LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held May 8, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. in the Dona Ana County Commission Chambers, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the Las Cruces MPO website.

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

POLICY COMMITTEE (PC) MEETING

Following are the minutes from the MPO Policy Committee (PC) meeting held on Wednesday, December 12, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. at Dona Ana County Commission Chambers, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
Mayor Pro Tem Sharon Thomas (CLC)
Councilor Gil Sorg (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Karen Perez (DAC)
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (Las Cruces MPO)
Andrew Wray (Las Cruces MPO)

OTHERS PRESENT: Rebecca Maes (NMDOT) Harold Love (NMDOT)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT) Jack Valencia (SCRTD)
Larry Altamirano (LCPS)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY – No conflict of interest.

Trustee Flores asked for a motion to change the agenda because Rebecca Maes from Santa Fe is present and Trustee Flores would like to move her presentation up on the agenda.

Commissioner Garrett motioned to move discussion item 8.1 to be heard after this motion.

Councliilor Pedroza seconded the motion.

All in favor.

Tom called roll to establish a quorum.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Present

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza

Pedroza: Present

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez

Benavidez: Present

Murphy: Councillor Sorg

Sorg: Present

Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas

Thomas: Here

Murphy: Trustee Flores

Flores: Present.

8.1 NMDOT STIP

Maes: Good morning, Madame Chair, Board members, I think you all have a copy of this handout.

Flores: It’s the estimation of obligation limitation. Does anybody else not have theirs?

Maes: And actually in back of this front page there are a couple of attachments if you want to take them apart and I’ll show you exactly how the numbers come across to that first page.

Flores: I would take the time to mark New Mexico on the second and third page because those are the numbers we will be dealing with, my suggestion just write a line across New Mexico so you can see the numbers better.

Maes: So what I’m going to do is I’m going to take you step by step of how we come up the numbers that we distribute out to our districts with the federal dollars. So on this first line as you can see under NHPP we $217,768,101 and then going across under STP, HSIP, CMAQ, the Metropolitan Planning and the TAP funds, which then if you look at this sheet comes directly off of here under New Mexico’s number, all I do is pull that directly across onto this sheet and then the next three numbers are take downs which you will also see on these attachments. The first one is Section
1 154, which is the open container requirement that is an automatic take
down before we even distribute any money and the second is ……

3 Thomas: And tell us what the open container requirement is about.

5 Maes: This is for the DWI. And the second one is the Section 164………..

7 Pedroza: Excuse me, does that mean that New Mexico is being penalized in the
amount of $500,444,000 because we

9 Maes: Yes.

11 Pedroza: Because we do not have an open container law?

13 Maes: Well, actually I think what it is, is how it was explained yesterday by Mike
Sandoval, our planning director, is that they weren’t in compliance a
couple of years ago, so this is what happened as why we and this is
actually a new penalty that we just received because we only have to have
the Section 164.

15 Pedroza: Will that at some point be lifted?

17 Maes: I’m sure because he said now that they are in compliance so I guess it’s
just how, because this is actually done through our Traffic Safety Bureau
so we just actually take it down as part of our targets before we even
calculate the numbers to issue.

19 Pedroza: Okay and about how long do you think that process will take?

21 Maes: I’m not sure. I would have to check on that and get back to you on that
one.

23 Flores: I believe he said that they expected the legislature to correct that this year,
is my memory.

25 Maes: Okay and I can double check it for you and I could get back the
information, and then the next one is the Section 164, which is the
minimum penalties for DWI and DUI repeat offenders and this is the one
that we’ve had all along that has been a take down.

29 Thomas: And what’s wrong with that one? Our minimum penalty is not high enough
or something so we pay a penalty?

31 Maes: This one I know we’ve had so I’m not sure on this one. I know it’s been
ever since I started doing this which has been about four years now, we
always taken the take down.
Thomas: If these are things that need to be corrected by the legislature then these are things that this Body in particular needs to know about because we’re the policy makers and we’re the ones that can actually go to the legislature and try to get changes made so if we’re being penalized this much money for something the legislature’s not doing, we need to know that and we probably need to organize all the policy committees across the State and try to do something about it, so we really need to have that information.

Maes: I will take this back and we will get some information to Tom, okay.

Garrett: Madame Chair, just to follow up on that, the timing of our needing to get the information is as soon as possible with the legislature starting in January, thanks.

Maes: And then the third line, the two percent SPR, that’s two percent of the amount that we were given is a takedown, which we take out of the NHPP and the STP section. This is what funds our work program that comes to the MPO’s and the State-wide work program that’s done through our planning division.

Thomas: Madame Chair, can you explain that a little more. What do you mean by that?

Maes: The work program is the one that funds the MPO’s for some of the traffic counts that they do and I don’t know Tom if you can …………

Murphy: The SPR is essentially the State’s equivalent of the PL funds. They fund the general office activities out of it. They’ve funded in the past freight, a freight study, they bend money towards developing their long range transportation plan; they use them for traffic counts in the rural areas of Mr. COG. I think they are discussing with El Paso about using them in the rural parts of Dona Ana.

Thomas: What does SPR stand for?

Murphy: SPR is State-wide Planning and Research.

Thomas: So it’s used primarily for studies and research that the MPO’s and the RPO’s do?

Murphy: Primarily research coming out the general office in Santa Fe. Occasionally they will sublet some of that down to the MPO. Last time we got SPR funds was in 07/08 to help us update our travel demand model.
Thomas: So primarily it's research that's done in the main office in Santa Fe.

Murphy: That's correct.

Pedroza: Madame Chair, one more question. Does that mean that the SPR may or may not be reduced from the funds that the MPO is going to have to use depending on whether the State legislature has a research project to do or is it automatic that they simply reduce it from the funding?

Murphy: Madame Chair, Councillor Pedroza, Rebecca jump in if I get wrong, the MPO PL funds are set by federal legislation. There is a set amount that they are taking down. The take downs affect the top number of what the State is getting overall and that will filter down and affect the other amounts as well.

Pedroza: Thank you.

Maes: So then on the next line you'll see the sub-total, which after all the take downs this is what's left and the next line is the assumed obligation authority, which is set by, was actually set this year by Congress so we actually got in our apportionment letter so this year it's at 94.6%. So what that means is that we can spend 94.6% of the money that has been given to us. We don't get the full 100% and then the available obligation limitation is the amount after the take down of the obligation authority, so then if you turn to the next page which is a little bit smaller and has all the numbers. It's the estimation of obligation limitation available for programming. So the available obligation limitation is brought forward under each one of the categories, which your first one is NHPP and then the STP, the HSIP, the CMAQ, the Metropolitan Planning, the TAP program and then on the third line under is where it gets split out. NHPP doesn’t get split out into any further categories and then the STP funds get split out into the STPL, which is surface transportation large urban and then the STPS is surface transportation small urban, the STPR is surface transportation rural, and the STPF is the surface transportation flexible, and then also now is the surface transportation bridge off system.

Thomas: Which ones are these; these are the ones that are here under funding category?

Maes: Yes, those are the STPL, STPS, STPR, STPF.*********

Thomas: Okay, can you go over those again so we can put the titles in here.

Maes: Okay and actually I have them for you on the last page. I have a conversion sheet for you so it tells you exactly what they are.
Flores: This is what Claude went over. He went over the definitions of them yesterday, right?

Maes: Yes and they are all actually on here, the program descriptions are on here.

Flores: Right, okay.

Maes: Surface transportation are larger, then there is the STPL.

Thomas: I don’t see it here on the last page. The first one here is STPL.

Maes: It’s the old TPU, if you go across.

Thomas: Okay.

Flores: And the flex was like an area………………

Maes: It could be used anywhere in the State.

Flores: It could go back and forth between like, what did he use, he used a mini-urban. He had a special term for it.

Maes: The small urban?

Flores: Yes, small urban, is that what…………

Maes: Yeah and the small urban can only be used between 25,000 and 200,000. And then the STPO, which is the surface transportation bridge off system that is for bridges that aren’t on the NHS system, that money can be used there.

Murphy: Madame Chair, if I may, the NHS system consists of the interstate, the US highways and the principle arterials within the State, so these would be bridge monies for minor arterials, collectors and Rebecca, I’m not sure about local roads but I think that it does apply to those.

Garrett: Madame Chair. Tom, I’m just wondering if you could give an example of the off system bridge that we would have talked about, do we have any?

Murphy: Madame Chair, Commissioner Garrett, off-system bridge would apply to say the Dripping Springs crossing there right near the Farm and Ranch Museum. I’m trying to think where we do other bridges, probably would be applicable to any local roads that would go over the interstate, things of that nature.
Garrett: Okay, thanks.

Maes: And then the next line is our debt service, which is usually about $122M so…we’re on this page on the third column down, so that comes right off the top. We take our debt service right off the top so those are the bonds that we’re paying back.

Flores: Is that about 30%, what was the amount on that?

Maes: It’s actually…….

Flores: Thirty-seven percent?

Maes: Maybe a little bit more because what we actually distribute out is about $178,000 so we’re taking $121M right off the top. And then the next line is our release of obligation authority which are releases that come back to us after old projects are closed so usually what we’ll do is we’ll try and put them back to distribute them out so they can use the money and this year we only have the $5.32M because we had an additional and we used those to cover our 2012 closeout, so we wouldn’t hold up any projects not from getting obligated at the end of the 2012 federal fiscal year so we advance constructed them and then we’re paying back the money now with the 2013 money that is available to us. So that is what the $5M is going back.

Thomas: Can you get just a little closer to the microphone. We’re having trouble understanding…..

