don’t have to expand but we’re able to do things that, that increase capacity, maintain flow, make, make (inaudible).

Pedroza: Is that like remotely look at, using those cameras to, to ...

Murphy: They can use, they, they can remotely use the cameras, they can, there’s some degree of automation for it. They’ll have, they’ll have a, a traffic control center.

Pedroza: Right.

Murphy: Which essentially is somebody, some staff member who has access to those, who can control those cameras and they can adjust the signal timing if they see congestion or if there’s any you know accidents. Bus priority on those corridors or emergency, emergency vehicle preemption are also aspects of, of those ITS that can be done.
Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. Are, are all the transportation issues around Centennial resolved? Because there was a lot of discussion about the alignments and what roads were coming in in order to make sure that they were adequate you know ...

Flores: Logistics.

Garrett: Two ways in and out for emergencies and, and so forth as well as the impact of extension of the, the roads in front of A Mountain to the west of A Mountain. Does this reflect any significant changes in ...

Murphy: I think that one of, one of the things and I alluded it, alluded to with the Missouri extension is a, a multiple, you know more cardinal directions of access to that, better, better circulation. We, we are, it, it was put in our UPWPA that, that you approved last, last summer that we looked at a Missouri, extension of Missouri and part of that is to look at circulation patterns around Centennial and we'll be moving the, we'll be moving forward with the contract with that. Hopefully we'll, we'll get as our fiscal agent have the City Council approve that, I'm, I'm trying to get on the March 2nd agenda for that but that's, the, the purpose of that study is to, is to look at those questions precisely and then come up with, come up with some recommendations.

Garrett: But that, right now that's the only major study proposed, change associated with Centennial per se.

Murphy: That, that is the, that is the only change that, well it's, that is, that is the name of the study that we're going for. We're looking at doing a Phase A study which in NMDOT parlance is, is how, how they move every project forward. They do an A, B, C and then construction drawings on the, in the Phase A the primary purpose of it is to look at the purpose and need for a project and one of the things that they, they study very closely would be the no build situation, or the no build condition. On studying the no build situation, the question will be asked and hopefully answered, “Are there other things that you can do to address the perceived problem?” That's how I, that's how I see those questions getting, getting addressed within the realm of that report.

Garrett: Okay. Could I just ask one other question?

Flores: Sure.
Garrett: These projects that are being proposed, how well are they aligned with transportation recommendations that are in the comp plan that’s been developed by Viva Dona Ana? Does that system get down to there, there’s some ideas there and I’m just curious about how this work aligns with that work.

Murphy: I think it aligns fairly well but you know but as you’re saying the, the scale of vision looking at them are different. I think in taking all these projects as a whole we’re working on strengthening the existing communities and, and taking care of our maintenance obligations and it’s not, not spreading out new, new capacity so I think we line up pretty well with the Viva Dona Ana on that. As far as specific project selection we’ve got, got most of, most of these are, are pretty city-centric. That’s, that’s where ...

Garrett: I understand.

Murphy: We’ve been hearing that and I understand a lot of the Viva Dona Ana, any capital improvements I think are being concentrated in the, in the borderland which is outside our geographic responsibility but, so that’s why we’re not seeing that but I think philosophically I think we, we line up real well with the aims of Viva Dona Ana.

Garrett: Yeah, the, the main, the, the, the study area for the MPO takes in La Mesa and, right, I mean it goes all the way ...

Murphy: Yes.

Garrett: Over there, takes in Berino and, and Vado and Mesquite and, and San Pablo and all of that and I think the, the Viva Dona Ana plan anticipates strengthening and seeing certain kinds of improvements and growth in those areas and so it’s partly, I, I realize by the scale that it’s still like a neighborhood scale for the City of Las Cruces but nonetheless those are important scales. And you know how this relates to Mesilla as an example, just kind of looking forward, have we adequately addressed the critical needs within those areas? Just a question.

Murphy: And there’s one that, that would really help to, to get through our Technical Advisory Committee. We have three County staff members on, on the Technical Advisory Committee and you know really we’re dependent upon them to put forward any specific projects in, in those, in those areas.

Garrett: Who are they?
Murphy: It’s John Gwynne from, from the Flood Commission, Luis Marmolejo from, from Planning, and Rene Molina from Engineering.

Garrett: Okay. We just need to make sure that they’re plugged into what’s going on with the other things so we don’t have ...

Murphy: Right.

Garrett: Disconnects all over.

Murphy: And you know, you know I, I think you know I, I think the, the scale of projects that the MPO looks, look at might miss you know the, the neighborhood size of La Mesa or Berino. One thing that we, we are looking at doing is you know pedestrian needs plans MPO-wide and I think, I think the, the historical communities down south will be, you know their pedestrian needs will be covered or taken into account and, in that, in those types of studies.

Garrett: Well a, a good example though is the Corridor Plan which is 28 and connects in with ...

Flores: Mesilla.

Garrett: Mesilla and then runs south through a good portion of the MPO and that would have to do with amenities and bicyclists and you know signage. I mean there’s a bunch of things that are part of that that you would think that one would merit some attention as part of this.