Maes: Okay and then the line after that is just the totals after the takedowns and any additions that were added in and then you’re next line is the federal share which shows the federal, state or local split on each one of these funding categories and the only one that has changed was the NHPP because we used to have individual of an IMNH which are now all combined into NHPP with the new MAP21, so the split went from 92.64 to 85.44 and then what we do after that is we calculate in the federal share and with the match and that gives the ob-limit with match. And then the next line is our State-wide programs, which is our consultant program. We do a takedown of $8.5M under the STP flexible category and our next line is the cost adjustments and if you notice that’s a takedown. What we’ve done is we’ve taken the release authority, added in the obligation limitation and then we’ve taken it out so this is what we use for change orders that come back so they don’t affect the district’s money and for any coverage’s that are over on when they start issuing change orders or anything on the project or if a project needs to be closed and it’s short, this is where the money comes from, and then our safety program we take out the whole amount because that’s done by application process and then it’s a
subtotal of everything after the additional takedowns or additions is the
next line. Then the next line is what we’ve added in here is the State 50%
of TAP, which 50% of the TAP funds now with MAP21 comes directly to
the State, so what we’ve done is we’ve taken down the 50% off of what’s
been issued by TAP and we’ve put it in NHPP right now but I think that’s
going to change. It’s actually, what their process is right now I think it’s
going, we’re going to give all the TAP funds to the MPO’s and RPO’s for
them to do their competitive process to and they can award the funds.
And then the next line is the top selection which is the 50% that would be
left afterward to distribute and then the next line are sub-allocated
programs. That first $12M that you see there, that’s a takedown. What
we’re doing is we took out $12M off the top to do State-wide program for
bridges to start working on the bridges that are on the deficiency list and
you will also see a takedown of $2M under the STBO, which is the off-
system bridges so that will also be done at a State-wide level, so our
bridge area is going to start looking at the deficiency programs to see what
bridges are in need of this and start working on that list from here forward.

Flores: What do you mean by off-system bridges?

Maes: These are the off-system bridges that aren’t on the NHS system and the
next takedown is the CMAQ flex, they are working trying to see if they can
work on a program where this money may be used somewhere in the
State that qualifies for the CMAQ flex, of course, this is the stuff that
comes into play for the non-attainment areas, correct, for the non-
attainment areas so they are looking any suggestions of maybe that there
is an area where you have a non-attainment area where you can……..it
would be more down for the El Paso MPO area and then the next
takedown is the PL because we don’t distribute the PL funds that come to
us, that gets distributed through planning so we don’t distribute those so
we just take them off so they don’t go across.

Thomas: I’m sorry, say that again.

Maes: The PL funds which are the planning funds, that takedown of $1.729M, we
don’t distribute those through our section that gets distributed through the
planning where they distribute them out to the MPO’s for use.

Thomas: It gets distributed through what?

Maes: Through planning, our planning area distributes these funds.

Murphy: Those funds are distributed by the general office planning section, not ....

Thomas: Within NMDOT.
Murphy: Within DOT.

Thomas: (inaudible) DOT.

Maes: NMDOT.

Murphy: New Mexico DOT. Rebecca says we, I believe she’s talking about her specific (interrupted)

Thomas: So for example, what kinds of things might it be distributed toward?

Murphy: That $1.7M is distributed among the five MPO’s through a formula that was developed by the planning office in consultation with the MPO staff from around the State.

Thomas: So it’s divided among the five MPO’s?

Murphy: That’s correct.

Maes: Okay and then the last line is what’s available left to program after these takedowns or additions that were added in here.

Sorg: Madame Chair, could I ask a question about one line? In the TAP columns the State’s 50% of TAP, the State is providing 50% of the funding in TAP, is that what that means?

Maes: What the log reads is that 50% of the TAP funds come directly to the State, to the DOT and the other 50% gets distributed out based on population.

Sorg: MPO’s in other words.

Maes: MPO’s, RPO’s, yes and that process is going to take place through our planning division, which they are in charge of setting up the competitive process and so that’s why we take it out. The only ones that actually we’re distributing is the large urban because those go directly to the TMA’s so that’s the only reason why you see a balance getting forwarded there is because the TMA’s do get to program there……..

Thomas: Madame Chair, can I restate, so the ones that get distributed directly to the large MPO’s, the TMA’s – that’s TAP funds too?

Maes: Yes.

Thomas: And that comes out of, does that get distributed first and then the rest of it is divided up 50/50 or how does…..
Maes: No, no, it's all done by population, so it's based off the population, for example, like the Albuquerque metropolitan area; it's based off their population and then the section (interrupted).

Thomas: That's what you're talking about the 50% that goes to the MPO's, you're not talking about the whole fund at that point?

Maes: No.

Thomas: You're talking the TAP gets divided 50% State/50% everybody else, then the TMA's get theirs off the top by population.

Maes: No, no, that 50% that goes to the MPO's and RPO's is done by population, so then that will get distributed by population, that's why if you notice there are four different categories for it, so it kind of falls into the same STP lines, like you have your rural, your large urban and the small........

Thomas: And the TMA's are the large urban?

Maes: Yes.

Thomas: And yesterday they talked about some kind of equality factor or something because it ended up short cutting the smaller MPO's.

Maes: Yes, there is a formula sheet that they had handed out of how they did it and that was done in our planning division.

Thomas: Right and what was it they did to try to make it more equal. Claude was talking about yesterday.

Flores: They did a flat fee. Didn't they give it a flat fee for the smaller rural areas?

Murphy: If I may jump in, the equity factor applied to the PL funds distribution that was essentially based on minimum staffing levels to operate an MPO. The TAP funds from what I've seen so far, I have only seen what you saw yesterday. It is strictly population based. There is no adjustment within those population formulas for the TAP funds.

Maes: Okay, so then these totals across the Levels program, if you turn to the last page which is the third one is the estimation of district targets for federal fiscal year 2013.

Sorg: I have to comment, Madame Chair. It's pretty difficult for us to understand you. It's mostly to do with this system we have and this, if you can go
slower that would help a little and make sure you speak right directly into
the microphone. Thank you.

Maes: Okay, so then if you notice the amounts have come across under the
NHPP, STPS, STPR, STPF, STBO and the TAP L, so then what happens
here is we break them out by district and I've also included the two large
TMA MPO's in here to show the funds that go directly to them, which are
the STPL, the large urban and the TAP large urban and then everything
else on this based on lane miles of how the distribution gets to each one
of the districts by fund on this sheet.

Thomas: And so at the bottom you have that MAP-21 target and the SAFETEA-LU
target, so you are telling us that under the new MAP-21 program it is $4M
less?

Maes: Yes and that's only because we're not distributing the, we used to
distribute the enhancement money and now that TAP has come into place
with MAP-21, that has to be done on a competitive process so we can no
longer distribute that out to our districts because we can't be, the State
DOT cannot be a lead on any of these projects.

Thomas: Okay, so then yesterday they talked about the fact that for those TAP
projects that if we had old enhancement projects that we should sort of
dust them off and put them back in and if there was leftover enhancement
funds at the State level that you were going to use to kind of catch up on
some of those.

Maes: Yes and those we were, if you do have some that are ready to go I would
work with your districts to see about getting those programmed. We're
working with our districts to get a list so we can see about how much
money we are going to need. I don't know if we do have enough to
fund...........

Thomas: And you have any idea what the deadline is going to be on that because
the other thing we talked about yesterday was the format and they said
that we could just use the TIP form but they wanted us to have it an
additional page that addressed this and that it has to be done on a
competitive process but if we have some projects that have already been
through our competitive process and we're currently on our TIP that are
enhancement projects that we only need to attach one page with some
reference to this.

Maes: That actually is in reference to TAP. The enhancement funds, the old
enhancement funds that were with SAFETEA-LU, those requirements
aren't the same as what TAP are, so if you have an enhancement project
that meets the old requirements of TPE, which was the transportation
enhancement funds then that is what we are going to go by. That TAP is
two different.................

Thomas: So they are not going to re-evaluate those based on these new.

Maes: That’s for the competitive process.

Thomas: Okay, so they are going to assume that we did a competitive process and
that’s acceptable, that’s not how I understood it yesterday.

Maes: No, for the TPE funds, it doesn’t have to go through a competitive
process. Well, it has to go through your MPO’s and that has to go through
all that but it doesn’t have to meet the competitive process that the new
TAP under MAP-21, so it still falls under the old rules of SAFETEA-LU for
what the requirements are for enhancements, those are the rules that it
falls under.

Thomas: Okay, so we just need to go back and look at those and like I said sort of
dust them off and get back on the list because there are some left over
funds for enhancement projects, but we also have to start then looking at
projects for TAP and instead of using our process which we’ve worked on
pretty diligently here, we’re now going to have to use some project that
satisfies this and this is what the State has tried to figure out.

Maes: No, it still has to go through your process but at the same it’s going to, the
State level has to have a competitive process that meets all of your
processes so it can go through their process and they are going to be the
ones to make the overall decision.

Thomas: Right, but it would behoove us it seems to me to make our process satisfy
this process if that’s what is going to happen to all those projects. If they
are going to go through, I mean why go through our process if it doesn’t
shape those projects so that they can do well under this process and I
understood from yesterday that you are taking comments on this only until
the end of the year.

Maes: That’s our planning division.

Flores: Yeah, I think they have said just by January 2 because he said the end of
the year and he said he would give two more days, January 2 so they
have to..............

Thomas: So I think that this Body, we need to look at this because it is going to
have a big impact on how we choose projects in the future and so if we
have some comments on this we need to get them into the planning panel.
Maes: Yes.

Thomas: And who is that we’re supposed to send them to Tom?

Maes: I believe it was Maggie Ryan. Maggie Ryan.

Murphy: Maggie Ryan but you can also send them to and I can send them (inaudible).

Maes: Or even to probably Jolene and she could.

Pedroza: As I recall Maggie was going to be out of the office for quite a while till the end of the year or something so it would be better to send them Tom.

Thomas: Okay, so maybe a little later when we get to staff report you can talk about this a little bit more Tom and how we should respond to it.

Murphy: Yes.

Maes: So I don’t know if you any questions on this sheet of how distributions go and how we distribute out to the districts.

Thomas: Madame Chair, I think that it’s, lowering the (inaudible) distribution is fine in how the TAP is going to fit in. I think at least in my case I’m more interested in what the goals and performance objectives are going to be because this funding, I mean as we go forward with MAP 21 we have to meet those goals and performance objectives and so this is how it’s divided up now but once those goals and performance objectives are in place if you don’t meet them, that money goes away.

Maes: Yeah, our obligation limitation goes from 94.6 to 65%.