Murphy: That’s a, that’s a very good point. I think we should find an, a way to reflect that on the map and then, and then come up with a proposed, proposed cost for that to you know help demonstrate that, that it’s fiscally constrained but yeah I see that and thanks for bringing that up.

Garrett: That’s a good, that’s a good example of one that, that does tie in.

Murphy: Absolutely.

Garrett: With the, okay.

Murphy: And then I guess go down the list there’s a, a Triviz-University and I-25 ramp redesign that I believe the DOT is looking at.

Flores: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Madam Chair, does that include an underpass underneath University Avenue with Triviz?
Murphy: That’s what I’ve heard, yes.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Right?

Doolittle: Yes.

Sorg: Thank God. Don’t say anything.

Murphy: And then combined with our Missouri study we’re looking at a West University study as well and this would be from 478 to 28, looking at what, what we can do in the area to improve circulation and particularly around Zia Middle School and then again I hope they have that at, at, that’s contract at Council at the, their March 2nd meeting so we can get working on that. Next slide, please.

And then this is a little bit of, this is, I guess a little bit of what we know of the funded ones, more maintenance, I-10 we all know really the Valley Drive which is proceeding, the Main-Solano intersection, Roadrunner design building a new maintenance facility for their buses and we have a signal at, at Picacho and 17th.

Pedroza: (inaudible) No they’re not.

Murphy: Actually I think, actually we saw this slide already. I apologize.

Sorg: Yeah it did look familiar.

Murphy: And then, and then this is, this is our far out years and some very expensive ones, Arrowhead Interchange, Mesa Grande construction from Onate down to Lohman which would be, be, be the first expansion that we’re looking at in this, in this plan, under this plan but we would wait till after 2030 to do it and the City suggested that we do a Madrid grade separation at I-25 crossing similar to Spruce. Next slide.

And then in the tiny map in the right-hand corner you’ll recognize the former major thoroughfare plan showing all the potential right-of-ways. What we want to do is to retain this map as, as a right-of-way preservation map but we’re going to add some language to it that kind of, kind of strengthens our you know lets our, our maintenance focus over the next couple of years, we have a statement we do not support public funding for expansion of the roadway system at this time. And then the third bullet point would be the, the really big one which will get, get you guys yelled at about how unreasonable, unreasonable I am is we’ve started asking for cost-benefit analysis on roadway expansions so that when a, when a subdivision or development comes to your Council or Commission asking
to, to approve it and to, for you to accept maintenance of all these new roadways that MPO hopes that we'll be able to ask, ask for a cost-benefit analysis to it which not, not only accounts for the increased revenues that the property taxes bring and, and all that but it also has an accounting of what the maintenance costs over the years and what the first rebuild is going to cost. You know maintenance is an ongoing thing, you look back couple of slides we have the mill and overlay on I-10 to the Texas border and that’s a mill and overlay on a five, six-year-old road so maintenance, maintenance has to go on for the life. It’s no such thing as really being a new road and worry about it 20 years later.

Pedroza: Will you get, be, Madam Chair?

Flores: Yes Councillor.

Pedroza: Will you be giving us criteria to use in order to evaluate whatever cost-benefit is presented to us?

Murphy: I don’t think we want to give any criteria. I think we just want to ask the questions, have the answers put out there, and then you or your successors in those seats can, can say, “Well wait a minute you know, you know why should we do this?” And then you can you know based on the current you know this way the MPO, we’re not putting up a road block, we’re just asking for more information so you can make better decisions.

Pedroza: You’re putting it all on us, yeah. Okay.

Murphy: Okay. Next slide.

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Well just to follow up on, on Councillor Pedroza’s comment I, I think it would be appropriate to have in the plan a, a statement that, that staff would be available to provide best practices or to provide examples of good cost-benefit analysis for this kind of work because leaving it hanging for those who don’t have an existing model is problematic to actually getting it done.

Pedroza: That’s what I meant to say.

Murphy: Yeah. That’s a, that’s a good idea seeing that you’re take, taking the note for that.

Flores: All right.
Murphy: Okay. I can get this next slide. That, that concludes the presentation I had so if there are any questions that hadn’t, hadn’t come up already.

Flores: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: I, in that project list can we not rule out the interchange at Engler and I-25?

Pedroza: Rule it out.

Sorg: I just don’t want it then ruled out because you know maybe in 20, 30 years that will be an important place for people to move around on.

Murphy: I do have a, I do have a discussion of the Engler interchange as well as the Brazitos interchange in the chapter itself.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: Given, given the cost of those interchanges and I haven’t gotten final, final financial numbers from Claude Morelli yet but my guess at this point is we would be able to do one interchange and my guess and you’re all welcome to overrule me is that the Arrowhead would be the most likely one to, to advance first. But again we update the MTP every five years and so if conditions change in five years it’s kind of, it’s in the out years ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Murphy: And could be moved forward.

Flores: Right.

Sorg: Okay.

Flores: Okay and (inaudible)

Doolittle: Madam Chair I just have one question concerning, or one comment concerning the Engler interchange, is right now it is too close to the US-70 and the Dona Ana interchanges so under the current criteria being provided by Federal Highway there will not be an interchange at Engler. That doesn’t mean that that criteria won’t change.

Sorg: That’s good to know.

Doolittle: But under current criteria ...
Flores: It’s not so ...