Thomas: Right and so once again because this Body is a policy making body, it’s those goals and performance objectives that are of utmost importance to us in how we are going to do that across the State with the legislature with the DOT, those are the discussion we need to have and so I don’t know how you are planning to carry those out in the future but it seems to me we need a lot of cooperation here and a lot of working together to make sure that we’re setting that the goals given what this federal government has asked us to do that we’re setting goals and performance objectives that work for our State and most importantly, I guess the thing that worries me the most is that we seem to do transportation planning without paying attention to economic development and I really, I don’t know how you can send this message up the ladder but I think the State economic development people ought to be involved in the transportation planning because that’s the bedrock for economic development.
Maes: Unless you have any other questions, I'm done.

Flores: Does anybody have any further questions for Ms. Maes?

Garrett: And thank you for the briefing, I must say it was helpful for you to sort of work us through and here is how this ties to this page and then you can follow and see how the numbers move. I think I've got a pretty good idea of how they shift from page to page. What I'm not real clear, I think and this may be very basic but on the district targets how much is that our district will have.

Maes: District 1, it's the $25,495,386.00.

Garrett: Okay, now there are if I am understanding this, then there are five program categories? Okay and the selection of projects within District 1 we have a role, I mean this sort of gets to the role of the MPO in determining these projects, can you just sort of summarize that.

Maes: Actually I'd probably have to defer to if I could to Trent because since he is here with district, we just issue them out and from there……

Flores: Are we going to have any further questions for Ms. Maes?

Garrett: I don't know it depends on the answer to this question.

Doolittle: Good morning, Trent Doolittle with the DOT. Tom may have to expand a little bit on at least the formal process with MPO but if we have projects either in the Las Cruces or the El Paso MPO of course we have to through your process to get it added, but ultimately the District prioritizes based on our needs where we initially spend that money and Jolene’s talked a little bit about interstates, of course our top priority, but ultimately the District will prioritize where that $25M goes and if it happens to fall within the MPO area then we run through your process to get it included as part of STIP.

Garrett: Okay, so there is an interesting point of it is your priorities but if it's got to go through our process, I mean that is where I think goals and process begin to be important in terms of how we talk about that, right?

Doolittle: Correct.

Garrett: Because to some degree it needs to be our priorities too without prejudging what it is.

Doolittle: Correct, well for instance we’re rebuilding Motel/Avenida de Mesilla/I-10/I-25, all of those fall within your MPO area so we have to run through your
process to get it added into the STIP, but ultimately that also falls within
our priority because it’s on the interstate so it really just kind of depends
on where the projects are falling.

Garrett: So it would seem to me that for these categories, for this $25M for those
projects you are going to identify within the Las Cruces MPO that the
criteria are important, that we understand how you see the situation and
what work needs to be done and that it would also a matter of our saying
well are there other projects that we also think are important that fit the
same criteria and then that would be where we would be having that
discussion.

Doolittle: Certainly.

Garrett: Okay, so that’s going to be some of these large construction projects to
some degree, right? Is that one way to characterize these?

Doolittle: For the most part, yes, but we do have some smaller pavement
preservation projects, you know those types of work, it doesn’t necessarily
have to be a big project. I mean a lot of times it’s actually good to have a
few smaller projects set aside in case we have redistribution of smaller
funds or we have a little bit of money left over. It’s actually good to have
some smaller projects set aside to fill in gaps and we actually do have at
least some internal discussions tied to some of those smaller projects to
fill those gaps. We actually have shelf projects ready to go that don’t
necessarily include a $10M bridge project, so we can certainly have those
discussion and ultimately I think that’s one of the good things about adding
myself to the Policy Board is those types of discussions can take place
amongst the Board.

Garrett: Okay, yeah I mean a category for example like STBO. It would seem to
me that knowledge of local conditions and needs and all that kind of thing
would play a significant part of the discussion about how those monies
might be used.

Doolittle: Correct and actually our bridge inspection program inspects all bridges
whether they are off-system or not and so we are familiar with the
condition that but you are correct amongst the group itself we could
certainly prioritize whether we replace a bridge in the City of Las Cruces or
the Town of Mesilla. Those discussions will certainly help prioritize that
deficiency list.

Garrett: Okay, that helps me with that. I think then I’m probably going back to
page 2 and maybe the one thing that I would, that I’m not really, I tried to
take notes as fast as I could to identify those places where there are funds
that the MPO is going to be competing for and some of those are as I understand it handled by the planning office.

Maes: Yes, what is going to happen is the planning is putting together a plan for if you are talking about the TAP funds.

Garrett: This is the one thing I need to make sure I’m clear about, TAP funds are one of the things we compete for.

Maes: Yes.

Garrett: What are the other things we compete for?

Maes: Well, anything else that would qualify within your area as far as funding goes because if you see the STPL, the larger one goes directly to the TME’s. The STPS can be used anywhere under 200,000 but up to 25,000 I believe. The STPR is the rural areas, so that’s where anything for $25,000 and below so that is strictly for use in those areas.

Garrett: But isn’t it handled through the district?

Maes: Yes and I believe, that’s what I was just talking to Trent and will have to, I believe every district has a call out for projects that they do every year and I think it’s from based on our policies and procedures that we have in place for the STIP. We have it on there from January 1, so it would be January 1, 2013 and I believe the deadline is April 1 of that same year, so this would be for projects that you are looking at for maybe like in 2014 or 2015 that you would like to present to the district that you see that you have need for and maybe they can look at their program and see where they can maybe get you some for…………..

Garrett: Okay, maybe what I’m trying to here is that there is clearly one category and it’s $25.5M, what happens here is tied to the District, it has to go through the District however it’s administered, right?

Maes: Yes.

Garrett: Okay, there are other funds that don’t tie into the District and an example of that might be the Metropolitan Planning funds, is that correct? Those are distributed through the State planning among the DOT’s?

Maes: Yes, those are actually the funds that come to the MPO’s. Those are the ones that are based I believe on a calculation, is that how they distribute. That’s the calculation that…………..

Garrett: So there is no competition there at all, just …………….
Murphy: No, those are distributed by formula that is developed by the State.

Garrett: Okay and the Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Maes: Those are the ones that they put out a call for projects where you have to do your application and also have your crash data available when you are submitting them.

Garrett: And in terms of process though, that doesn’t tie directly through the District.

Maes: No, that is at a State-wide level.

Garrett: That’s a State-wide level that the MPO is competing for.

Maes: That’s everybody, the whole State.

Garrett: What I’m trying to do is to understand where we in terms of the funds and how they are going to come to us, there is some of these that we are going to compete with everybody, there are some that we are working and maybe through a competitive process within the District. There are going to be some that are funded on a population basis and come directly to the MPO, right.

Maes: Yes.

Garrett: And are those the three categories.

Maes: Yes.

Garrett: Okay.

Thomas: Can you tie them to the way they are listed here so we know which are which?

Maes: All the TAP ones are by a competitive basis which will be done through our planning section. The PL funds are also, those are the ones that are issued directly to the MPO’s, the PL, okay. The CMAQ mandatory goes directly to the two TMA areas, non-attainment areas which is the El Paso and the Albuquerque MPO. The STBOFRS goes to the District along with the NHPP, which are the ones that you see on this sheet. Pretty much everything that you see under each district goes directly to the district unless it’s within a TMA which would go directly to the TMA’s.
Murphy: Madame Chair, if I may jump in and the money is to go to the district, the SPTS and STPF. I’d like to kind of get away from using the word competitive. I think Mayor Pro-Tem had it right earlier, these are the funds that we need to work with the District cooperatively to set common goals that help achieve our objectives. This is where we can tie in economic development. This is why we’re trying to get the District engineer onto this Body so that, you know, so that we do cooperate more with the District and we align our goals and make sure that we have the same goals so that we serve our constituents.

Thomas: Thank you. I just wanted to say to Commissioner Garrett that the TAP funds are, on the federal level they took the enhancement projects and Safe Routes to School and a whole bunch of other things that used to come by formula and they threw them onto this thing called TAP and then they divided by half to the State and half to the MPO’s and then the projects there is a competition among the various projects to see which ones go forward but so we no longer get direct funds by formula, for example, for Safe Routes to School. But going back to working with the District, Trent, I think what is mystifying to us is that you said well you have a lot of projects sitting on the shelf and they are small ones you can pull out and every year you pick some and bring them to us and you say well these are in your area so we want you to approve those, but I think that we have a hard time making those decision because we don’t know what your big picture is, so what are the goals for District 1 and in therefore why did you pick this project. I’d like to know, okay our goals are for District 1 are dadada, we have all these possible projects with this many bridges and this interstates whatever and based on these goals we decided to pick these projects, it’s at that level I think we would like you to come to us and say do you agree that these are the best ones to pick for this project or are there some other projects that you have that might replace or might be complimentary to what we’re trying to do here so that we can look at that whole area. I mean for example there is a lot of stuff going on down along the border with Santa Teresa. We’re working on an economic development plan down there. The transportation is very important. I suspect those of us who sit up here who also sit on a lot of other committees have some knowledge about some things that are going on that would be useful for making decisions about which transportation projects we ought to pursue, so I think what we’re asking you is could you please come, we got all this funding information now but now we want to know what our common goals for this District and what do you think the possibilities are to meet those goals and what do we think the possibilities are to reach those goals and how do we sort out all that out and put them together in ways that will get us the most bang for the buck.

Doolittle: Correct and Mayor Pro-Tem, Madame Chair, I agree with you completely. In all honesty where we sit now with our system being 50 years old, the
interstate system, you know we are spending a lot of money on bridges that ultimately have to be replaced. They are on the deficiency list, specifically here in Las Cruces we are running over State loads on New Mexico 9 completely around all of this area because the bridges here in town are deficient. They are load restricted. We cannot run those loads. We are in the process of basically holding our interstate system and replacing sections of roads, we don’t have a choice. I think we’re to the point now where we are starting to catch up with that and we can actually start looking at long term and being proactive rather reactive and honestly for the past, I’ve been with the department for 15 years, for those 15 years in all reality we’ve been reactive because we didn’t have a choice. I think we’re to the point now we’re starting to look long term. I actually sit on a pavement management system committee that’s going to be ultimately looking at the State-wide system and really changing the way that we think. We’re doing a lot of Band-Aids now because we don’t have a choice. This pavement management system will actually start looking at fully reconstructing roads and then ultimately managing those pavements over the course of their entire life rather than us just throwing $2 or $3M at a project just because it’s falling apart and that’s all that we can afford to do and so ultimately I think this MAP21 is falling into some of the things that we have been doing internally for quite some time, that we are completely changing the way that we’ve done things in the past and I think that’s consistent with what you are requesting of us as a department to come to this Board with, a long term plan and ultimately projects that will meet those goals as well.