Doolittle: And ultimately that’s why it was never even discussed as an option when we did the at grade you know separation at Engler.

Sorg: The what separation?

Doolittle: Not at grade.

Sorg: Oh, not at grade.

Doolittle: Grade separation, sorry. Grade separation project recently but on our current criteria we cannot put an interchange there.

Murphy: Let me ask what’s the current criteria? I thought it was a mile in urban areas and three miles in rural. Has that changed?

Love: Two miles.

Doolittle: Typically, I agree with Harold typically we try to go with the two mile spacing between the interchanges but ultimately there’s concern with the, with the vicinity of Engler to the Dona Ana and US-70 because of weaving and, and those types of things.

Murphy: I, I, a follow-up question on that.

Flores: Okay.

Murphy: How, would that affect us with Arrowhead and the I-10 and 25?

Sorg: Good question.

Doolittle: It could but ultimately because those were designed as a, I-10/I-25 interchange was designed to incorporate Arrowhead so you’ll also see that on the current I-10/I-25 interchange there is a road that kind of goes off to the south that is out in the middle of nowhere. That was built because of the Arrowhead interchange. So ultimately because they were designed to work concurrently with each other it, it won’t be an issue. And we’ll still have to go through the process of, not an IJR.

Herrera: IACR.

Doolittle: IACR which is a justification interchange, or an interchange justification on the highway.

Murphy: Is it an interstate, interstate access ...
Herrera: Control request.

Murphy: Control request.

Doolittle: So ultimately I’m not worried about Arrowhead.

Barraza: One or the other.

Doolittle: We’ve had several requests come to my office lately for one at Madrid for instance. That one won’t meet criteria either and those are the same justifications we’re using along that entire I-25 corridor.

Sorg: Madrid and where?

Doolittle: I-25.

Sorg: Oh, really?

Doolittle: Just from, from citizens that live in the area and ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Doolittle: Go through Spruce, those types of things but, but Missouri you know the question of Missouri, we’re fixing to replace that bridge, why isn’t it an, why isn’t it an interchange, same, same scenario. Too close to Lohman. But Engler falls, to get back to your question Engler falls under that same rule that ...

Sorg: So the distance between the Lohman interchange and the Main Street interchange is far enough apart, in other words Engler is closer than that distance.

Doolittle: Yes.

Sorg: Okay.

Flores: Anyone else?

Garrett: Yes, Madam Chair. This really has to do with how this plan relates to other plans, transportation plans. Is, is the El Paso MPO currently updating theirs or what, what cycle are they on?

Murphy: I think they’re, they’re slight ...

Doolittle: I think Jolene can answer that.
Herrera: Madam Chair, the El Paso MPO is on a slightly different cycle. Their MTP has already been updated and it was adopted last year.

Garrett: So they’re not going to look at that for another four years?

Herrera: Unless something drastic happens where they have to redo models and things they probably won’t, no.

Garrett: Okay, but just as an example we have projects here that we’ve been talking about and working on in, in terms of planning for example that are now being incorporated in this plan. Correct?

Murphy: Yes.

Garrett: So we still have room to deal with some of those south county concerns that, that are part of Viva Dona Ana in that plan, more by getting individual studies or projects identified. Is that correct? What I’m looking for is some, some guidance in terms of what the process is for connecting some of the other regional planning we’re doing with some of the plans that ultimately result in you know applications for funding and, and getting, getting things built.

Herrera: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett, there’s actually, plans can be amended without doing a whole update of the plan, so if the County comes up with a list of projects that you would like to add as long as they’re not adding capacity projects those can be introduced into the El Paso MPO plan at any time and I know that, that Harold and Trent and I have had discussions with the County engineering staff about some very specific projects that they would like to see in the El Paso MPO plan. So there’s a, you know some steps that need to happen but we don’t have to wait for them to update the entire plan to add those I guess.

Garrett: Then they would be formalized ...

Herrera: Right.

Garrett: As part of the update when that, when that occurs.

Herrera: Yes.

Garrett: Or, or whenever it, yeah.

Herrera: Yeah. And there’s several network years that they look at so there’s you know the short-term years and then the middle-term years and then longer-term so depending on where your project falls ...
Garrett: Okay.

Herrera: I guess we can work with them on that but yeah but please don't think that you have to wait for an update to add projects in.

Garrett: And is there a similar kind of plan, this is for MPOs that we’re talking about. Is there a similar one that’s for RPOs?

Herrera: The state is actually, as part of our long-range plan update we’re helping the RPOs develop their own plans and they will have similar, they’ll be similar to what the MPOs actually create for their specific areas so they’ll be consistent with the state long-range plan but then they’ll focus more on you know their specific issues in the area.

Garrett: And when are those plans being ...

Herrera: Those plans are being developed now and there’s been several rounds of stakeholder meetings and public meetings and we’ve been at this for over a year now gathering that data so right now those plans are being written. But if there’s something specific that you would like to talk about as far as getting in the RPO plan, I think I know where you’re headed with that but we can always talk about that.

Garrett: Has that come up?

Herrera: It did. Yeah.

Garrett: Is it in, is it in the process, is it, is it ...

Herrera: Yeah.

Garrett: It's in the mix?

Herrera: It’s in the mix and all of those public comments are documented so ...

Garrett: Okay. We’re talking about the Upham Interchange.

Pedroza: I should’ve known.

Garrett: Yeah. Yeah so okay. All right. Thank you.

Flores: Right. Anyone else? No. All right.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS
Flores: So we’ll move on to Committee and Staff Comments. There’s some staff comments coming up.

Murphy: Yes. Staff comments, one we’ve kind of, kind of hit, already addressed. We’re moving forward to the items of UPWP, the corridor studies for Missouri and for University. I am shooting to get them on Council on, on March 2nd, provided I get through the review process. We had, we have negotiated for contract terms with Bohannan Huston and come to, come to acceptable pricing levels for that.

Flores: Okay. All right. So any Committee comments?

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Doolittle: Madam Chair, I’d like to go through and give a quick update on our current construction projects.

Flores: Okay.

Doolittle: Vado-Mesquite project, they actually, since they’ve moved to the Vado Interchange they’ve been moving very rapidly. We have all of the curb and gutter at both roundabouts put down. If you actually drive out there now you can get a feel of what the layout’s going to be. They’re currently working on putting the concrete pavement in place. The expectation is we’ll be finished with the east side by this coming Friday.

Sorg: Really?

Doolittle: Yes. And then it looks like we’ll be finished with the, with the entire project with the exception of some small items by the end of next month.

Pedroza: Wow.

Doolittle: So since they’ve moved to that interchange, they had some hiccups getting started but they are moving very rapidly. They continue to have concerns from the truck stops because of reduced businesses and again we, we considered a value engineering from the contractor that ultimately reduced the long-term closure of that so we had to go with the full closure but ultimately reduced ...

Flores: Time.

Doolittle: Reduced the length so we’re doing everything we can to get those ramps open but appreciate the cooperation of the contractors to get in there and
get that done. Luckily we’ve had weather working with us as well and so it’s been, it’s been good for us and we’ll actually finish earlier with that project than we had originally anticipated.

Flores: Okay.

Doolittle: Anthony drainage project on NM 460, we continue to relocate some utilities in that area but ultimately that’s to put in some curb and gutter and deal with some drainage that we’ve had in Anthony itself, some flooding problems with some local businesses and so that project is moving, moving along. It’s really in its early stages of the project so we’ll, I’ll have more details as we progress through that project.

The North Main project here in town we are working on concrete placement. Actually they’re going to begin that Friday at the intersection of Madrid and North Main so that we can work on trying to get that intersection back open. Working on hot mix, continue to work on storm drains, some electrical work, sidewalk and curb and gutter. That project is tentatively scheduled to be finished in August.

The last one I want to touch on real briefly is of course I-25/Missouri bridge. Traffic we’ll begin to see some impacts tomorrow as we go in and eradicate the existing stripe, put down the temporary stripe for the, for the detours and the shifting of the traffic. Contractor will then impact traffic substantially starting Monday.

Sorg: It’s bad enough already.

Doolittle: And, but again we’re in the very infinite, infancy of that project.

Sorg: Just stay away ...

Doolittle: I finished a meeting this morning but I, I think it’s, it, it’s going to be an inconvenience for a while but it’s a much-needed project and I think we have a real good sequence of construction to address two lanes. Two lanes southbound will always be open. Northbound will be reduced to, to one lane for a majority of the project but we understand the importance of keeping the southbound to its capacity as we can and again that, that will, the big impacts will start Monday.

Flores: Okay.

Pedroza: What about Missouri itself how, how is that going to be impacted?

Sorg: Severely.

Doolittle: It will be impacted. Initially we’re going to start up top on the I-25 portion. Of course down underneath we’re going to do some improvements to the
We’re going to do some access control, new signals, but that one won’t be for a few months while we get, get to work on the, on the top portion of the roadway. Again I’ll provide updates as we, as we move forward on the project but at this point you will see very minimal impacts to the, to the local roads underneath.

Flores: And also ...

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Pedroza: When, I think this has been going on for quite a while but crossing Triviz and I guess it’s Telshor on either side of, of the bridge, it seems a little tiny bit dangerous because the lights kind of hold up the traffic and it, it holds the same at Triviz and then people coming west on Missouri end up in the intersection when the light for Telshor is, or I don’t think it’s Telshor.

Garrett: It’s, it’s Don Roser.

Barraza: Don Roser.

Flores: Del Rey?

Pedroza: Yeah, that’s right. It’s Don Roser. Okay, when that one has a green light there’s, there’s cars you could say parked in the middle of Missouri because the light is not coordinated.

Doolittle: As part of this project the, the project development team did look into the signals and we’ll adjust timing the way that we need to. You may still have some of those issues very similar to what you’ll experience at Spruce. Luckily Spruce doesn’t have the through but ultimately vehicles stopped in the intersection is a law enforcement issue but when we get the signals in place there will be a, an opportunity to, to monitor and, and adjust the timing of that but that is a responsibility of the state and all of the work underneath. We’re participating in part of the funding. The City is as well but the, the timing of those signals is the City’s not the Department’s.

Pedroza: Okay. I’ll have to talk (inaudible).