Thomas: Yes and I think we’re all facing, I mean we have the same problem in the City, so does the County, so does Mesilla. We started doing the pavement management program a year or so ago. We now have the data from all (inaudible) and that’s fine you have to have that, that’s your first step but now that we have that and we start looking at, that helps us say these are the worst roads but in terms of which are the worst roads we also have to tie that to our land use planning and to our economic development planning because we can’t make the decision solely on this road is the worst road, you know maybe this road and this road are the same but that one leads to you know it’s going to be part of the road that leads to the spaceport and this one goes to a subdivision with ten houses, so it’s at that level that I think we need to have the discussions so that we can say this is going on at Santa Teresa or this is going on out at the West Mesa Industrial Park and I think it’s new territory for all of us. What I find in the five years I’ve been on this Committee and on the Council is that more and more everything that I’m involved in we’re now starting to have to look at it on a more regional level and we have to move away from this “oh well, this is the worst street and that’s the worst sewer” and it has to be part of a larger vision, I guess.
Doolittle: And one of the other things that we’re going to have to really consider is we really can’t afford to spend small portions of money on all of our roads, eventually we’re going to have to spend large portions to make bad roads good and then ultimately keep them in that condition, with that being said we’re going to have some roads, if you’ve got two bad and you spend money on one, one is not going to meet the expectations of governmental entities and the department and our citizens and we’re going to have to address those public concerns as well but again, I think that works towards a long term plan of addressing truly what our needs are long term.

Thomas: And in some places paved roads have returned to dirt roads and as we look at the overall system that might be true some places. We’re the ones who interact with the public most and so we need to know, we need to be in on those decisions so that we have a way of talking to our constituents and saying here is why.

Doolittle: Correct, I agree completely and I think we as a department have been heading that way, it’s just a matter of changing the perspective and ultimately the way we have been thinking for, honestly, at least 15 years.

Flores: Thank you, do we have any further questions for Rebecca Maes?

Benavidez: You have made a study of which roads or bridges are the worst in this area in Dona Ana County?

Doolittle: For the most part, our bridge program we do have a deficiency list, so for your bridges that list is readily available. The pavement management committee that I sit on right now we’re in the process of collecting the data and putting that into the pavement management system software. My guess is that is probably two or three years out before we have a real solid list. Honestly, we prioritize our out because our maintenance patrol supervisors call and say this road is falling apart and we’ll look at how much money we’re spending on maintenance and supplies just to hold that road together. Our roadway prioritizing is really due based on experience and what we’re spending to maintain.

Benavidez: So in your opinion as we speak right now, do you know which road in County or City needs immediate attention or you don’t have that information at the moment?

Doolittle: I want to say right off the top of my head I don’t. I can certainly visit with my staff. Our STIP, we can look at our STIP and show you at least internally what we feel because it will be on our, at least the next two year STIP. You mentioned improvements along the border, we’ve been talking about NM 136, of course it falls out of this area but NM 136 is a concern, but again those issues we’re addressing with small pavement preservation.
2 ½ inch in-lay projects when ultimately they may require full depth
reconstruction. They are 25 years old, so what you are going to see on
the STIP and what our priorities are at this point might be Band-Aids when
long term we may need to look at full depth reconstruction projects and
ultimately more funding. I’m sorry I don’t have anything for you right off
hand, bridges I could supply you that fairly quickly.

Benavidez: Thank you and thank you so much for presentation.

Flores: So I don’t see any further questions for Rebecca and thank you for your
comments.

Maes: Thank you Madame Chair and the Board for allowing me to present today.
Thank you, have a Merry Christmas too.

Flores: Have a safe trip back. So moving on to public comment.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Councillor Sorg motioned to approve the agenda.
Commissioner Benavidez seconded the motion.
All in favor.

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

   5.1 September 12, 2012
   5.2 November 14, 2012

6. OLD BUSINESS

   6.1 Resolution 12-10: A Resolution Adopting the 2013 MPO meeting calendar

This is a request to recommend adoption of the 2013 MPO Meeting Schedule and the
2013-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Schedule to the
Policy Committee. The Policy Committee is scheduled to meet on a monthly basis with
the exception of the months of March and July.

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

Tom Murphy presented three options regarding meeting times.
Flores: In addition, Commissioner Perez stated that if they are at 9 a.m. she will
not be able to make them and I know Sam Bernal works and so he would
not be able to the 9 a.m. either.
Thomas: I’m sorry I think I missed it, Commissioner Perez says she cannot come to 9 a.m.

Flores: She cannot come and I just assume that Bernal can’t either because he still works. Does anybody have any preference that they would like to state? My personal feeling is that we have problems making a quorum. We had a problem today so even though it personally benefits me to have the 9 a.m. meetings, I think for making the quorum I suggest we do the 5 p.m. straight across. Does anybody have a problem with that? For all the meetings Option A is my preference.

Thomas: Yes, Madame Chair, especially if it means two other people can never come to 9 a.m. meetings then we’re facing even bigger………my issue this morning was just a one-time thing but if it’s for all the meetings for some of the members then that’s a problem. I would go with A.

Flores: Do I have a motion?

Sorg: I’ll move to approve the Option A for scheduled meetings of 2013.

Thomas: Second.

Flores: Do we need to have a roll call vote since it’s a resolution?

Murphy: Ok.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett

Garrett: Aye

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza

Pedroza: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez

Benavidez: Aye

Murphy: Councillor Sorg

Sorg: Yes

Murphy: Mayor Pro-Tem Thomas

Thomas: Yes.
Murphy: Trustee Flores

Flores: Yes

Motion passes, vote 6-0 (3 members absent).

7. ACTION ITEMS

7.1 Resolution 12-12: A Resolution amending the MPO Bylaws to have the SCRTD represented on the TAC

The South Central Regional Transit District (SCRTD) has requested membership on the MPO TAC. The SCRTD is a political subdivision of the State and is comprised of Dona Ana, Sierra, and Otero Counties plus most of the incorporated municipalities within. All members of the MPO are also members of the SCRTD. The SCRTD was created to provide public transportation on a regional basis and is poised to adopt its initial Service Plan this fall.

Federal regulations require that operators of public transportation are included in the MPO process.

The addition of another TAC member will increase the membership to 15 and increase the quorum requirement to 8. MPO staff supports this request.

Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

Flores: Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Valencia? Seeing none, I noticed that there are some grammatical errors on the 5th Whereas, adoption of its portion of the bylaws, its meeting – I believe it should read because we’re talking about the TAC not there, we’re not talking about the numbers of the TAC but the TAC as a whole; and additionally on the bylaws under 2. Responsibilities amended the second paragraph, five sentences down it should read “appropriate governing body for its review, concurrence and recommendation” and then “a negative response from the governing will be a veto with the proviso that if the veto process is contrary to any State or federal statutory requirement”, so just some typos need to be fixed.

Murphy: Okay, we’ll work with you on that. I’ve just been notified that we’re about to lose our recording system, so you will probably……
Flores: Well, it’s just to me it’s a typo so do we kind of just amend it?

Murphy: We’ll work with it but what I want to do is get to the vote.

Flores: Can I have a motion for this Resolution?

Garrett: I move approval of Resolution 12-12 amending the MPO Bylaws to have the SCRTD represented on the TAC.

Pedroza: Second.

Flores: Let’s have a roll call.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett

Garrett: Aye

Murphy: Councillor Pedroza

Pedroza: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Benavidez

Benavidez: Yes

Murphy: Councillor Sorg

Sorg: Aye

Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas

Thomas: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Flores

Flores: Yes

Motion passes – vote 6-0 (3 members absent).

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 NMDOT STIP – moved under Conflict of Interest

8.2 Advisory Committee Updates
Murphy: We did not have the TAC meeting in December. We did update the Bylaws and I think we’re just going to be jumping into public participation update with Committees in the upcoming new year.

9. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Murphy: From staff perspective, we had the MPO quarterly here yesterday. There is a lot of information put out to us by the State. I do need to process a bunch of that. We did pass out on Mayor Pro Tem’s suggestion the TAP priorities and I’m supposed to be getting an electronic document from Mr. Morele that actually goes into deeper depth of that. We’ll forward that to you as well for comments to be disseminated, essentially that’s the table of contents and they want to develop those criteria deeper and that is I think the substantive comments will come from.

Within, hopefully, late January, early February time frame we’ll be taking the JPA through each of your governments. We did get approval from FHWA so we meet our December 31 deadline from our FHWA review.

Flores: I also wanted to discuss, we were going to have a work session today and can you talk a little bit about what you were, we were thinking about having it in January; however, you had volunteered……….I’ll let you kind of explain what you volunteered quickly.

Murphy: Yes, as part of yesterday’s meeting NMDOT informed us that FHWA approached them about creating a summit and they would bring in some national speakers and they wanted to have that within an invite with the Policy Committee members and they were looking for a July time frame and I volunteered to work on picking the speakers, organizing the logistics and getting ideas through and I think that really fit into with what a lot of this Body has been looking for. This will have FHWA backing on it. It will be more motivating to the other Policy Committee members around the State to come and join and we’ll be able to have face to face.

Flores: We might pay for them to come as well.

Murphy: We’re looking into being able to pay for travel expenses for Board members to help also with the motivation to attend that meeting and just a little side note, my MPO colleagues were jealous with four you attending the MPO quarterly at portions and they are just complete jealous about the level of participation that my Board is doing in the process so I congratulate all of you for your interest in the process.