Benavidez: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Commissioner.
Benavidez: Yes, I wanted to ask and regarding those, hearing you say regarding the Engler road, so Missouri won’t qualify either for an on and off ramp in that area?

Doolittle: That is correct and that one is actually even closer than the Engler.

Benavidez: Okay.

Doolittle: University is exit one, Lohman Interchange is exit three so there’s a little bit less than two miles between the two so when you start putting Missouri in and then you start mixing it with the southbound traffic getting, getting off at University it just doesn’t create a very safe situation with, with the ability to get on and off at those interchanges.

Benavidez: Okay.

Flores: Commissioner.

Hancock: Not about your issue. Are you done with your report?

Doolittle: Madam Chair, I, I think Harold had one ...

Hancock: Okay.

Doolittle: One comment or question.

Love: Madam Chair, just corrected Trent, in the morning for southbound traffic on I-25 going to Missouri we will be blocking the University off-ramp in the morning.

Doolittle: Yes, Madam Chair. He, he is correct.

Flores: Okay.

Doolittle: So the detour that will be set up will take them around to the I-10 exit at University.

Flores: Okay.

Garrett: I’m not going on that side of town.

Flores: All right. Mr. or Commissioner.
Hancock: Madam Chair, thank you. Madam Chair, a quick update on South Central Regional Transportation District.

Flores: Okay.

Hancock: We, we’ve been working on securing the funds that were allocated last year for buses. We think we’ve pretty much got that under control. Our next big step is to complete the DOT plan and submit that to DOT by the deadline we have of May 31st. We’re on target to do that. The County has stepped up to the plate and agreed to pay for a consultant. Greg White’s going to come to work for us for the County to complete that plan and, and I’ll be working with him to try to, try to create a plan that can be approved fairly quickly. We’re continuing to discuss with the Commission and with the business community and others about interest in, in a, a good plan going forward for the Transportation District. Tomorrow I’ll be meeting with Robert Garza to talk about the Roadrunner and what kind of plans they have in the future. The, the discussion is to try and move Roadrunner underneath the Regional Transportation District and see what kind of interest we have there. I’ll be meeting Friday with the interim transportation director, Moustas I believe his name is.

Murphy: Maestas.

Flores: Maestas.

Hancock: Yeah. Maestas, Maestas and that’s kind of where we are in Transportation trying to crank it up and get Transportation going again by September 1st.


Garrett: Thank you. The, the MPO as you all are aware is, is part of the Camino Real Consortium and we officially end the, the work that we’re doing when the grant is exhausted on July 30th of this coming year, of this, of this year. So one of the questions that we’ve been talking about on the region leadership committee has to do with continuation of the Consortium into implementation and other kinds of work that build on the, the work we’ve been doing with Viva Dona Ana. I, I think the, the questions that I was raising about coordination of different kinds of plans with, that are being done in terms of transportation and the, the Comprehensive Plan and the Corridor Plan that are all part of Viva Dona Ana and then how that gets coordinated with potentially three other plans that are driven by MPOs and RPOs as an example of the kind of potential coordination and benefits of, of having an opportunity to work together as we move into the future. And we’re going to at some point need to be entertaining a motion for this, or a
resolution for this group to decide whether or not to continue in support of
the Camino Real Consortium. We don’t know at this point whether there
will be any expectation in terms of volunteer time or in terms of, of costs.
We’ll be talking about that at the meeting on Friday but this is an important
point as, as we look at integration of transportation with land use and other
kinds of, of things as we move forward. So I just want to raise that and as
I understand it the MPO has not been putting money into this but we have
been contributing time.

Flores: Staff.

Murphy: Yes. We’ve got staff and then Trustee Flores has been giving of her own
time to, to the effort. Reason we’ve not given any, any money is cause
our money, our dollars are federal dollars which are ineligible to do the,
the required matching amount of the HUD funds.

Garrett: Right and I, I should say that one of the things I’ve been asking for is an
option for moving forward that doesn’t require any funds, that basically it’s
just everybody’s cooperating and so this ends up being a, a coordinating
entity that we would continue to look for grants and if we get grants then
depending on what we get a grant for we may hire staff, we may pay for,
for a consultant but that, that there, one of the options would not involve
any additional funding in order to be able to move forward.

Flores: All right. Thank you. Anyone else?

Benavidez: I have a, yes I have a question. This question is for Trent. In regarding
the different construction projects that you have around Dona Ana County,
do you select the, the contractors from, how do you select them? Do you
select them through a, a bidding process, through purchasing contract, do
you give priorities to companies from New Mexico, how does, how do you
do that?

Doolittle: Madam Chair, in, in our district we have two different options. One is
through the STIP which is the federal dollars. All those are put out to bid
and ours is a low bid award. Just recently State Transportation
Commission passed the policy implementing contractor qualifications so
ultimately over the next several years we will be evaluating contractors
based on numbers of claims, liquidated damages, safety records, those
types of things that will move away from the low bid process. But
ultimately at this point we have not implemented, we just have a
Commission policy, we have not implemented or created a, a procedure to
do that. So anything that’s being bid is a low, low bid award. The other
option that we have internally that we typically do with our state dollars,
our district money is price agreement and so a lot of our, a lot of our
smaller pavement preservation like the chip-seal that we did on NM 28,
that was through a price agreement. It was not put out to bid. It’s an
annual, it’s an annual bid. Basically it allows you know rapid turnaround.
Prices tend to be a little bit higher because there’s some risk on the, on
the bidding contractors on you know quantity and timing but those are
really our two options that we use for doing any kind of preservation. We
actually have one for pavement and we have a price agreement for bridge
repair; for instance you know we have multiple price agreements. Facility
repairs if something happens with one of our rest area buildings, typically
that work is done through a price agreement and not through a bid
contract.

Benavidez: And so normally you won’t, you don’t have to hire a New Mexico
contractor. You have to select the, the contractor who’s the best ...

Flores: Bid.

Benavidez: For that particular project. Is that, is that correct?

Flores: Okay.

Murphy: If, if I may jump in here. With the use of federal funds they’d be prohibited
from having a, having a local preference.

Benavidez: Oh, okay.

Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: If I could just, but that doesn’t preclude local companies from applying to
be on these lists?

Murphy: Right. Absolutely.

Garrett: Aside from the open competition issue.

Murphy: Yes. The, the, the government just cannot, cannot express a preference
for any kind of local when using federal dollars.

Garrett: What about 8A, is that still in place, 8A contracts? Do, does that apply to ...

Flores: Can somebody explain 8A contracts?

Garrett: 8A contracts were set aside for minority businesses.

Flores: Oh.
Garrett: We used a lot of those in the Park Service, again federal money for construction projects.

Doolittle: Madam Chair, we typically establish a DBE goal but that’s the only, that’s the only portion that’s incorporated into our projects so it’s not ...

Flores: DBE goals, diverse ...

Murphy: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise.

Flores: Okay. All right.

Benavidez: Thank you.

Flores: You’re welcome.

Doolittle: I guess one point of clarification. You, you mentioned do we award based on the best contractor or the best fit for a contract, it is purely at this point a low bid. Purely. The only prequalification that we have at this time is a, is a, basically a one-page form that says you know are you licensed and bonded, we do have some requirements for subcontractors that they have to be prequalified you know seven days after bid you know those types of things. But our current prequalification requirements are very minimal. The new process that we’ll implement will be much more detailed. Contractors will get bonus points or, or an adjusted score for instance based on how well they’ve, they’ve conducted work in the past so as we work on implementing this new process it will no longer be a low bid. It will be a best qualified process.

Benavidez: Okay. Thank you.

Flores: Okay.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: So we’ll move along to public comment. Anyone from the public?

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:34 p.m.)

Flores: Seeing none, we’ll move along to adjournment. We’re adjourned.

_____________________________
Chairperson
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MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
POLICY COMMITTEE  
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 8, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 Resolution No. 15-03: A Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a Cooperative Agreement between the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO).

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and adoption of Resolution 15-03

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
1. Copy of Resolution 15-03

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement is for the management of the grant from NMDOT to MVMPO for funding the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for Federal Fiscal Years 2015-2018. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is the basic contractual agreement between NMDOT and the MPO that delineates the responsibilities of each organization.

The UPWP is a required core MPO document which outlines the transportation planning activities to be conducted by MPO Staff as well as processes that MPO Staff will participate in, but not necessarily oversee. The UPWP must contain a budget of both funding and staff time and must be in compliance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. As per the NMDOT Planning Procedures Manual, the UPWP must be renewed every two years. The current UPWP was adopted by the Policy Committee on June 11, 2014.
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 15-03

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO SIGN A COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION.

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

WHEREAS, the MPO and the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) are both public agencies and are empowered to enter into this MOA; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of the State of New Mexico designated the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization as an MPO pursuant to Section 112 of the Federal Highway Act of 1973. The results of said action allowing both the MPO and NMDOT to be responsible for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. §134, Metropolitan Planning, 23 U.S.C. §104(f)(3), Apportionment, 49 U.S.C. §5303, Mass Transportation-Metropolitan Planning, and 23 CFR §450.330.C, Metropolitan Planning; and

WHEREAS, 23 U.S.C. §134, and 49 U.S.C. §5303, authorizes federal assistance for the development of transportation plans and programs by way of a grant program to be administered by each state; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of the State of New Mexico has designated NMDOT to receive and administer the federal funds under these programs; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is an MPO document required by 23 U.S.C. §450.308(c) to identify the work of the MPO over a one or two year period. The current MPO UPWP was adopted by the Policy Committee on June 11, 2014.

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

(I)
THAT the MPO Chair is authorized to sign the attached MOA, attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and made part of this Resolution.

(II)

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

DONE and APPROVED this 8th day of April, 2015.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By:
Second By:

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

ATTEST:  APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Recording Secretary  City Attorney
March 2, 2015

Mr. Tom Murphy
MPO Officer
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
PO Box 20000
Las Cruces, NM 88004

Mr. Murphy,

Enclosed please find three originals of the Cooperative Agreement between the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. Please have the appropriate representatives sign all three documents and return them to me at the address indicated below. Upon execution of the Agreement by NMDOT, one original will be mailed to you for your records.

Please note that the current Memorandum of Agreement with NMDOT expires June 30, 2015.