Flores: So for Mr. Murphy’s ideas let’s wait for July and organize this. I responded that perhaps we would like to try and have a work session anyway in January to plan the July session. Do we want to invite other
MPO members, maybe telephonically, to plan the July? Do we want to meet together amongst ourselves to plan the July and have a work session in January? I want to know what your thoughts are and of course, be brief because have limited amount of time. Do we have to stop? Okay. So we are adjourned (meeting stop because of system upgrade at the County).

10. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comments.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:11 p.m. (due to system upgrade at County offices).

________________________________
Chair
Following are the minutes from the MPO Policy Committee (PC) meeting held on Wednesday, January 9, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. at Dona Ana County Commission Chambers, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)  
                  Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)  
                  Mayor Pro Tem Sharon Thomas (CLC)  
                  Councilor Gil Sorg (CLC)  
                  Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)  
                  Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)  

MEMBERS ABSENT:   Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)  
                  Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)  
                  Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)  

STAFF PRESENT:    Tom Murphy (Las Cruces MPO)  
                  Andrew Wray (Las Cruces MPO)  

OTHERS PRESENT:   Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)  
                  Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
                  Aaron Chavarria (NMDOT)  

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order.

Roll call to establish quorum.

Murphy:  Trustee Bernal  
Bernal:  Here  
Murphy:  Commissioner Garrett  
Garrett:  Present  
Murphy:  Commissioner Hancock  
Hancock:  Present  
Murphy:  Councillor Sorg  
Sorg:  Here
Quorum was present.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Trustee Flores stated that Olga Pedroza has been vice chair. Councillor Pedroza was unable to attend today’s meeting but she did state that she was willing to be Chair.

Trustee Bernal nominated Councillor Pedroza for Chair.

Councillor Thomas seconded the motion.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal

Bernal: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett

Garrett: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock

Hancock: Yes

Murphy: Councillor Sorg

Sorg: Yes

Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas

Thomas: Yes

Murphy: Trustee Flores

Flores: Yes

Motion passes, vote 6-0 (3 members absent).

Commissioner Hancock nominated Billy Garrett for Vice Chair.
Councillor Thomas seconded the motion.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal
Bernal: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Yes

Murphy: Commissioner Hancock
Hancock: Yes

Murphy: Councillor Sorg
Sorg: Yes

Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas
Thomas: Yes.

Murphy: Trustee Flores
Flores: Yes.

Motion passes, vote 6-0 (3 members absent)

New chair is Councillor Olga Pedroza and new vice chair is Commissioner Billy Garrett.

In Councillor Pedroza’s absence, vice chair Commissioner Billy Garrett acted as Chair.

Commissioner Garrett thanked Trustee Flores for her service.

Tom Murphy wanted to interject an agenda amendment. Since the work session item 6.1. IMIP of Cd. Juarez was discussed earlier; he wanted to amend the agenda by removing Item 6.1. from the agenda and replace with NMDOT update.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY – No conflicts of interest.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comments.
5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1.  *Resolution 13-01: A Resolution Certifying Compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the 2013 Calendar Year by the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Annually, the Las Cruces 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 “aye” to approve Resolution 13-01 approving the 2013 Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization Open Meetings Resolution.

2. Vote “aye” to approve Resolution 13-01 with additional amendments or modifications.

3. Vote “nay” and do not approve Resolution 13-01 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.

Tom Murphy gave a brief presentation.

Councillor Sorg motioned to approve Resolution 13-01.

Trustee Flores seconded the motion.

Murphy: Trustee Bernal
Bernal: Yes
Murphy: Trustee Flores
Flores: Yes
Murphy: Commissioner Hancock
Hancock: Yes
Murphy: Councillor Sorg
Sorg: Yes
Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas
Thomas: Yes
Murphy: Commissioner Garrett
Garrett: Yes

Motion passes, vote 6-0 (3 members absent).

Work Session Item 6.1. removed from the agenda and replaced with updates

6. NMDOT Updates

Jolene Herrera, NMDOT, introduced Aaron Chavarria. He is the new technical support engineer for District 1. He is replacing Gene Paulk.

Jolene gave updates on construction projects that are happening in the area and are upcoming.

- Engler is completed;
- I-10/I-25 is scheduled to be completed by March 2013;
- Motel Boulevard is supposed to be completed approximately the first week of March. Jolene heard from the project manager today that it should be open to all traffic on Motel Boulevard and I-10 by the end of January.
- Cable barrier project on US 70 – it is from Rinconada to NASA Road – it is scheduled to begin February 4th, Smith & Aguirre was awarded the contract. They have 120 working days to complete this project, estimated completion date around mid-June. Working hours will be Monday thru Friday – 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. and there will be lane restrictions since the median is very narrow there.
- Project on US 70 this side of Rio Grande Bridge all the way to Main Street, that is scheduled to begin the end of March. They have a 60 day ramp-up time and 85 working days of construction. It is a resurfacing project.

Doolittle: that project (the barrier project) doesn’t go all the way from Rinconada to NASA, the contractor is going to do that in two mile segments so we won’t go in there and we won’t have a one lane for that entire corridor from that 9 a.m. – 3 p.m.

Councillor Sorg asked about Rinconada down to I-25.

Doolittle: The cable barrier doesn’t meet design specifications for that area. We are actually in the process of trying to acquire funding to implement concrete
wall barrier. Right now, again, that is in the very preliminary stages of trying to acquire that funding but we do recognize the need. It’s just cable barrier because of the deflection of a cable barrier with it not being rigid in a lot of places there we don’t have the room to allow that deflection so we’re looking at other options and other funding sources to get that section addressed.

Garrett: I just wondered two things. One is, is this the kind of thing that you would consider having a groundbreaking on?

Doolittle: Typically with this scope we don’t, no.

Garrett: I’m wondering because of the sensitivity of the things that have happened along that stretch if it might not be a good thing to not just get out and get started which is important but also to consider the possibility of having some kind of a ceremony to initiate the work. It also gives an opportunity to get more information out about how the work is going to be done in terms of lane closures and speed control and the whole safety of the thing. We could really work it into some kind of a safety themed event. That’s just a thought.

Doolittle: Certainly, we’ll consider that and the other thing we may want to consider also is a ribbon cutting.

Garrett: At the end of it.

Doolittle: Correct.

Garrett: Right. Councillor Thomas.

Thomas: Mr. Chair, yeah, I think Councillor Sorg and I would both most be very interested in that because it’s our districts that are on either side of 70 and Commissioner Hancock now has that area as well so we’ve got three people on this end of the desk who probably would like that.

Doolittle: The other thing we also discussed with the contractor is holding public meetings on typically where we have high volume traffic, high profile projects we’ll have public meetings to share the lane closures and those types of items with the public other than through a public announcement, so I’m hopeful that before the project even starts we’ll be able to go through a sequence of construction and start putting out press releases and having public meetings to discuss the long term scope as well.

Thomas: Okay, Mr. Chair, would you make sure that the three of us get that information because we have big (inaudible) especially Councillor Sorg and I have big email list. We had a community meeting last night, a joint
meeting, we had about 70 people there and people were very happy to get
information. I think we might be able to get a pretty big crowd if we all
work together on it.

Doolittle: Certainly.

Garrett: Good and the second question, with the reduced amount of time that work
occurs on a daily basis you made the point of saying it was Monday thru
Friday and is there, what are the implications of working at least one more
day on a weekend in order to get the project finished. Do you have to pay
special rates for that kind of thing?

Doolittle: We don’t have to, ultimately the contract time has been established and
it’s up to the contractor to determine what his hours are and his time
frame. One of the things that was discussed at the pre-con is they want to
at least look at the possibility of working Saturday thru Wednesday
because on Saturday and Sunday we’re hopeful that we can expand those
time frames. The contract right now is written regardless of the day of the
week, they work from 9 a.m. – 3 p.m. but on weekends if it allows us to
expand those hours either before or after we’re going to try that, so right
now the scope of the work is Saturday thru Wednesday but regardless
they get charged per a contract whether a working day is Monday thru
Friday, so if they choose to work on Saturday or Sunday they are not
charged a working towards the contract but you are exactly right it gets us
a little bit ahead of the game. I think one concern that contractors typically
have is if for some reason they are not as efficient as they hoped or traffic
doesn’t allow them to be as productive they typically use those weekends
to make up for lost time that they may have had at the beginning of the
project so my guess is initially they are only going to work five days a
week and if there are delays due to whatever that they may start working
more days over the course of the end of the project but for now it’s a
Saturday thru Wednesday schedule, proposed schedule.

Garrett: I would say that there is strong support for the idea of the project being
finished ahead of time because of the safety issues and so whatever can
be done I’m sure would be appreciated.

Doolittle: The other proposal was when you first begin a project, of course, there are
inefficiencies in learning curves and they had originally scheduled to start
up at Organ and then work their way into town; we have since convinced
them to start at the other end just because of the traffic and the number of
accidents and fatalities that we’ve had in that area, so they are actually
going to start at Rinconada and then work two mile sections up the hill
rather than down into town so that was another compromise we worked
through with the contractor.
Flores: Do you give bonuses for early work being completed or completing early?

Doolittle: Not on this project. We do have that capability, for instance, on the I-10/I-25 it has that an early finish, on this project it does not.

Garrett: Very good, thank you, good report and Mr. Chavarria welcome.

7. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Thomas: Thank you Mr. Chair, I just want to catch up on a couple of things that we talked about at the last meeting and so going forward, we were going to at this meeting plan the summer MPO Policy Committee – whatever we're calling it – summit, so can we make sure that is on the next agenda so we can get to that. We also in response to information about the federal money that NMDOT receives that presentation we wanted to track what happens with the open container and the DWI legislation so I don't know if you have any more updates on that Tom, but the legislative session is starting pretty soon and so I think we need to pay attention to that. I think they are only looking at open containers, is that right, they are not looking at DWI?

Murphy: I don't recall off the top of my head. I think we're just at the deadline for bill submittal for the legislature so we'll probably get a report in the next day or so.