Feel free to contact me at (505) 476-2155 or (505) 231-7769 (cell) if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Jessica Griffin, AICP
Government to Government Supervisor

Cc: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Government to Government Liaison
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

This grant agreement is between the New Mexico Department of Transportation (the "Department") and Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (the "Grantee"). The Department and the Grantee agree as follows:

1. **Award.** The Department hereby awards the Grantee funding for the following project: Unified Planning Work Programs for Federal Fiscal Years 2015-2018.

2. **Scope of Work.** The Grantee shall perform the professional services stated in the Unified Planning Work Program for the current fiscal year and the Department’s Planning Procedures Manual.

3. **Payment.** To be reimbursed for eligible expenses, the Grantee must submit timely, properly prepared reimbursement requests as provided in the Department’s Planning Procedures Manual. The Grantee acknowledges that the Department will not pay for any expenses incurred prior to both parties signing the agreement, after termination of the agreement, or in excess of the amount of the award noted in section 1. The Grantee must submit its final reimbursement request no later than thirty days after termination of this agreement.

4. **Records and Audit.** The Grantee shall strictly account for all receipts and disbursements related to this agreement. The Grantee shall record costs incurred, services rendered and payment received, and shall maintain these financial records during the agreement and for three years from the date of submission of the final expenditure report. On request, the Grantee shall provide the financial records to the Department and the state auditor, and shall allow the Department and the state auditor to inspect or audit these financial records during business hours at the Grantee’s principal office during the agreement and for five years after termination. If the financial records provided by the Grantee are insufficient to support an audit by customary accounting practices, the Grantee shall reimburse the Department for any expense incurred related to the insufficient documentation within thirty days of written notice from the Department. If an audit or inspection reveals that funds were used for expenses not directly related to the project, or otherwise used inappropriately, or that payments were excessive or otherwise erroneous, the Grantee shall reimburse the Department for those funds or payments within thirty days of written notice.

5. **Officials Not to Benefit.** The parties intend that no member of the New Mexico legislature or the United States Congress, or any public official, public employee or tribal council member, in that person’s individual capacity, will benefit from this agreement.

6. **Termination.** The Department may terminate this agreement for any reason, by giving the Grantee thirty days written notice. The Grantee may only terminate this agreement based on the Department’s uncured, material breach of the agreement. On receipt of a “Notice of Cancellation,” the Grantee shall suspend work unless otherwise directed by the Department.
in writing. The parties acknowledge that termination will not nullify obligations incurred prior to termination.

7. **Appropriations.** The Grantee acknowledges that:

   (1) this agreement is contingent upon sufficient appropriations and authorizations being made by the Congress of the United States or the New Mexico state legislature;

   (2) if sufficient appropriations and authorizations are not made, this agreement will terminate upon written notice by the Department to the Grantee; and

   (3) the Department will not expend any funds until they are approved for expenditure, and the Department’s determination as to whether approval has been granted will be final.

8. **Compliance with Law.** The Grantee, its employees, agents and contractors, shall comply with the following:

   (1) Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Environmental Justice Act of 1994, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, and 49 C.F.R. § 21;

   (2) all federal and state laws, rules, and regulations, and executive orders of the Governor of the state of New Mexico pertaining to equal employment opportunity, including the Human Rights Act, NMSA 1978, §§ 28-1-1 through -15 (In accordance with such, the Grantee states that no person, on the grounds of race, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, spousal affiliation, serious medical condition, age or handicap, will be excluded from employment with or participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to, discrimination in any activity performed under this agreement. If the Grantee it is found to be in violation of any of these requirements, the Grantee shall take prompt and appropriate steps to correct such violation.); and

   (3) state laws applicable to workers compensation benefits for the Grantee’s employees, including the Workers’ Compensation Act, NMSA 1978, §§ 52-1-1 through -70, and related regulations.

9. **Notices.** For a notice under this agreement to be valid, it must be in writing; be delivered by hand, registered or certified mail return receipt requested and postage prepaid, fax or e-mail; and be addressed as follows:

**Department**
Jolene Herrera, Liaison
Government to Government Unit
750 N Solano Drive
Las Cruces, NM 88001(575) 525-7358
10. **Severability.** The parties intend that if any provision of this agreement is held to be unenforceable, the rest of the agreement will remain in effect as written.

11. **Tort Claims.** The parties intend that (1) immunity from liability for tortious conduct under NMSA 1978, § 41-4-4(A) will apply to all conduct relating to this agreement, (2) only the waivers of immunity from liability under NMSA 1978, §§ 41-4-4 through -12 will apply, and (3) this agreement does not waive immunity from liability for tortious conduct relating to this agreement of any employee of the Department or the Grantee.

12. **Jurisdiction and Venue.** The Grantee acknowledges the jurisdiction of the courts of the state of New Mexico for any adversarial proceeding arising out of this agreement, and that venue for any such proceeding will be in the First Judicial District Court for the county of Santa Fe, New Mexico.

13. **Project Responsibility.** The Grantee acknowledges that it bears sole responsibility for performing the services referred to in section 2.

14. **Term.** This agreement takes effect upon signature of all parties. If the Grantee does not deliver the signed agreement to the Department within sixty days of the Department’s signature, the agreement will be voidable by the Department. The agreement terminates at midnight on September 30, 2018 unless earlier terminated as provided in section 6 or section 7.