Thomas: Okay, so let's make sure we have that on the next agenda so we can and in the meantime if you get information and you want us and you need help from us and we all to Santa Fe and we are there various times during the sessions so you want to call on us to talk to our people or try to lobby on behalf of the DOT so that we don't lose that money, that federal money, please let us know because we all do that and then after we looked at the presentation on all the federal money and how it gets divided up, some of us still had some questions about places that wherever we might have some impact on that and Tom and I sat down, my understanding increased quite a bit but I could still use some more help and I think we need to do that, whether it needs to be in this kind of a setting or a work session but it's very helpful to me to sit down and do that with Tom and I think it would be helpful if you did that with all of us and we have an opportunity to increase our understanding as we go forward so I'd like to ask that we find a way to do that sometime soon.

Garrett: Duly noted, thank you.

Flores: I'd comment that we had a work session today, it was very informative but I guess if could make some notes for people that weren't able to come
because there was another meeting scheduled so a lot of people weren’t able to come.

Garrett: Will we be able to get some material from that meeting.

Thomas: We should have the presentations that were given.

Flores: Maybe post them online or something.

Thomas: Right and we’ll transcribe Andrew’s notes from it. I wasn’t able to attend the entire meeting myself.

Sorg: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a word or two that I got out of the meeting today with the folks down from Juarez and that is that what they were talking about is a huge investment that they are making in their infrastructure as well as projecting their economic growth. They are talking about auto assembly plants; of course Fox-Con increasing three or four times and so Homer from DOT was showing some of the infrastructure that possibly we might need here on this side of the border for supporting that growth they have or projecting down there and one of the things that came to my mind, of course, he showed the UP project there but the road from the Santa Teresa area up to I-10 at our West Mesa Industrial Park is on their radar and so that will be something that will be coming along and that we’ll have to take a look at, at some point and time and that’s all that’s the main thing I got out of and of course they went into a lot of their planning and so forth that they have for the City there and that was quite detailed and their GIS program down there is remarkable. In fact I was told by Christine Logan in the meeting, she says their GIS is better than the University’s here but that’s a subjective comment, thank you.

Garrett: Trustee Bernal, I would like to simply say it’s good to see you again and welcome back to the Committee.

Bernal: Thank you.

Murphy: One staff comment, Mr. Chair. Part of the reason I missed a portion of today’s work session is I’ve been deeply involved in interview processes to replace Mr. Hume and Mr. Hoskins and while the associate transportation planner process is still ongoing I’d like to introduce you to the MPO’s future new transportation planner, Andrew Wray, who was the successful candidate in that process. He did very good and probably next month he’ll be joining me up at the table and speaking with all of you a lot more often.

Garrett: Very good, congratulations.
8. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned.

___________________________
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1. CALL TO ORDER  
Commissioner Garrett called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m.  
Tom Murphy called the role to establish quorum. Five Committee Members were in attendance so there was a quorum for the meeting.  
Tom Murphy requested a change in the agenda to insert “Staff and Committee Comments” between “Action Items and Adjournment.” The request was approved by the Members.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY – No conflict of interest.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

4. ACTION ITEMS
   4.1 *Resolution 13-02: A Resolution amending the TIP
Garrett: If I could just let me go ahead and get a motion on the floor and then we'll move from that into presentation and discussion.

Flores: Motion to amend the TIP.

Barraza: Second.

Garrett: It’s been moved and seconded. Could we now have the presentation about that?

Tom Murphy reviewed the items for the amendment to the TIP Program.

1. #W-100032, the funding for the Safe Routes to School coordinator and we have been approved funding for FY 2013 and FY 2014 for Devashree’s position.

2. #TL-00011 is funding for some Roadrunner Dial-s-Ride vans that will be funded into FY 2014.

3. #W-100080 is the Safe Routes to School Phase 2 Infrastructure Money in the amount of $500,000 that has been enabled through the Safe Routes to School Action Plan and will be going to the City of Las Cruces to do the projects for the Tier I schools as recommended by approved Action Plan.

4. #W-100060, Safe Routes to School Champion Funding. That is the money that goes to Mesilla Elementary to fund their program.

5. #LC-0070 is a movement of pavement preservation for US-70 from Morton Lane to the Rio Grande Bridge. It is being moved up one fiscal year from FY 2014 to FY 2013 and the funding is being increased by $600,000.

6. #LC-00080 the pavement preservation for NASA Road to Aguirre Springs Road and is being moved back from FY 2013 to FY 2017.

Garrett: Does anyone on the Committee have a question or a comment regarding any of the items? Norma?

Barraza: No, no. I do not.

Garrett: Councillor Thomas.

Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There was question as to how the schools were chosen. Can you just explain that to us briefly so we know how to answer that question if it keeps coming up?

Murphy: Certainly. The Action Plan itself developed, through the coalition that helped in the writing of the Action Plan, developed a multi-criteria evaluation of all the schools within the Las Cruces Public Schools District. They looked at things such as population of school age children within what was deemed a walkable area. They looked at the roadway network
for roads that are relatively direct connections to the schools and then there were some surveys that were done on willingness to participate. Really the criteria was kind of established to pick the ones where the environment was most suitable to encourage the walking and then to just bring the facilities up to even high standards, hopefully to see some progress in the amount of students that we have walking and biking to school.

Thomas: So, was there some kind of point system or...? I see some percentages and an average so I didn't know how the scoring system worked.

Murphy: There was a point system. I do not recall the weighing of the point system at this level but it was certainly discussed through the Coalition. It was discussed at the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee. It was discussed at the Technical and Advisory Committee and it was discussed at this Committee level at the time so we think that the process was really well thought out and had a lot of opportunity to input and I do know that some of the people that you may have heard from do not agree with the results of it; but we did have this through a public process and it is what was approved to do this evaluation.

Thomas: I think we need, you know,, if we do this again, I think it needs to come with a paragraph or two describing how the system operated and how schools got rated so that’s right with the list so that we, you know, we always have the explanation. It just saves us from having a lot of questions so, you know, I guess I still don’t understand how some schools have 82 points average and some have 254. I don’t know that works and I don't know how to explain it to anybody.

Murphy: We’ll see if we can get a better summary within there in the sheets but it’s all contained within the approved Action Plan, which was approved by this Body. We also held various work sessions with the City on it, as well.

Thomas: Yeah, I think we all know that but, you know, again, it comes down to people looking at it and seeing these numbers and these schools chosen and those not chosen and it’s always a good idea just to be transparent to make sure that this is how this worked and this is how these schools got these points and got chosen.

Murphy: We’ll certainly try and take those recommendations and we always want to be as transparent as possible.

Thomas: All right, what’s “BTW?” I just (inaudible, laughing)

Murphy: “BTW?”
Thomas: It was the first one in the list of schools. I didn’t know what that was.

Murphy: Booker T. Washington.

Thomas: Oh, okay.

Murphy: On Solano just north of Spruce.

Garrett: Anyone else?

Sorg: Me, Mr. Chairman.

Garrett: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the first column you have “percent R-E-P-W,” Could you just tell me what that means? (inaudible) “Percent...REP W,” it’s just the initials. I don’t see any explanation of it. No, said separately.

Murphy: That column which you are referring to is in the Action Plan and is the “Percent of Reported Walkers” and those are numbers that are derived from the in-school surveys that we conducted at every school throughout the District.

Sorg: And a “Pot Walker” is what?

Thomas: A “Pot Walker” is a “potential walker.”


Murphy: And those would be the ones that exist (inaudible – two people speaking at the same time)…

Sorg: Well, I want to make that clear.

Murphy: … in the shed. (general laughter) Yes, we’re not in Colorado or Washington.

Sorg: Right. Okay. Now, I didn’t have a chance to look at this before so I’m going to study it a little bit more and I’ll ask questions later if I need it. Okay? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Garrett: Other questions on any of the items in the TIP request? Could you just briefly summarize why additional funding of $600,000 was requested or being potentially moved?
Murphy: Mr. Chair, we’ll have a representative from NMDOT answer that question.

Garrett: Very good.

Herrera: Good morning.

Garrett: Good morning.

Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT. $600,000 was added to that one because the initial Engineer’s estimate went up slightly. We’re going to do some additional work that wasn’t in the original scope.

Garrett: Okay.

Herrera: That’s why that was added.

Garrett: And again, just for the record, in terms of the shift from 2013 to 2017, in terms of the work on US 70…

Herrera: Um-hmm.

Garrett: What was the reason for doing that?

Herrera: There’s a really large project in 2014 and we’re going to have to clear the way to provide funding to complete that large project. It’s outside of the MPO area, a bridge in Silver City.

Garrett: Okay. I think we’ve heard about that bridge a number of times.

Herrera: Yes.

Garrett: Right. It’s in Silver City….

Herrera: In Silver City, Hudson Street bridge on….

Garrett: … and it’s a safety issue, if I recall.

Herrera: Right.

Garrett: So it’s within the District but outside the MPO?

Herrera: Yes, it is.

Garrett: All right.

Sorg: One more time.
Garrett: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Are you finished, Jolene, then with what you wanted to say?

Herrera: Yes, unless there was …

Sorg: I just have a comment.

Herrera: Okay.

Sorg: Just for the record. I see in 2015 there’s a scheduled $9,000,000 payment with preservation on I-10 from Las Cruces to the Texas state line. I’m just sad, a little sad, that that $9,000,000 couldn’t be put together to be used for the rail going from Las Cruces. That way we would have a little less traffic on I-10 and not have to preserve the pavement as often ‘cause it is… well, I suppose it’s going to be on the older part of the pavement that didn’t… yeah. Okay.

Herrera: Yes.

Sorg: Understand. Thank you.

Garrett: Anything else from the Committee? Okay, anything else from our audience in terms of comments? All right, in that case let’s proceed with the vote if you would call the roll, please.

Murphy: Trustee Flores?

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza?

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas?

Thomas: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.
Murphy: Just to verify: it was a motion by Mayor Barraza and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Thomas?

Garrett: Yes.

Flores: The motion was by me and the second was by Mayor Barraza.

Murphy: Oh, okay. Thank you.

4.2 Resolution 13-03: A Resolution Approving the City of Las Cruces’ Project Application for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HISP) funding on El Paseo Road

Garrett: All right, we’ll now move on to the next item, which is Resolution 13-03, approving the City of Las Cruces’ Project Application for Highway Safety Improvement Program on El Paseo Road. Could I have a motion to approve?

Thomas: Move to approve.

Sorg: I'll second it.

Garrett: All right, so that was by Mayor Pro Tem Thomas and seconded by Councillor Sorg. Mr. Murphy, could you proceed then with your presentation on that or comments on that?

Murphy: Yes. I will comment. Each year the New Mexico Department of Transportation issues a call for safety projects. It’s 100% funded and it’s essentially known as the Safety Program. Initially the call comes out around September and jurisdictions are encouraged to apply for these monies. At one point they announced that they were not going to do it and then reversed themselves. We were not notified initially on the reversal of the announcement and, I believe, it was probably late November when we did, indeed get a notification that the funding would be available for this year. We passed along that information to the Public Works Directors for the City, the County and the Town.

We did receive back a project proposed by the City for this funding and the project that they chose was to implement the recommendations of the previously completed El Paseo Road Safety Assessment and the City then went ahead and scoped out that project to figure out what the costs would be and they put together, using the Road Safety Assessment as the basis for the project, at $335,000 safety project that will install new street signs, upgrade pedestrian facilities to ASA compliance, do some restriping of crosswalks, signal warnings and construction of medians along the El Paseo Corridor from University up to where work has already been
completed near Wyatt. I will answer any questions you may have about
the project.

Garrett: Do Committee Members of Mr. Murphy? Yes, Mayor Pro Tem Thomas?

Thomas: Thank you. I just have a comment. This came out of the El Paseo
Project, right, when we were working on that?

Murphy: That’s correct. The City’s looking for implementation and actually I did
skip over one point which should be pertinent. This is an application to a
competitive funding process so this project will be thrown into an
evaluation process along with the projects from all over the state and the
money’s not guaranteed at any point but it does meet the approval of the
MPO in order to be submitted.

Thomas: Yeah. It’s a state-wide competition? Right?

Murphy: Yes.

Thomas: I just want to say that when we started doing the El Paseo Corridor Project
as part of the ETA Technical Assistance Program the first time they came
out and looked at El Paseo they went, “Oh, my God! You have a lot of
problems here.” So they actually got…what was it, FHWA? That came
and did the…?

Murphy: It was a company, FHWA, I think the…. There was another sub-agency
the DOT had asked.

Thomas: Could have been but anyway this was kind of just gravy on top of what we
were doing with the ETA project. I mean, they were so horrified by the
problems on El Paseo that they kind of got somebody, “Well, you need to
do this,” and so they got this done and you can see it’s very thorough, I
mean, they looked at every place where, you know, a pedestrian wouldn’t
be able to see across the street or the things weren’t marked. So it would
really be excellent if we could start getting something done on that and it is
one of the highest, if not the highest, pedestrian corridors in the city and
so these problems, a lot of which are pedestrian, are real important.

Garrett: Thank you. Other comments or questions? Yes, Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: I just want to reiterate, as I looked over the report, the Assessment, I
agree. It is an area that definitely needs to be worked on and, hopefully,
the grant will be approved. It’s a project from University all the way down
to Main Street. Am I correct? And I have seen the increase in
pedestrians along that area; but not only pedestrians, also the traffic flow.
So I think it is a project that definitely needs to get some funding and, hopefully, this grant will be approved.

Garrett: Any other comments by Committee Members?

Sorg: Mr. Chairman?

Garrett: Yes, Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: I just want to add my support to this, too. It’s high time we get moving on some improvements on El Paseo. Thank you.

Garrett: Any comments by those in attendance? We’re happy you’re here. In that case, let’s proceed with the vote.

Murphy: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Murphy: Councillor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Murphy: Mayor Pro Tem Thomas.

Thomas: Yes.

Murphy: Commissioner Garrett

Garrett: Yes.

5. STAFF COMMENTS

Garrett: Do we have any staff comments?

Murphy: Just one, Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee. I’d like to introduce the MPO’s newest Associate Transportation Planner. His name is Chowdhury Siddiqui. He comes to us most recently from the North Dakota Department of Transportation and previous to that he’s received a Doctorate in Transportation Engineering as well as a Masters in Transportation Engineering before that from the University of Central...
Florida. We're looking forward to having him on board and we're beginning to get a lot more work done.

Garrett: Very good. Welcome.

Sorg: Mr. Chairman?

Garrett: Yes.

Sorg: May I ask if you could spell his name?

Murphy: Yes, I can, actually. It's C-h-o-w-d-h-u-r-y S-I-d-d-i-q-u-i.

Thomas: I wasn't even close. (all laughing)

Sorg: Well, welcome. I see you're returning back to the warm country from those icy places. I used to live in North Dakota so I know what it's all about. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Garrett: Anything else?

Murphy: No more staff comments.

Garrett: Very good. Committee comments? Mayor Barraza?

Barraza: Mr. Chairman and members of the MPO, I just wanted to give you a bit of information. I just got back from Santa Fe meeting with our Legislators, but while I was up in Santa Fe I had an opportunity just to briefly speak to Representative Steinborn and he did mention to me that his is considering putting forth... and I wasn't sure whether with capital outlay or just a bill on the floor, regarding a feasibility study for rail transportation from Doña Ana County up north and he asked me if it was something the Town of Mesilla would support and most definitely, the Town of Mesilla would support that study and it's something that I'm very much interested in also. And he knew that we were going to have some type of a meeting. He wasn't sure if it was an MPO or RTC meeting today but I just wanted to keep an eye out with the Legislative reports that are coming out and see if you see something pop up from Representative Steinborn and I hope this is something that the MPO would support.

Garrett: If I understand correctly, we're not going to be having another meeting before the Legislative session concludes so we're not going to have an opportunity to actually act as a group on this but I think the point could be that the staff could disseminate information as it becomes available, make sure we have the information, then within our own individual capacities we could express support for the measure. Yes, Mayor Pro Tem Thomas.
Thomas: Yes, I talked to Representative Steinborn this morning. Actually, it’s from El Paso to here and, hopefully, to the Space Port so, you know, the plan we’re working on in the Regional Transit District and there was another piece of that plan that was that feasibility study for the commuter rail. We’re updating the service and finance plan for the three county transit district, but there was also a report that was part of that plan that was a feasibility study for a commuter rail from El Paso to the Space Port but it’s based on 2000 census data. So Representative Steinborn’s trying to find money to update that with 2010 and also to look at economic impact because since that time a lot of stuff has started and is going on now down in Santa Teresa and on the southern border of the county ad he would appreciate letters of support. I know we can only do individually; that’s, you know, what we’re doing with the RTD as well. But I can send around… Jack’s working on the letter today, Jack Valencia, so I can send around a little bit of everybody so you’ve got some facts to use if you want to then write a letter.

Barraza: Mr. Chair?

Garrett: Yes, Ma’am.

Barraza: If I could ask Mayor Pro Tem Thomas a question: is he requesting this, the capital outlay money, or is it through a bill?

Thomas: He’s requesting it through capital outlay. They told us that’s how we had to do it.

Barraza: Because I know today capital outlay requests are due to them…

Thomas: Yeah. That’s why I talked to him this morning and yesterday.

Barraza: Okay.

Thomas: So he’s going to get it in today but he would like letters as soon as possible in the next, you know, three or four days so that he can start assembling some support.

Barraza: Did he say how much he’s requested?

Thomas: Fifty thousand.

Barraza: Okay. Thank you.

Garrett: Mr. Murphy.
Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I may add to the Mayor Pro Tem’s statement; that Camino Real was something that we did look at within the confines within the prevue of Transport 2040 so from a long range planning perspective it’s something that the MPO has adopted and supported a stance on that. So in your capacity as individual leaders that is something you may reference as well.

Thomas: Thanks for that.

Garrett: Very good. Thank you. Anyone else? Mayor Pro Tem?

Thomas: If you remember at the last meeting I had kind of a list of things that keeps getting blocked so I just want to do that again. We said we were going to work on planning a summer MPO meeting and we haven’t gotten back to that yet. I’m still concerned about the legislation. I don’t know if we know anything about the Open Container or DWI, if anything’s happening in the Legislature ‘cause I haven’t followed that.

Then, a couple new things: I did a webinar a couple weeks ago on the Invest Project that Federal Highway’s doing. It’s performance goals and performance measures and they’ve tested it in a lot of places around the country and now they’re ready to move forward with it and if anybody wants to use it, you know, they would like us to get involved. So I guess I’d like to hear from, maybe at the next meeting, from DOT what they know about this Invest thing that the Federal Highway’s doing and if it’s something we want to look at ‘cause since that’s part of the Federal legislation to move towards goals and performance objectives and if Federal Highway is testing this I figure maybe we should know something about it since it may indicate where they’re going.

Maybe Joanne can answer this: there’s an RFP out for something to do with the West High Mesa Road. Can you give us a little information about that?

Apodaca: First, Members of the Committee, I’m not Jolene but I do have information for you. My name is Gabby Apodaca.

Thomas: Hi, Gabby.

Apodaca: The RFP that we have out for the West Mesa study is just a study. It’s a Phase A study. It’s not going to go into much detail other than to say, you know, what is the feasibility of getting this done? So it’s just the very first step in a study.

Thomas: Can you give us some kind of timeline on that when you might choose a consultant and when you might get a report?
Apodaca: We do have a consultant on board already. We are going to be working through the negotiations with them and I do believe we have Molzen Corbin.

Thomas: And do you know about how long it'll be before they get the... what's the length of time before...

Apodaca: For the study, I would imagine by next year this time we'll have the first portion of it.

Thomas: By next year then. Okay. So some of us are working on various kinds of economic development programs and stuff and this would be a big part of that so if you can just kind of give us reports as you go along it'd be really helpful.

Apodaca: Sure.

Thomas: Thanks.

Garrett: Along those lines, just two things: one is that it would be helpful to know if they're going to have any public meetings, scoping, discussion, input of any kind if we could know what the schedule is for those meetings and what the purpose of those meetings would be.