15. **Applicable Law.** The laws of the state of New Mexico, without giving effect to its choice of law principles, govern all adversarial proceedings arising out of this agreement.

16. **Amendment.** No amendment of this agreement will be effective unless it is in writing and signed by the parties.

17. **No Third-party Beneficiary.** This agreement does not confer any rights or remedies on anyone other than the Department and the Grantee.

18. **Merger.** This agreement constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter of the agreement and supersedes all other agreements, whether written or oral, between the parties, except that this agreement does not supersed the Grantee’s rights under any other grant agreement.

19. **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise.** The recipient shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the award and performance of any DOT-assisted contract or in the administration of its DBE program or the requirements of 49 CFR part 26. The recipient shall take all necessary and reasonable steps under 49 CFR part 26 to ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts. The recipient’s
DBE program, as required by 49 CFR part 26 and as approved by DOT, is incorporated by reference in this agreement. Implementation of this program is a legal obligation and failure to carry out its terms shall be treated as a violation of this agreement. Upon notification to the recipient of its failure to carry out its approved program, the Department may impose sanctions as provided for under part 26 and may, in appropriate cases, refer the matter for enforcement under 18 U.S.C. 1001 and/or the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 (31 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).

Each party is signing this agreement on the date stated opposite that party’s signature.

Date: ______________________, 2015

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: ______________________
Cabinet Secretary or Designee

Date: ______________________, 2015

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

By: ______________________
Title: ______________________

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency.
Date: 26 Feb, 2015

By: ______________________
Assistant General Counsel
Department of Transportation

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency.
Date: ______________________, 2015

By: ______________________
Counsel for Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
AGENDA ITEM:
6.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee Appointments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review, Evaluation, and Appointment

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Letter of Interest

DISCUSSION:
The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee (BPAC) has 11 members: 6 citizen representatives and 5 staff representatives. According to the MPO Bylaws, the staff representatives are appointed by the head of the department they will represent within each jurisdiction. The citizen appointments are made by the Policy Committee.

Currently, there is one citizen representative positions open: Pedestrian Community Representative.

There are two types of citizen representatives: jurisdictional and modal. The jurisdictional representatives will be selected to represent the three MPO member agencies – one per agency. Based on MPO staff’s interpretation of the Bylaws, this representative should understand planning issues and facility needs surrounding non-motorized transportation. This understanding is required to integrate walking and biking into the regional transportation system. Finally, the role of the citizen should be to promote walking and biking in their respective jurisdiction.

The modal representatives consist of two bicycling community representatives and one pedestrian community representative. For their respective roles, the desired representative should understand the planning issues and facility needs for bicycling or walking, and promote bicycling or walking in the community at large.

Attached to this Action Form is the letter of interest from the individual who answered staff’s request for volunteers on the BPAC. Please review the letters, evaluate their ability to fulfill the roles described above, and prepare questions that may help you make a final decision. As there is only one applicant, the Policy Committee will hold a “yes” or “no” vote on appointing the applicant.
Andrew Wray  
Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization  
PO Box 20000  
Las Cruces, NM 88004

Andrew Bencomo  
1256 Osage Court  
Las Cruces, NM 88005  
575-642-5924  
abencomo@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Wray,

I am writing to express my interest in the position of Pedestrian Community Representative with the Mesilla Valley MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee.

I am a retired Deputy Chief with the Las Cruces Fire Department, and as a former administrator am well versed in governmental workings, committees and related requirements.

I am also one of the co-organizers of the Las Cruces Running Group, whose purpose is to establish, promote, and maintain an active running community in Las Cruces and the surrounding areas. We do this by providing opportunities for runners of all ages and abilities to meet their personal fitness goals by conducting group runs, group training sessions and fun, competitive events. Many of our members also bike regularly. We currently have 478 members, whose input into Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities I feel would be invaluable, and available, to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee through the running group network.

Additionally, I have been a member of the PLACE MATTERS team for the past 2 years. PLACE MATTERS is a local health initiative, through the Community Foundation of Southern NM, whose mission is to address and improve conditions that shape health through policy development, community action and measuring the indicators associated with health. This is accomplished by evaluating where people live, work, and play, and evaluating how these places are influencing individual and community health. Currently we are, in cooperation with staff from Dona County Government, performing a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) on the county’s Viva Dona Ana Comprehensive Plan, with our specific focus being on the Parks and Trails portion of the plan. The HIA is progressing well, and has been gladly welcomed by Place Makers (a separate group from PLACE MATTERS) who are responsible for the work to update the county’s Comprehensive Plan.

I feel with my well rounded background and experiences, as well as community connections, I would be a valuable member of the Mesilla Valley MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee.

I thank you in advance for considering me for that position.

Sincerely,

Andrew Bencomo
MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 8, 2015

AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
A draft of the MTP Update will be provided at the meeting.

DISCUSSION:
The Mesilla Valley MPO is currently in the process of updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan, known as Transport 2040. This item is a public presentation of the MTP draft. The 30 day public comment period for the MTP began at the TAC meeting on April 2.