Apodaca: Okay. I'd be surprised if we get any of that in the first initial because it's just taking in the information of what's out there. The next phase would bring us into a public information meeting.

Garrett: Okay.

Apodaca: This is just us pretty much gathering information and not really making any decisions.

Garrett: Got it. The second question is: what are we calling this thing on the West Mesa?

Apodaca: I believe it's the High Mesa...

Thomas: I had West High Mesa Road.

Apodaca: Yes.

Thomas: That was the information I got.

Apodaca: Yes, you're right, The West High Mesa Alignment Study.
Thomas: Would it be useful for them to, 'cause now we have some consultants on board who are looking at economic development, especially along the Border and what impact it's going to have on the county. Would that be useful information for Molzen Corbin?

Apodaca: It's information that we've connected them with already.

Thomas: But we're doing new stuff now. We have a new study going out now that's just starting.

Apodaca: Actually, it would be useful to them.

Thomas: Yeah. Okay, so we should have them get in touch with Molzen Corbin.

Apodaca: Yes.

Thomas: Okay. Thanks.

Garrett: Anything else? Thank you very much.

Apodaca: Thank you.

Garrett: Mayor Pro Tem, do you have any other items? Just so I can... you asked for the next meeting to include some discussion about the Summit. Correct?

Thomas: Yes. Uh-huh.

Garrett: As well as the status of legislation relative to Open Container.

Thomas: And DWI. Those were the two things that money was taken away from the state because of our current legislation.

Garrett: Okay.

Thomas: And then the Invest thing from Federal Highway.

Garrett: Very good. So if we could just make sure that those get added to agenda for next time.

Apodaca: Mr. Chair.

Garrett: Yes, thanks,

Apodaca: I actually have kind of an update on the Open Container Second Offender Law. It's a couple of weeks old but last I heard from Mike Sandoval, he's
our Planning Division Director, but he’s also in charge of the Traffic Safety Bureau. He said that what he heard is that both of those bills had been stopped in the House and he’s not exactly sure why or for how long they were going to be stopped. He didn’t have a whole lot of detail on that. I can check back with him today and see if he’s received any updates since then. But as far as I know it’s somewhere in the House.

Thomas: So I think this is something that, well, just to speak for myself, I know I’m very interested in it and if it results in our losing Federal money, at the end of the session, I guess, we would like a report on kind of what the complaints were and why it got stopped so that we can figure out ways to bring it back so that it will have a better chance ‘cause I think… and if we do this summer MPO meeting that should be a big part of that. But, you know, how can we work together across the state to get something done in these areas so we’re not losing money?

Apodaca: Okay; and I’ll check with Mike Sandoval to see if there’s any more updates and to be sure to send that to Tom so he can disseminate that information.

Garrett: Very good. Thank you. Anything else from the Committee Members? I just have a housekeeping item of a sort: we get wonderful packets and there’s lot of information here. There’s so much information that it’s hard to track if I have to leave it all in the packet. So I would really like to be able to break my packets down so that I have the minutes, for example, I can have a section of minutes and keep track of what we do in our meetings that I can track the TIP as a file, that I can track the… I mean, we have a nice report here about El Paseo but, just as an example, it starts on the left-hand page rather than on the right-hand page. It means that resolutions sometimes have information on the back side that has to do with something else and it would be immensely helpful if these packets… I love the fact that they are printed on two sides, but it means it’s very difficult to break these apart into manageable organized notebooks or whatever we do as far as hard copies. If you could insert blank sheets behind pieces so that there is a meaningful break and, you know, we have a document and it always is going to start on the right-hand page. I realize this is something that’s unique to our culture but it makes it really tough if… you know, ‘cause otherwise then I have to take these apart, make extra copies in order to make it useful. Would this be of interest to the other Members of the Committee? It’s not just an idiosyncratic…

Sorg: Yes.

Thomas: Yes.

Garrett:….. personal… okay, well…
Sorg: I concur.

Garrett: That’s good. You could try that for the next time and let’s see how it works for everybody and if additional direction is needed then we can provide that at that time but I would appreciate that.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Garrett: Okay, are there any other items then for discussion? If not could I have a motion to adjourn?

Barraza: Motion to adjourn.

Sorg: Second.

Garrett: All in favor say aye.

All: Aye.

Garrett: Any opposed say nay. We are adjourned.

__________________________________

Chairperson
LAS CRUCES METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE
ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF April 10, 2013

AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 A Resolution Adopting an Adjusted Boundary for the Las Cruces Urbanized Area

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and Approval

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
Map of Urbanized Area
Resolution to be provided as addendum

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

Proposals for adjusting the Las Cruces UZA include:

• Adding Onate High School and other land abutting US 70 from Sonoma Ranch to Porter
• Using proposed Mesa Grande alignment to proposed Lohman extension to square off UZA boundary south of US 70
• Using Desert Wind/Arroyo Rd. from I25 to Sonoma Ranch extension to square off boundary north of US 70.
• Include the Las Cruces International Airport and the West Mesa Industrial Park.
• Include Red Hawk Golf Club and NMSU Golf Course Clubhouse.
The Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the Lead Agency responsible for boundary smoothing, subject to NMDOT and FHWA approval; and

WHEREAS, the adjusted UZA must encompass the entire Urbanized Area designated by the Census Bureau; and

WHEREAS, the adjusted UZA should be one, single contiguous area; and

WHEREAS, the adjusted UZA should encompass areas outside of municipal boundaries that have urban characteristics with residential, commercial, industrial or national defense land uses consistent with or related to development patterns within the boundary; and

WHEREAS, the adjusted UZA should encompass all large traffic generators within a reasonable distance from urban area – such as fringe area public parks, large places of assembly, large industrial plants etc.) To include transportation terminals and their access roads – such as airports, ports of entry, and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee recommended approval of the adjusted urbanized area (UZA) at their March 21, 2013 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the adjusted urbanized area (UZA) at their April 4, 2013 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for this resolution to be APPROVED.
NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I)

THAT the Las Cruces Urbanized Area, as shown in Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made part of this resolution, is hereby approved.

(II)

THAT MPO staff are hereby authorized to take appropriate and legal actions to implement this Resolution.

DONE and APPROVED AS AMENDED this 8th day of May, 2013.

APPROVED:

__________________________________________
Chair

Motion By:
Second By:

VOTE:
Chair Pedroza
Vice Chair Garrett
Councilor Sorg
Councilor Thomas
Commissioner Hancock
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez
Mayor Barraza
Trustee Bernal
Trustee Flores

ATTEST: APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________
Recording Secretary

__________________________________________
City Attorney
AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval of the requested amendments to the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
FY2012 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Reports

DISCUSSION:
On May 11, 2011, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termin</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100930</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>US 70 Concrete Barrier Installation</td>
<td>I-25 Interchange and Rinconada</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.
A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2012-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

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

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

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee adopted the FY 2012-2017 TIP on May 11, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the NMDOT has requested amendments to the FY 2012-2017 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program to be approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization:

(I)

THAT the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Year 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.
THAT the Las Cruces MPO’s Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit “B”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved.

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

DONE and APPROVED this 8th day of May, 2013.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By: 
Second By: 

VOTE: 
Chair Pedroza 
Vice Chair Garrett 
Councilor Sorg 
Councilor Thomas 
Commissioner Hancock 
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez 
Mayor Barraza 
Trustee Bernal 
Trustee Flores 

ATTEST: 

__________________________
Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM: 

__________________________
City Attorney
Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Area          Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization          Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT: Proj: US 70 Concrete Barrier Installation Fr: I-25 Interchange To: Rinconada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Desc.: Installation of concrete barriers in US 70 between I-25 Interchange and Rinconada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks: New project as of 4/11/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category</th>
<th>TIP Informational Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUND SOURCE</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP MAP-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, April 11, 2013
Resolution 13-06 Attachment “B”

LAS CRUCES MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 450.334, the New Mexico Department of Transportation, and the Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces urbanized area hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:


(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

(3) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);


(5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and

(6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d).

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR

__________________________

Date

NMDOT

__________________________

Date
AGENDA ITEM:
8.1 Las Cruces Country Club Road Alignment

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and discussion

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
None

DISCUSSION:
Zia Engineering will give a presentation regarding their proposals for the redevelopment of the Las Cruces Country Club.
PROPOSED ROADWAY ALIGNMENT OPTIONS
PROPOSED ROADWAY ALIGNMENT OPTIONS

- **OPTION A**: CONNECT ONTO N. SOLANO DRIVE AT EXISTING SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION WITH MADRID AVENUE.

- **OPTION B**: CONNECT ONTO E. MADRID AVENUE, EAST OF EXISTING BASEBALL PARK.
OPTION A

**BENEFITS**
- Uses existing infrastructure (existing lighted intersection)
- Lessens the number of signalized intersections in the area
- Promotes integration of Apodaca Park and Park Ridge Development
- The proposed point of intersection will allow full traffic movements
- Lower traffic and transportation costs
- Does not negatively impact surrounding business and properties
- Impacts less City property area

**CHALLENGES**
- Approximately five mature trees will have to be replanted or removed
- Existing restroom facilities will have to be relocated
- Impacts 0.216 acres of actual Apodaca Park
- Is not consistent with approved MPO Thoroughfare Plan
**OPTION B**

**BENEFITS**
- Direct connectivity between N. Main Street and Madrid Avenue will help mitigate traffic issues on N. Solano Drive and Desert Drive
- Invites pedestrians and traffic south of Madrid to Park Ridge Development
- Does not impact Apodaca Park property
- The placement of a multifamily residential development adjacent to the park provides land use compatibility while enhancing safety and security of Apodaca Park
- Is consistent with approved MPO Thoroughfare Plan

**CHALLENGES**
- Challenging intersection design due to close proximity of existing intersection between E. Madrid Avenue and Sexton Street
- Most left turns will be prohibited
- Could negatively impact surrounding properties and business (particularly Storage Units at the corner of Madrid and Sexton)
- Increases the number of signalized intersections in the area
- Higher traffic and transportation costs
- Impacts more City Property area
- Eliminates Girl Scouts Camp
Questions & Answers